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Despite the broad range of attempts to mix “rock” and “classical” music by “progressive (“prog”)” rock musicians from the late 1960s, many writers on prog rock have interpreted the music in a relatively monolithic manner; they often have interpreted the resulting intertextuality simplistically as an elitist experiment that opposes rock’s populist origin. This could certainly be one interpretation of prog, but it is only one of many; there are additional kinds of possible narratives, according to the specific ways in which the materials are combined and fused. Yet the variety of intertextual approaches has rarely been recognized explicitly, and little analytical or musicological attention has been paid to the distinctly different intertextual styles. Generalized approaches to intertextuality have been common not only within popular music studies, however, but also within many humanistic fields. Since Julia Kristeva’s coinage of the term intertextuality in the late 1960s, theorists of the arts (literature, music, painting, architecture, etc.), sociology, politics, economics, and many other fields, have almost always treated intertextuality in a singular manner, presuming that all intertextual practices are more or less of the same kind. Consequently, dynamic aspects of intertextuality that result from correlation between diverse forms of intertextuality have rarely been fully considered, though they play crucial roles in the history of
twentieth-century arts.

This dissertation suggests the need to view intertextuality in its multiplicity and dynamism, by disclosing and interpreting a variety of intertextual practices and their important historical developments in the case of prog-rock keyboardist Keith Emerson’s “crossover” music. Six new models of intertextuality are introduced and explored in detail as Emerson’s important intertextual styles. These models are termed: background intertextuality, dialectic intertextuality, revisionary intertextuality, subtle intertextuality, multi-ply intertextuality, and framed intertextuality. These are distinct from the Bakhtinian “dialogic” model of intertextuality, but play crucial roles in the stylistic development of the musician. This study thus proposes and models a range of pragmatic ways to expand the scope of intertextual analysis, and transcend the limits of certain intertextuality theories in music, as well as in the arts in general.
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INTRODUCTION

Intertextuality and Musicology

Intertextuality – that critical term coined by French literary theorist Julia Kristeva in the late 1960s – no doubt counts as one of the most important but also most frequently misunderstood words within a wide variety of humanistic fields such as literature, the visual arts, philosophy, politics, sociology, economics, and music.¹ A list of the scholars who are supposed to have “developed” the term theoretically—including French deconstructionists Roland Barthes and Jacque Derrida, semiotic scholars Umberto Eco and Thomas Sebeok, German Rezeption theorists Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser, social and political scholars such as Foucauldian critics, African-American scholar Henry Louis Gates, Jr., and neo-Marxist Fredric Jameson, as well as all those important figures who

¹ Kristeva, “Bakhtin,”; and her Semeiotiké at chapter 4. Some might argue that Roland Barthes is the true coiner of the term, on the grounds that Barthes’s theory of intertextuality has perhaps been received sooner than Kristeva’s within English-speaking countries, because the Kristeva book was not translated even partially into English until 1980 in Roudiez, Desire in language (the translation was reprinted in Moi, The Kristeva Reader) whereas Barthes’s was already translated in c1970. Some have indeed pointed out that Kristeva attended Barthes’s seminar sometime in the late 1960s and might have come up with the idea of intertextuality under the influence of Barthes. But Orr infers that Kristeva presented her idea in Barthes’s seminar and influenced Barthes, and that there might be “[s]ome very strange Oedipal rivalries” between the two scholars. See her Intertextuality, 33. Considering the relative lack of definitive evidence for Barthes’s coinage of the term, it seems safer at this point to follow the general custom of ascribing the term to Kristeva.
used these thinkers’s theories in individual fields—does not project an image of a consistent “development” of the term over several decades. Kristeva’s most often-cited “definition” passage is probably the following: “any text is constructed as mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least double.”

But this passage has often been (mis)read only as a gloss of Russian Formalist Mikhail M. Bakhtin’s idea that “the central problem in prose theory is the problem of the double-voiced, internally dialogized word, in all its diverse types and variants.” In spite of the multiplicity clearly implied by Kristeva’s word “mosaic,” it is perhaps the Bakhtinian word “double” with which intertextuality has most often been realized and developed by subsequent theorists. To be sure, “double” is also multiple, but it usually implies two whereas “mosaic” suggests more than two (hence Kristeva’s “at least” right before the word “double” in the above quotation).

Despite such an expansive tendency in Kristeva’s implication, which this

---

2 Kristeva, Semeiotiké, 85. English translation is from Moi, The Kristeva Reader, 37.


4 Here I am deliberately simplifying the issue, to facilitate a quicker arrival at discussions on musical intertextuality. Indeed, the situation is not so simple; on the one hand, Bakhtin’s words “in all its diverse types and variants” also suggest an expansive tendency like Kristeva, and on the other, Kristeva does sometimes emphasize the doubleness like Bakhtin when she says, for example, “The ideologeme of novel is just this intertextual function defined by extra-novel text and by means of the novel text.” See her Semeiotiké, 54. But as Orr elucidates, what made Kristeva the coiner of intertextuality and not a copy of Bakhtin is more important for an understanding of intertextuality, and Kristeva surely had to expand the Russian theory, which is the topic of her Ph.D. dissertation, to be accepted by her French linguistics circles. See especially Orr’s discussion in
dissertation supports, the word “double” has often been taken too literally in relation to intertextuality. As a result, so many practical studies of intertextuality, including those of borrowing, quotation, paraphrase, and many other kinds of incorporation of other texts, examine only two intertexts (the text under investigation and an external text incorporated) and, what is worse, only a single relation between two intertexts, almost unanimously calling it “irony” – since this is precisely what Bakhtin means by “double-voicedness” – without particularly considering multiple other relations possible between the intertexts. \(^5\)

As a consequence, many studies have ignored the crucial fact that no text – whether literary, musical, or otherwise – has only two intertexts and that, more to the point, no two intertexts establish only one kind of relation with one another. Despite Kristeva’s daring revelation of this crucial fact, the term intertextuality has rarely been understood in the sense in which its coiner conceived it. The history of the notion of intertextuality is thus marked by an oversimplification of Kristeuan theory and an overgeneralization of various intertextual practices. \(^6\)

\(^5\) Other well-known namings include “parody” and “homage” in particular. But both of them and some others are just additional overgeneralizations, as will become clear in the course of this dissertation.

\(^6\) Similar points as to a refracted reception of Kristeva’s theory have been made occasionally from different viewpoints by different authors since the early 1990s. Manfred Pfister, for example, criticizes those structuralists who “have narrowed down its meaning from Kristeva’s general principle of texts presupposing other texts, to the set of devices within which one text pointedly refers to another, its ‘pretext.’” For “such a reduction of intertextuality to distinct and pointed references from one particular text to another runs counter to the vitally expansive nature of this principle.” See Pfister, “How Postmodern is
Of course one should still not forget that even “doubleness” is, by definition, more multiple than “oneness” at least, and one could even say that the scholarly move from one to two is surely an important revolution wrought by intertextuality theories. In fact, a text had formerly been considered a self-contained entity, reflecting a single, coherent authorial voice and written in what Bakhtin would call a “unitary language.”7 “Organic unity” had been the single most important criteria for a text’s value as an academic subject, and anything that disrupted this unity was unwelcome to scholarly investigation. Thus in studies of influence, for instance, an external text that directly influenced a given text had been discussed only in relation to the author’s biographical background or his/her technical resources, and not as an intertext that directly confronts and interacts with the original integrity.8 The kinds of texts in which a juxtaposition of two different voices is significant – such as “comic, ironic, or parodic discourses”9 – thus received little scholarly attention because these do not show “unity” or “oneness” of a single authorial voice. Thus, when intertextuality theories emerged against such a scholarly context, they made a huge impact indeed. By replacing “oneness” with “doubleness,” intertextuality theories resonated well with postmodernist movements, and powerfully facilitated serious studies of what had been unjustifiably excluded from serious investigation, such as gay/lesbian, 

7 Bakhtin, The Dialogic Imagination, 269-272.

8 A big exception is literary theorist Harold Bloom’s theory of influence. See his Anxiety of Influence, as well as Chapter 3 of this dissertation.

9 Bakhtin, The Dialogic Imagination, 324.
post-colonial, and African-American studies, popular culture studies, and film studies, among others. Considering that all these now-important areas of exploration have been initiated by “dialogic” approaches to intertextuality, the power of “doubleness” is indeed inestimable.10

And yet, there is no necessity to stop there. To reiterate, “mosaic” is even more expansive than “double.” The move from one to two is fine (which is what Bakhtin had done already in the early 20th century); now we can further move on to three, four, or more,

10 My point in this paragraph – and in this dissertation as a whole – is not at all to argue for or against “unity” of a text; my attitude towards this issue is that we cannot determine between “unity” and “disunity” until a considerable amount of both analytical and conceptual work is done to define the word “unity.” In the field of music studies, as Ruth Solie elucidated in “The Living Work,” “organic unity” has been the dominant criteria for centuries, while since around 1990 there have been more and more scholars who argue for “disunity.” Reviewing some studies for “disunity” (Kramer, “Beyond Unity”; Korsyn, “Brahms Research”; Dubiel, “Sense and Sensemaking”; Agawu, Playing with Signs; and Chua, Galitzin Quartets of Beethoven), Robert Morgan recently says that their conclusions for “disunity” is a “false conclusion,” since “conflicts inevitably accompanying unity” is “a matter of complexity, not disunity” (Morgan, “Concept of Unity,” 43). But one cannot decide so unquestionably whether a certain conflict in a text represents disunity or complexity of unity. Morgan himself seems to recognize that his “unifying analyses reflect a predisposition to find unity; but all analyses reflect predispositions of some sort or other” (42, emphasis original). This statement is in congruence with Kramer’s suggestions such as “It is all too easy to project the perceptual unity of listening back onto the stimulus ... There is some degree of textual unity in most pieces; there is also a measure of textual disunity in a lot of music ... Thus ... it is impossible to get completely beyond unity in perceived music” (Kramer, “Beyond Unity,” 14). Kramer’s position is that the question of “how are works of music unified? – is not the only one to ask” (15). Kramer never disagrees with the idea of unity but only suggests another way to look at music. Compared with Kramer, then, Morgan seems naive because he simply denies all these arguments as “false.” If “all analyses reflect predispositions of some sort or other,” and if arguments for “disunity” are wrong, then arguments for “unity” must equally be wrong. Arguments for both “unity” and “disunity” are simply a reflection of the analyst’s predispositions, unless s/he more theoretically defines the meaning of the very term “unity” conceptually and philosophically, which none of these scholars has attempted to do.
so to speak (which is what Kristeva suggested in the late 1960s).11 This means not only that more than two intertexts can be taken into account but also that more than one relation even between two intertexts can be considered more carefully than before. But intertextuality has almost always been regarded as a “double-voiced discourse,” one interplay of two intertexts. In the sense that intertextuality scholars have always resorted to this “dialogic” model, one may say that studies of intertextuality have been monolithic, as Mary Orr indicates.12 Indeed, they seem to try to find out a “dialogic” model in any given text whenever intertextuality is a topic of discussion. It is only since the mid-1980s and only very slowly that such monolithic approaches have been challenged by such literary scholars as Karlheinz Stierle and Rainer Warning, Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister, Worton and Still, Nathalie Limat-Letellier and Marie Miguet-Ollgnier, and Heinrich E. Plett.13

It must be admitted, however, that the study of music has been something of a late-comer compared with many other fields in the arts and humanities, not only in taking

---

11 This may sound as if I was assuming that “the more we find in a work, the better we understand it,” but this is not the case. In order to better understand a work, it is necessary to find many elements first, and to proceed further to discover specific relations among those elements. This is why, as will be stated at the end of this introduction, this dissertation does not choose to just find many intertexts in Keith Emerson’s pieces in order to transcend the limit of existing intertextuality studies. It chooses to find a variety of specific relations among intertexts.


up the issues of intertextuality but also in realizing the importance of its plurality. Studies of musical intertextuality started only around the mid-1980s with the work by Vladimir Karbusicky, Robert Hatten, and Günther von Noé. The significance of their contribution in launching a new area of exploration must not be overlooked, of course. Perhaps for the first time in music studies, Hatten and others stressed the importance of intertextual reference in music as confronting the intratextual musical structure, suggesting that “borrowing/intertextuality” in music can be heard independently of the intratextual structure of music. But this work emerged about fifteen years after Kristeva’s coinage of the term intertextuality, while other disciplines had already been discussing intertextuality since the 1970s. In addition, music scholars’ work on intertextuality was

---

14 One can partly see the tardiness of musicology by checking the publication history on the subject. Entering “intertextuality” and “literature” as search keywords in the online database World Cat (accessed on April 24, 2005) returns 553 books including 62 pre-1990 publications (which constitute about 11.2% of the 553 books), whereas entering “intertextuality” and “music” also as search keywords in the same database returns 36 books including only one pre-1990 publication (which constitutes only c. 2.7% of 36 books). Although this cannot be a precise comparison partly because World Cat has a general tendency to omit musicological publications, the above result seems largely true, since even a database specifically geared for musicology such as RILM returns a similar result. In fact, entering “intertextuality” in RILM (accessed also on April 24, 2005) returns 167 books and articles of various kinds, which include only 6 pre-1990 publications (c. 3.6% of 167). Studies of musical intertextuality indeed seem to have started much later than in other fields.

15 Karbusicky, “Intertextualität in der Musik”; Hatten, “Place of Intertextuality”; and Noé, Musik kommt mir ausserst bekannt vor.

16 Hatten says, “Intertextual exploitation for a conscious compositional strategy may or may not carry the kind of markedness values which lead to correlations with certain meanings or affects,” suggesting that intertextuality can.

---

See also his Musical Meaning for his use of the terms “markedness,” “correlations,” and so on.
still a naive version of intertextuality studies, with no awareness of the problems in monolithic approaches. Hatten, for example, explores different strands of “intertextual context” found in Berio’s *Sinfonia*, but he does not necessarily explore multiple relations that each intertext may establish with other intertexts, not to mention multiple relations between these different “strands.”\(^{17}\) Thus there is very little to add to a typical “dialogic” approaches.

Later in the early- to mid-1990s, there was a rush of publications on musical intertextuality, some of which are certainly groundbreaking: those by Kevin Korsyn, Joseph Straus, and John Covach, for example. Their work is probably the first to explore various, not single, ways in which intertexts interact with each other in music. Korsyn and Straus both use literary scholar Harold Bloom’s theory of “anxiety of influence.” Korsyn uses Bloom’s well-known “six revisionary ratios” of psychoanalytical and rhetorical relations between two intertexts to elucidate various ways in which the music of Brahms can be seen to interact with that of Chopin.\(^{18}\) Straus even expands on those ratios and invents his own “specifically musical revisionary ratios” to discuss different ways in which early twentieth-century composers establish themselves by confronting and overcoming the music of the past.\(^{19}\) Almost independently of these Bloomian studies, Covach approaches musical intertextuality from a more semiotic viewpoint and analytically explores various

\(^{17}\) Hatten’s discussion on Berio appears in his “Place of Intertextuality,” 73-75.

\(^{18}\) Korsyn, “Towards a New Poetics.”

\(^{19}\) Straus, *Remaking the past.*
mechanisms of musical humor and satire (rather than anxiety) in the music of rock groups The Rutles and Spinal Tap. These attempts are truly outstanding since many other studies of the time often simplistically use Bloom’s concept of “anxiety of influence” with no reference to the “ratios” or no intention to explore multiple intertextual relations. By detailing diverse intertextual relations, studies of musical intertextuality seem to have entered a new era.

Yet, a general trend of studies of musical intertextuality after the Bloomian boom rather looks reactionary. The period from around the mid- to late-1990s is marked especially by the rise of publications devoted to the study of jazz and other African-American music, but the approaches in these studies seem to return to the most naive version. Studies by such scholars as Samuel Floyd, Jr., Robert Walser, and Ingrid Monson take a cue from W. E. B. Du Bois’s *The Souls of Black Folks* and Henry Louis Gates Jr.’s *Signifying Monkey*, as well as the latter’s source, Bakhtin’s works in his *Dialogic Imagination*. And a discussion on two intertexts – white European intertext

---

20 Covach, “The Rutles,” and “Stylistic Competencies.”

21 The majority of Bloomian studies of music in the 1990s use Bloom just to make their work look up-to-date and informed by literary and post-structuralist theories. Adam Krims cautions against such superficial Bloomian studies in his “Bloom, Post-Structuralism(s), and Music Theory.”

22 More on this in Chapter 3.

23 See Floyd, Jr., “Ring Shout!” which was first published in 1991, and later reprinted a number of times from 1999. See also Walser’s "Out of notes" which was first published in 1993 and reprinted a number of times from 1995. Also see Monson, *Saying Something* which was published in 1996, as well as Du Bois, *Souls of Black Folks*; and Gates, *Signifying Monkey*. 
and black African-American intertext – commonly leads to a conclusion that the essence of the repertoire under investigation is Bakhtinian “double-voiced discourse.” In the widely disseminated study of jazz, *Saying Something: Jazz Improvisation and Interaction*, for example, Monson discusses jazz from the aesthetic standards derived from the European American world and from the African American world, and argues for Du Boisian “twoness” or Bakhtinian “doubleness” in “intermusicality” of jazz improvisations. While Monson’s and others’ work in a similar direction is quite impressive in their arguments against the idea of jazz as a “pure” and autonomous genre, most of these studies are interested too much in moving from “oneness” to “twoness” to further consider various relations between two intertexts. All kinds of intertextual relationships are ultimately characterized only as an “ironic” relation. Thus the monolithic tendency not only continued but was further reinforced.

But most recently, there has been a new development towards an expansion of the studies of musical intertextuality. Three scholars’ book-length work deserves a brief mention here. First, J. Peter Burkholer contributes a thirty-seven-page article on “borrowing” in the second edition of *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* in 2001, which is a seminal contribution to studies of musical intertextuality, even though he

---

24 Of course this is not to say that the work by Du Bois and Gates Jr. be that simplistic. My point here is that, despite the richness of Du Bois’s and Gates Jr’s viewpoints, the music studies based on these viewpoints tend to simplify the essence.

25 Monson introduces the term “intermusicality” to denote “aurally perceptible musical relationships” as opposed to those “musical relationships observable only with the aid of a score.” See Monson, *Saying Something*, 97-132, especially 125-129.
does not discuss intertextuality directly but rather limits himself to the study of “borrowing” which he defines as “the use in a new composition of one or more elements from a specific piece.”

This huge article surveys a history of various kinds of musical borrowing in Western art music in particular, and offers a useful table entitled “Elements of a Typology of Musical Borrowing,” in which he lists six fundamental questions to ask in order to consider a typology of musical borrowings and some concrete answers to them.

Though in his approach an emphasis is placed on the dichotomy between “the existing piece” and “the new piece” – a dichotomy reminiscent of Bakhtinian “dialogic” model – his table not only provides a useful “checklist” for practical studies of musical borrowing, but it also gives a clear idea of the considerable variety of relations possible between only two intertexts. His article most convincingly cautions against any generalization of borrowing practices into an “irony.”

A second recent publication to note is David Metzer’s *Quotation and Cultural Meaning in the Twentieth-Century Music*, published in 2003. Metzer contributes a

---

26 Burkholder, “Borrowing,” the quotation is from p. 5. That Burkholder “limits himself to the study of borrowing” can be known from his definition of “intertextuality”; he says that intertextuality “is a broader term than borrowing” and “embraces the use of a general style or language as well as of a borrowed melody.” See Burkholder, “Intertextuality.” He developed his studies on intertextuality from his researches on the music of Charles Ives in the 1980s and 1990s and, already in 1994, published a short summary of a typology of musical borrowing. See Burkholder, *Charles Ives; All Made of Tunes*; and “Uses of Existing Music.” Note also that the first edition of *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* does not have such an entry as “borrowing.” See Sadie, *New Grove*.


28 Metzer, *Quotation and Cultural Meaning*.
focused study on musical quotation in various twentieth-century musical practices from both art and popular music fields, and offers sharp insights into cultural meanings of each specific quotation. Though he further limits himself to “quotation,” he digs even deeper into the possible relations between intertexts. To do so, he slightly shifts the focus of attention from the “dialogic” model to what he calls “the two-part design” of musical quotation. While the “dialogic” model broadly dichotomizes the intertextual music (e.g., ELP’s “Pictures at an Exhibition”) into the quoted music (e.g., Musorgsky’s “Pictures at an Exhibition”) on the one hand and the music quoting it (e.g., the ELP piece) on the other, Metzer’s two-part model offers a dichotomy between “the original,” which is the music of the past that is the source of quotation (e.g., the Musorgsky piece), and “the transformation,” which is the quoted music as heard in the new context (e.g., the Musorgsky piece as heard in the ELP piece).  

Emphasizing this all-too-often neglected but crucial distinction, he argues that “the original” also demands the listener’s attention even if it is heard as “the transformation” and that in this way “the original” could bring in whole associations of the culture with which “the original” is associated. Metzer thus transcends the limits of the same old “dialogic” interpretation of any intertextuality as “irony” by, in an almost virtuosic manner, offering a totally different set of “specific cultural discourse[s]” such as “childhood,” “race,” “madness,” “utopia,” “theft,” and

---

29 Metzer, Quotation and Cultural Meaning, 5-6. These examples within parentheses are mine, not his.

30 Metzer, Quotation and Cultural Meaning, 2-6.
“celebrity.”\textsuperscript{31}

A third noteworthy work on musical intertextuality is Michael Klein’s \textit{Intertextuality in Western Art Music} of 2005.\textsuperscript{32} Klein’s work is the most comprehensive introductory discussion on musical intertextuality to emerge thus far, drawing on a range of literature from both literary and music fields, though he relies heavily on Eco’s theory rather than Kristeva’s. In this book, he proposes a distinction between “a poietic intertextuality” (with those intertexts brought in by an author), “an esthesic intertextuality” (with those intertexts brought in by a society), “a historical intertextuality” (with those intertexts from the contemporary historic period), “a transhistorical intertextuality” (with those intertexts brought in from all time of the history), and “an aleatoric intertextuality” (with those intertexts taken freely from across time).\textsuperscript{33} Though his discussion about these distinctions is admittedly too general and never developed in the book, such a suggestion itself is crucial in the first book on music to bear the word “intertextuality” in the title explicitly\textsuperscript{34}; that could further warn against any monolithic approaches to musical intertextuality and

\textsuperscript{31} Metzer, Quotation and Cultural Meaning, 9.

\textsuperscript{32} Klein, \textit{Intertextuality in Western Art Music}.

\textsuperscript{33} Klein, \textit{Intertextuality in Western Art Music}, 12, italics original. The last one, “an aleatoric intertextuality,” may intersect the concept of “pastiche” in some interesting ways. This broad concept is not particularly examined within this dissertation, though it would be illuminating to explore in detail how this study could significantly intersect that idea. See a brief discussion on this topic in the conclusion of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{34} Klein’s book seems to be the first English book of this kind, though several Ph.D dissertations in music published earlier bear the word “intertextuality” explicitly in its title. For example, see Allsen, “Style and Intertextuality”; Goodman, “Refracting Berber Identities”; and Robinson, “Mahler and Postmodern Intertextuality.”
remind us that there are multiple levels of relations between given intertexts. Though the majority of other most recent studies on musical intertextuality as published in journals and books as well as presented in music conferences still uses the “dialogic” model, the publication of these several books just mentioned is a good sign that the multiplicity of musical intertextuality will be more recognized in the coming decades, even though it is much belated.35

What is sorely needed for a better understanding of musical intertextuality is a range of extensive attempts to make sense of the variety of intertextual practices in music without overgeneralizing everything into the “dialogic” model.36 This would include a study of a variety of intertextual models which have more than two intertexts and/or which show more than one relation between two or more intertexts. One such study would be almost necessarily made through an exploration of various styles of musical intertextuality within a certain historical period or geographic area. Another such study would be made through an examination of a single musician’s stylistic variety in musical intertextuality. The merit of the latter is to show cogently that even a single musician would usually have different styles of intertextual practices and that the “dialogic” model, therefore, has very limited practical applicability. Considering all this, Burkholder’s

35 Other recent important studies of musical intertextuality include Susan Fast, In The Houses Of The Holy, especially at chapter 1; Honey Meconi, ed., Early Musical Borrowing; Kevin Hold-Hudson, “The Future Is Now”; and Serge Lacasse, “Intertextuality and Hypertextuality.” The last two are not book-length work, but important because they are directly concerned with multiplicity of intertextuality.

36 This is perhaps true with other fields as well; as Orr also suggests, “work on practices is vital to the extension of intertextuality’s definitions.” See her Intertextuality, 9.
five-hundred-and-fifty-four-page book, *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing*, published in 1995, was quite a contribution. Burkholder enumerates fourteen different procedures of musical borrowing in Ives’s work, such as modeling, variations, paraphrasing, etc., and traces “a logical development in Ives’s uses of existing music (…). This evolution corresponds in many respects to the six main periods of Ives’s career.” Such a study is clearly an antithesis to any monolithic approach to musical intertextuality. In fact, Burkholder is frustrated by the lack of a better understanding of musical borrowing among previous scholars; he says,

> the entire discussion of this topic [on musical borrowing in Ives’s music] has been skewed by a misdefinition of the problem. All of Ives’s uses of existing music have typically been regarded as examples of a single technique, for which various names have been used. But not all of them are “quotations,” although he does at times quote familiar music in passing … Nor can Ives’s practice be consistently described as ‘parody’ … Not even the term ‘borrowing’ is sufficiently broad to encompass the variety of Ives’s uses of existing music.

Though such a study of stylistic varieties of intertextual practices in music has rarely been attempted since 1995, more studies in this direction would surely shed light on intertextual models different from the “dialogic” model and thus contribute to a real development of intertextuality theories. This dissertation attempts to contribute one such sorely needed study; it will investigate a variety of musical intertextuality one musician has been

---

37 Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes*.

38 Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes*, 5.

exploring over years: the mix of “classical” and “rock” music styles variously in the field of progressive rock.

**Intertextuality and Progressive Rock**

Progressive rock (“prog” rock) is evidently among the most important twentieth-century attempts at mixing “popular” and “classical” music styles.

40 “Progressive” rock is also called “art rock,” “classical rock,” “Baroque rock,” and “symphonic rock.” Though some writers try to make a clear distinction among these different terms (see Shaw, *Dictionary of American Pop/Rock*, for example), the majority of recent writers on this style of music seems to have employed the word “progressive” as an umbrella term which encompasses everything that these different terms could designate (see Benson, *Uncle Joe’s Record Guide*; Macan, *Rockin’ the Classics*; Martin, *Listening to the Future*; Stump, *The Music’s All That Matters*; Covach, “Progressive Rock” and “Echolyn”; Lucky, *The Progressive Rock Files*; and Holm-Hudson, *Progressive Rock Reconsidered*). This dissertation also employs the word “progressive” in this way, for it is my conviction that these terms could be distinguished only by an extensive amount of music-analytical studies which have yet to be done.

41 Of course, prog rock is not the only such attempt. “In fact,” as John Covach and Walter Everett say, “there seems not to have been a time in the last one hundred years when American musicians were not experimenting with some kind of pop-art music fusion; a brief chronological list spanning the century might include such diverse figures as Scott Joplin, George Gershwin, Gunther Schuller, Milton Babbitt, and Frank Zappa.” See Covach and Everett, “Preface.” Though in this specific quotation Covach and Everett talk only about America, they perhaps imply that the same may hold true with many other countries as well, including not only such English-speaking countries as England, Australia, and Canada, but also Germany, Italy, France, and Japan, where economic and social situations allow different kinds of music to coexist simultaneously. They may also imply that a similar phenomenon can be found even in pre-20th century music, if the words “popular” and “classical” are to be understood in the broadest sense. Examples include: 15th- and 16th-century “sacred” masses based on “folk” tune *cantus firmi* (“Missa L’homme armé,”
Particularly in the field of rock music—among many other “popular” music styles—those involved in the prog rock movement since the late 1960s have been making extensive attempts at incorporating “classical” materials into “rock” materials. In an effort to struggle for originality and to come into prominence in the music scene, some musicians resort to direct juxtaposition of “classical” borrowing and “rock” styles while others allude to such juxtaposition by simply contrasting “masculine and feminine elements,” electric and acoustic sections, or “soft” and “loud” sections, or simply incorporate only a few elements from “classical” music, such as long-range tension-building, irregular meter, motivic development, fugal technique, modality, programmatic multi-movement suite form, and the symphonic poem style. Prog rock also underwent stylistic change within its history. It started out in the late 1960s as the third of three “wings” of British psychedelic rock: “the first wing” being a blues-oriented category (e.g., Cream and Jimi Hendrix), “the second wing” being a jazz-oriented one (e.g., Soft Machine and Traffic), and “the third wing” being a “classically-oriented one (e.g., The Nice and Procol Harum). Prog rock then proceeded to a “mainstream” style which, with a generally more sophisticated sound,
“dominated FM radio and rock album charts” from 1969 to about 1977.\(^{44}\) In the 1980s, prog rock went underground, in the face of the rise of the “neo-prog” movement with less direct “classical” borrowing.\(^{45}\) In short, “rock-classical” intertextuality in the prog rock movement has never been a monolithic, unchanging entity; on the contrary, prog rock has produced a considerably rich and dynamic variety of “rock-classical” intertextuality.\(^{46}\)

Such a broad range of approaches to intertextuality notwithstanding, many writers on prog rock have interpreted the music in a quite monolithic manner. They simplistically understand any kinds of “rock-classical” intertextuality as a uniform entity in which a single “rock” intertext establishes a single relation with a single “classical” intertext – an understanding apparently based on that Bakhtinian generalized idea of “double-voicedness.” In fact, few writers notice a model in which intertexts establish plural relations, instead of a single relation, simultaneously at different structural levels of a single piece (cf. chapter 1) or at different points of one structural level of a piece (cf. chapter 2). They rarely imagine a model in which one kind of intertextuality gives birth to meaning in relation to another intertextual model (cf. chapter 3). They rarely imagine a model in which intertexts phenomenally shift their functions and create unstable mutual

\(^{44}\) Holm-Hudson, “Introduction,” 2.

\(^{45}\) Covach, “Progressive Rock,” 5-6; and “Echolyn,” 18-20.

\(^{46}\) A recognition of prog rock’s stylistic variety indeed seems to be shared by the editors and readers of prog-rock record guides, such as Benson, *Uncle Joe’s Record Guide*, Lucky, *The Progressive Rock Files*, Matsumoto, ブリティッシュ・ロック集成, or Otaka, ヤング・パーソンズ・ガイド, in which every album receives a brief review which would help the reader infer the specific style of the music.
relations accordingly (cf. chapter 4). They never imagine a model in which multiple intertexts are combined hierarchically in a more complicated manner (cf. chapter 5). They never imagine a model in which a “rock-classical” intertextuality itself is only a part of a larger whole (cf. chapter 6). Without imagining these and other different forms of “rock-classical” intertextuality, writers on prog rock have almost always treated the intertextuality as an unchanging substance and failed to explain the variety of intertextual attempts practiced by prog rock musicians.

This is not to say that all the writers have been describing prog rock exactly in the same manner; yet generally they have only interpreted the “dialogic” model in several different ways. Such different interpretations can be grouped into the following three types: (1) “rockin’-the-classics” type\(^47\): writers find “classical” intertext affected by “rock” intertext; they interpret the intertextuality either positively as an improvement of “classical” music into a more accessible form,\(^48\) or negatively as an insult to “classical” music tradition\(^49\); (2) “classicizin’-the-rock” type: writers find “rock” intertext affected by “classical” intertext; they interpret the intertextuality either positively as a sophistication of

\(^{47}\) The phrases “rockin’ the classics” and “classicizin’ the rock” are taken from Duxbury’s famous volumes, *Rockin’ the Classics and Classicizin’ the Rock*. But while she limits her “classicizin’ the rock” to “recorded orchestral versions of songs originally composed and/or recorded by rock musicians,” I use the phrase more expansively to mean any attempt to change “rock” to “classical” music. See Duxbuty, *Rockin’ the Classics and Classicizin’ the Rock*, ix.

\(^{48}\) e.g., Boeckman, *And The Beat Goes On*, 222.

\(^{49}\) e.g. Schuler, “Rockmusik und Kunstmusik,” 149; and Stump, *Music’s All That Matters*, 72-73.
the same-old patterned rock styles,\textsuperscript{50} or negatively as a betrayal to rock’s grass-roots origin\textsuperscript{51}; and (3) reciprocal type: writers find “classical” and “rock” intertexts affecting each other; they interpret the intertextuality either positively as a collaboration for a better form of music,\textsuperscript{52} or negatively as a collision into something worse.\textsuperscript{53} All these interpretations are based on an observation on which affects which – an observation on a relationship between a “rock” intertext and a “classical” intertext. If prog writers observed a different model other than the “dialogic” model and saw multiple relations operating simultaneously, none of these stereotypical interpretations would be sufficient, because they would have to mention more than one of these at the same time. But they have never seen anything other than the “dialogic” model, so in many cases they have employed only one of these stereotypes to describe an intertextuality in one piece.\textsuperscript{54} In worse cases, they employ one stereotype to describe a number of pieces.\textsuperscript{55} And in worst cases, they employ one stereotype to describe all prog rock pieces\textsuperscript{56} – an extreme overgeneralization that does characterize the writings on prog rock as a whole.

\textsuperscript{50} e.g., Gentle Giant, “Liner Notes”; and Jethro Tull, “Liner notes,” 7.

\textsuperscript{51} e.g., Bangs, “Exposed!,” 44; Marsh, \textit{Heart of Rock and Soul}, xv; and Gillett, \textit{Sound of the City}, 328-332.

\textsuperscript{52} e.g., Weinstein, “Rock and Classical”; and Kozinn, “The Role of Rock,” 50.

\textsuperscript{53} e.g., Kneif, “ ‘Roll Over, Beethoven’,” 535; Stump, \textit{Music’s All That Matters}, 87; and Ward et al., \textit{Rock of Ages}, 481.

\textsuperscript{54} e.g., Kneif, “ ‘Roll Over, Beethoven’.”

\textsuperscript{55} e.g., Stump, \textit{Music’s All That Matters}.

\textsuperscript{56} e.g., Bangs, “Exposed!”; Weinstein, “Rock and Classical.”
unfortunately.\textsuperscript{57}

Some might think that monolithic descriptions of prog rock are evidence of the musical monolith, but such monolithic treatment is most likely a result of their limited analytical perspectives. These limited analytical perspectives can be illustrated by critic Robert Christgau’s commentary about Emerson, Lake and Palmer (ELP). When ELP won the “Best Composition Award” for their rendition of Musorgsky’s \textit{Pictures at an Exhibition} in the British rock journal \textit{Melody Maker}, Christgau wrote that “The winner was not ‘The Endless Enigma’ but \textit{Pictures at an Exhibition}. Funny, I always thought someone named Moussorgsky [sic.] composed that one.”\textsuperscript{58} His implication here is that ELP’s rendition of the piece is simply an imitation of Musorgsky and that there are no real rock elements in

\textsuperscript{57} To the best of my knowledge, there are only a couple of studies on the reception of progressive rock: Macan, \textit{Rockin’ the Classics}, especially at pp. 167-178, and Sheinbaum, “Progressive Rock.” Unfortunately, I have to add that both these authors examine only the negative receptions of prog rock, simply in order to refute them. For example, having criticized some negative opinions by Lester Bangs, Dave Marsh, Robert Christgau, Simon Frith, and others, Macan says, “The fact is, however, that the neo-Marxist view of music championed by Bangs, Marsh, Christgau, Frith, et al. was foreign to a large segment of the American rock audience of the 1970s. Bands such as ELP, Yes, and the Moody Blues … did well no matter what the critics said.” See Macan, \textit{Rockin’ the Classics}, 177. Macan simply counter-argues those negative responses, not being able to objectifying his own preference, though his research itself can be an important springboard for further serious studies on the subject. However, Macan must be included in those who take just one interpretation for all prog rock pieces, and in this sense, he is no different from Bangs et al.

\textsuperscript{58} Extracted from the original context, the quotation might not seem a strong criticism against ELP. It appears, however, as the “hook” sentence within a very short and cynical article, so the implications are relatively clear. Here is the article in its entirety: “In what is always described as the ‘prestigious’ \textit{Melody Maker} poll, Emerson, Lake & Palmer came up with a total of five awards, the most interesting of which was for Best Composition. The winner was not ‘The Endless Enigma’ but \textit{Pictures at an Exhibition}. Funny, I always thought someone named Moussorgsky [sic.] composed that one.” See Christgau, \textit{Any Old Way}, 290. “The Endless Enigma” in this quotation is an ELP piece.
the recording (therefore, for him it is a “betrayal” of rock – the (2) above). Importantly, to arrive at such a stereotypical conclusion, Christgau analyzes the music in an extremely superficial manner; his only analytical findings are that the piece contains Musorgsky’s music (a.k.a. “classical” music) and that there isn’t much “rock” (a.k.a. older “rock”). He just does not analyze the music further to find other intertexts, such as the blues intertext at “Blues Variation” and even ELP’s own intertext made by a reference to their own 1970 piece “Tank,” at “The Old Castle” – two of the rock intertexts which could forcefully affect “classical” music (i.e., Musorgsky’s original music as used in this ELP version) and thus create a sense of “insult” to, or “improvement” of, “classical” music (see (1) above). The critic also does not analytically figure out how Musorgsky’s harmony, for example, could effectively add some interests to “rock” aspects of the piece – an addition that could also be interpreted as an “improvement” of rock (see (2) above).59 And the plaintiff never analyzes the music to find how ELP changed both “rock” and “classical” music to create a totally new form that has perhaps never existed in the history, positively or negatively (see (3) above). Thus, even if we assume the “dialogic” model, every prog-rock piece can still be interpreted in all three – and possibly some other – ways simultaneously, as long as one analyzes the music in a variety of ways. But critics and writers generally do not analyze

59 Musorgsky’s harmony in *Pictures at an Exhibition* may well be a very good addition to rock’s harmony. Especially the harmony in “Promenade” may sound conformant with some, if not all, of rock music’s harmonic practices because of the insistence on triads, prevailing parallelism of an octave and a fifth, few leading-tone progression, and so on. For most recent studies of rock’s harmony, see Stephenson, *What to Listen For*, Capuzzo, “Neo-Riemannian Theory,” and Everett, “Making Sense.”
the music very carefully, and simply choose one of the three stereotypes.60

Prog writers’ monolithic approaches may also be a result of their poor understandings of the musical narrative in the music.61 For example, when they understand the music of prog rock as a “story” of “rock” affecting “classical” music and interpret this story as an “improvement” of classical music (type (1) interpretation above), they do not seem clear as to what kind of narrative agent tells this story of an “improvement.” In literary narratology, narrator, real author (RA), and implied author (IA) have often been distinguished from each other since Wayne Booth’s coinage of the

60 Only a few writers understand that all three of these interpretations may be simultaneously possible of a single prog-rock piece. Rockwell, “Art Rock,” on p. 348, is among the few writers who suggest a variety of interpretations possible simultaneously.

61 This dissertation assumes that a musical piece can be understood as a narrative or a drama. I am fully aware that there have been objections to this idea itself. Jean-Jacques Nattiez, for example, thinks that music cannot narrate because it does not have denotative levels of meaning as words or films do; Lawrence Kramer argues that to be a narrative music needs to resist the very essence of music such as continuity and closure; and Carolyn Abbate rejects the idea of musical narrative because music cannot express the past tense. But I am also fully aware that there have been many more opinions against these objections as well; Hatten argues that even in “absolute” music there are what he calls expressive genres which work semantically and there are even shifts of discourse levels in certain cases; Fred Maus shows that most analytical writings on music explain the music as some sort of drama whether or not there is discontinuity and closure; and Karol Berger, James Hepokoski, and David Metzer suggest that music can express the past tense by incorporating musical borrowings. There are also more nuanced authors such as Vera Micznik and Kendall Walton; the former distinguishes between high and low degrees of narrativity in music and the latter explores the specific ways in which music might be representational as opposed to the ways in which pictorial arts can be representational. This dissertation is concerned more with how music can be a narrative than whether music can be a narrative. For these discussions, see Nattiez, “Can One Speak of Narrativity in Music?”; Kramer, “Musical Narratology”; Abbate, Unsung Voices; Hatten, “On Narrativity in Music”; Maus, “Music as Drama”; Berger, “Diegesis and Mimesis”; Hepokoski, “Temps perdu”; Metzer, Quotation and Cultural Meaning; Micznik, “Music and Narrative Revisited”; and Walton, “Listening with Imagination.”
term “implied author.” The distinction may be best illustrated by literary theorist William Nelles’s brief narrative analysis of a story from Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels.* Gulliver as the *narrator* reports that there was strife between the kingdoms of Lilliput and Blefuscu, and that the fight derived from their long-standing dispute over which end of the egg to break before eating, the smaller or larger. As Nelles points out, here any modern reader can detect “a satirical or ironical level” behind the level of the narrator.” That level is the *implied author* whom the reader can detect purely from the text itself; but the implied author is different from the *real author,* because Swift himself is well documented as “fiercely partisan on these issues” for some specific religious and political reasons. In this case, Swift himself overlaps the narrator, but theoretically the RA need not overlap the narrator; the RA could deliberately create both the narrator and the IA. Thus the IA is different from the narrator especially when the narrator tells an explicitly “unreliable” story; the IA is also different from the RA in that the former is the image of the author that can be inferred solely from the text whereas the RA is the real flesh-and-blood author that might be known from the historical documents. To return to

---

62 Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction.* There has also been a corresponding distinction between narratee, implied reader, and real reader, thus making up a so-called “six-part” model of narrative transmission.

63 Nelles, “Historical and Implied Authors”; and Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels.*

64 Swift, *Gulliver’s Travels,* 31.

65 Nelles, “Historical and Implied Authors,” 43.


67 It must be added that RA/IA/Narrator cannot always be distinguished in such a clear-cut
a narrative interpretation of prog rock as “improvement,” if the story is indifferently told by the narrator – in the same manner as Gulliver tells the story – the IA and the RA might have different views toward this story of “improvement”; the IA might view this “improvement” rather sarcastically and the RA might create such a sarcastic IA deliberately just to elicit some debates among the audience, for example. In this case, the IA’s attitude may be away from the narrator’s and closer to (2) above (i.e., sophistication of or betrayal to rock);

manner and sometimes they even overlap, precisely because of the complexity inherent in any story itself. It must also be added that the concept of the implied author has been a topic of debate for a long time among literary theorists and there has been no accepted consensus among them. The literature for the IA includes: Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2nd ed.; Chatman, *Coming to Terms*; Nelles, “Historical and Implied Authors”; Bal, *Narratology*. The literature against the IA includes: Genette, *Narrative Discourse Revisited*; Toolan, *Narrative*; and Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*. Some useful theoretical debates on this very issue may be found in Nelles, “Historical and Implied Authors”; Diengott, “Implied Author, Motivation and Theme” and “The Implied Author Once Again”; Lanser, “(Im)plying the Author”; and Shen, “Narrative, Reality, and Narrator.” For a sample application of the concept of the IA in literature, see Waniew, “The Schizoid Implied Authors.” Regarding the applicability of this idea of the IA to musical narratology, there was an interesting debate between Fred Maus and Edward T. Cone that occurred in a panel session of the American Musicological Society’s 1988 annual meeting, held jointly with the annual meeting of the Society for Music Theory, in Baltimore, which was eventually published as a special issue of *College Music Symposium* 29 in 1989. In this debate, Maus reads Cone’s book *The Composer’s Voice*, especially at 77-93, as virtually applying the idea of the IA to music and Cone admits it later; see Maus, “Agency in Instrumental Music and Song” and Cone, “Responses.” But unfortunately, no more discussion on the applicability of the concept seems to have occurred since then, as far as I know, with the sole exception of Berger, “The Text and Its Author.” Berger, however, quickly jettisons the notion of the IA in literature and for that reason he declares the inapplicability of the notion to music without even discussing the music at all. Further productive discussions on this topic are surely in order. The present dissertation does not eagerly accept or reject the idea in music, but in the case of film music, the concept occasionally becomes important. More on this in Chapter 6.

68 This example vaguely assumes something like Edward T. Cone’s idea of “musical persona” as the narrator of music, though it is debatable whether his “persona” corresponds to the narrator or the IA. See Cone, *The Composer’s Voice*, 20-40; and Maus, “Agency in
and the RA’s attitude may be very removed and very close to the one represented in (3) above (both “rock” and “classical” collapsing into a worse form or collaborating into a better form). Depending on to which narrative agent a writer ascribes prog rock’s narrative, s/he could employ all three kinds of interpretations simultaneously. But many writers just do not think about the issues on narrative transmission. Thus one cannot simplistically assert that prog rock’s intertextual practices be monolithic on the grounds that many writings on prog do approach the music monolithically. The monolithic approaches can be considered a consequence of writers’ limited analytical perspectives on both music itself and its narrativity.\(^{69}\)

It does not follow, however, that no one has ever written something against such monolithic approaches to prog rock. Some important commentaries in this regard have been issued since the 1990s especially by Allan Moore, Edward Macan and John Covach.\(^ {70}\) Macan says, “By 1972, the formation of progressive rock as a distinct style was essentially complete. Nonetheless, even at this time talk of a self-conscious progressive rock ‘movement’ is probably misleading. (...) [P]ractitioners are often more keenly aware of Instrumental Music and Song.”

\(^{69}\) It may also be due to the writer’s political, social, and aesthetic stance, as Macan suggests. See Macan, *Rockin’ the Classics*, 167-78.

\(^{70}\) Moore, *Rock: The Primary Text*; Macan, *Rockin’ the Classics*; and Covach, “Progressive Rock.” Though both Macan and Covach published these studies in 1997, Macan already published a part of his study on the topic in 1992 in his “‘Spirit of Albion’” and Covach read an earlier version of his paper also in 1992 at a conference entitled “Popular Music: The Primary Text,” held at Thames Valley University, London, July 3-5. Therefore, all these commentaries were already publicized in the early 1990s.
Moore sounds somewhat emotional when he explicitly rejects monolithic approaches in favor of a pluralistic treatment: “As a movement, it [prog rock] was highly heterogeneous, and to identify it wholesale as ‘progressive’ is a mistake … Because of the contradictions inherent in the notion of a single, ‘progressive’ programme, I shall treat ‘progressive rock’ as a series of related but separate styles, … which deny the monolith of a single ‘progressive’ rock.”

Covach soberly pinpoints exactly where the problem is: he first indicates the fact that prog rock is often characterized as “rock music pasted over with a kind of art-music veneer” or as “soup[ing] up [of] classical music with a rock treatment,” and then continues, “Both of these characterizations are, as it turns out, applicable to much progressive-rock music. But a more crucial issue, however, is whether these descriptions account for all progressive rock; and further, whether they account for all the ways in which art-music is evoked even for progressive-rock tracks in which they are indeed applicable.”

Thus all these authors caution against any one-size-fits-all approaches to prog rock, and each of these scholars then examines specific styles in which “classical” music is incorporated in rock music so that overgeneralizations about prog rock can be amended and a better understanding of prog rock can be obtained.

One thing that is still largely missing, however, is a number of extensive studies on

---

71 Macan, Rockin’ the Classics, 25.

72 Moore, Rock: The Primary Text, 56-57; Rock: The Primary Text, 2nd edition, 64.

various intertextual styles of a single musician or a single group of musicians in prog rock. No single musician keeps exactly the same style over the years; all musicians without exception change their styles in one way or the other. Though many biographical fan books suggest some kind of stylistic varieties in one musician, there are very few analytical writings. Covach’s study in 2000 on American prog rock is among those few writings; this study analytically and historically elucidates a number of ways in which the music of 1990s’ prog-group echolyn can be seen as a blend of 1970s symphonic-prog and 1980s avant-prog styles; some pieces incorporate atonality, serialism, and extended tonality, and others use similar procedures or contrapuntal texture, motivic organization and multi-movement key scheme.  

Gregory Karl’s study on King Crimson is another such study; he compares the group’s styles of early and middle periods and concludes that there are simultaneously “move back in the direction of rock basics” and a critical breakthrough to an internal “struggle-to-victory plot type” of “classical narrative paradigms and constructive principles.” These and some other studies surely contribute to a further development of intertextuality studies. More and more studies on the variety of intertextual procedures – particularly in the music of most influential musicians such as ELP, Yes, Genesis, Pink Floyd, and other groups – would be crucial to a better understanding of “rock-classical” intertextuality. For this purpose, this dissertation chooses the intertextual practices by British prog rock musician Keith Emerson, the leader

74 Covach, “Echolyn.”

75 Karl, “King Crimson’s Larks’ Tongues in Aspic,” 138-139.

76 Other notable studies of include Everett, “Swallowed by a Song.”
of one of the most influential prog-rock groups, ELP (Emerson, Lake and Palmer).

**Intertextuality and Keith Emerson**

Emerson is known for two of his extremely influential prog-rock groups: The Nice (1968-1970, and briefly in 2002), which was one of the initiators of the prog-rock movement in the late-1960s along with Moody Blues, Procol Harum, and Pink Floyd; and Emerson, Lake and Palmer (ELP, 1970-1979, 1992-1993, 1996-97, and briefly in 1998), which is one of the prog-rock “supergroups” during most of the 1970s along with Yes, Pink Floyd, Genesis, Jethro Tull, and King Crimson. But Emerson became such an important figure not just in response to the general “crossover” trend in the music scene; he had been exploring various kinds of intertextual practices since childhood. In fact, born on November 2nd, 1944, in Todmorden, Lancastershire, in northwestern England, Emerson recalls that his very first musical experience was listening to the probably highly intertextual music that Emerson refers to as “the sounds of a ‘get-together’” in which his father Noel played a piano-accordion, one friend played a drum kit, and another sang, creating a mixture of possibly different styles.\footnote{See Forrester et al., *Emerson, Lake & Palmer*, 12-13.} Since then, most of Emerson’s life has
been full of different intertextual experiences. While Emerson had “classical” piano lessons with local piano teachers from the age of eight until around his high school graduation, he also studied jazz with “postal jazz courses” and played with jazz bands. He also had to play some tap-dance tunes for his aunt’s dance classes, where he learned how to change styles and tempo quickly on demands. These very early experiences most likely mixed up different styles of music in his mind. By the time Emerson was fourteen-years old (in 1958), he had already deliberately started experimenting with a mixture of different styles of music in such pieces as “Medley,” in which he diachronically connected three different country-style piano pieces. After high school graduation, in his first fully professional groups such as Gary Farr and the T-Bones and The VIP’s, he added “classical” materials to the blues-oriented music of these bands. In this period, Emerson was influenced by such Hammond organ players as Jimmy Smith and Don Shinn, the latter in particular being a big influence upon Emerson’s eclecticism of “classical” and “rock” music. Emerson is said to have extensively experimented with his ideas of combining than a response to the general crossover trend in the mid-1960s, since he was already into experiments with stylistic mixture in the 1950s, as the following text reveals.

78 Emerson says, “I played for my auntie’s dance classes when I was 13 or 14, everything from tap-dancing to ballet. I learned a lot of styles … .” Quoted from Hanson, Hang On, 13.

79 See Example 2-2 in Chapter 2.

80 Emerson’s first semi-pro band was The Keith Emerson Trio, and his second is John Brown’s Bodies. Gary Farr and the T-Bones is third, and The VIP’s is fourth. See Hanson, Hang On To A Dream, 12.

81 Hanson, Hang On, 14, 24. According to Emerson’s memory, he saw Shinn play “an arrangement of the Grieg ‘Concerto’… I guess seeing Don Shinn made me realize that I’d
“rock” and “classical” elements while he was accompanying then-renowned American pop singer P.P. Arnold. Emerson’s intertextual practices after he formed The Nice in 1967 are too richly varied to be detailed here; the following chapters discuss them. But at this point just a cursory look at his intertextual practices according to three main periods of his career up to the present would confirm that Emerson indeed did something different in each period of his career. In his “early period” (1944-1970) in which Emerson generally experimented with various groups and people – as discussed briefly above – and he tended to borrow specific “classical” pieces and juxtapose them with “rock” styles in his music (cf. Chapters 1 and 2). In his “middle period” (1970-1980) in which he played almost exclusively with ELP, he was interested in referring to “classical” stylistic elements (i.e., not specific pieces) or pieces that are not “classical” but “crossover” such as Friedrich Gulda’s “Prelude and Fugue” in ELP’s “The Endless Enigma” (cf. Chapters 3 and 4). And in his “late period” (1980-to present), in which Emerson has been continuing mostly as a solo musician, he has been interested in performing music with exclusively “classical” instrumentation (cf. Chapters 5 and 6). And all this is consistently a series of like to compile an act from what he did.” Quoted from Hanson, Hang On, 24.

82 In the following three-part periodization of Emerson’s career, the balance of the time spans is not even (the early period extends twenty-four years; middle period only ten years; and late period more than twenty-five years), but the middle period (i.e., the ELP years) was certainly the most fertile and intensely productive era in which most of his recordings obtained so-called Gold Discs within the U.S. and some of the materials recorded in this era are still being released these days. For more detailed biographies, see Forrester et al., Emerson, Lake & Palmer; Hanson, Hang On To A Dream; and Emerson, Pictures of an Exhibitionist.

83 The word “late” period should be understood only as a hypothetical one, because he is still performing pieces with young musicians and possibly—and hopefully—trying to do
intertextual experiments: even recently when he talked about his Fall 2004 US tour, Emerson said, “Along with Will Alexander we compounded the fact that mixed media does indeed work and exist!” He has been interested not just in intertextuality itself but also in various forms of intertextuality.

Such an evident variety in intertextual styles of Emerson’s music has rarely been discussed in any depth by the writers on his music. His intertextual practices have of course been mentioned as one of the most important aspects of his music; writers have most often described his intertextuality as “rock-classical” mixture, with some additional intertexts such as jazz, Latin music, blues, country, horror-film style, some 1950s pop tunes, etc. But the intertextual aspect of his music quite often seems to eclipse among other things new. Indeed, he has been announcing since a few years ago that his “Piano Concerto No. 2” has been in preparation and will be out soon. This and possible other new pieces may result in an unprecedented productivity in this “final” period; one might even be able to appropriately consider a fourth—and even a fifth—period(s) if he keeps creating new work for many more years to come. Such a hypothetical treatment is always necessary when one discusses a composer’s career while the composer is still active.

Emerson, “The Tour with ‘Tesra’ and ‘The Scorpions’.” Will Alexander is the engineer of Emerson’s band. The term “mixed media” is the word used in the mid-1960s to denote any experiments to mix “classical” and “rock” music—a word Emerson has been using since then.

Emerson’s jazz influence is very evident in so many pieces such as The Nice’s “Hang On To A Dream” at the piano solo and numerous other ragtime pieces with ELP; his Latin music influence is particularly evident in The Nice’s “Sombrero Sam” and pieces in his solo album Honky; blues was what his earliest professional groups played and what he himself has been playing even in “Pictures at an Exhibition”; country influence is particularly evident in the “down home” feel in many of his piano solo pieces; horror-film influence is particularly evident in ELP’s Karn Evil 9, 2nd Impression at a middle section as well as in actual horror-film scores such as Inferno and The Church; 1950s pop tunes generally influenced Emerson through P. P. Arnold and many pop-oriented pieces of The Nice and ELP are the results.
important aspects of his music in the writings on his music. Indeed, his talent as a keyboardist seems to be mentioned more often. For example, writers often comment on Emerson’s innovative use of the Hammond organ and the Moog synthesizer which drove the instrument companies to improve their products for stage use\textsuperscript{86}; the introduction of keyboard-trio format (keyboard, bass, and drums) to a rock context which created a whole new generation of followers; and his stage performance of stabbing keyboard with knives, rolling the Hammond organ over the stage, and playing keyboard backside front, as well as his sheer virtuosic techniques of playing difficult passages very fast. Other musical aspects such as his extensive approaches to harmonic and rhythmic progressions, ragtime performance on various riffs, and different large-scale formal schemes of the music, have also drawn the writers’ attention. Since Emerson has been innovative in so many directions, his intertextuality has been treated as only one of many other aspects, thus being regarded as a monolith.

But two writings on Emerson’s music are important for a study of his intertextual styles. One is George Forrester’s forty-six page chapter on musical aspects of almost all of ELP’s released pieces.\textsuperscript{87} This is certainly not scholarly writing on the band’s music or a study of intertextuality proper; it could rather be characterized as a logical extension of

\textsuperscript{86} The inventor of the Moog synthesizers and the president of the Moog company, Robert Moog, occasionally even accompanied ELP’s tours to help Emerson setting up the extremely difficult instrument and to figure out how to improve for the heavy stage use. See a photo inserted between pp. 128 and 129 of Forrester et al. \textit{Emerson, Lake & Palmer}. See also Pinch and Trocco, \textit{Analog Days}, especially 200-213, for Emerson’s role in the history of the Moog synthesizer.

\textsuperscript{87} Forrester, “Musical Analysis.”
such detailed record guides as Joe Benson’s 1989 *Uncle Joe’s Record Guide: Progressive Rock* in which a thirty-page chapter on ELP reviews most of the ELP work track by track.\(^8^8\) But these record-guide approaches are a clear evidence that ELP’s music is perceived among writers as having such a wide variety that each piece deserves a separate review. The other important writing on Emerson’s musical styles is Blair Pethel’s D.M.A. dissertation of 1988, which more explicitly aims to trace Emerson’s stylistic development.\(^8^9\) Pethel discusses Emerson’s styles from the early years up to 1977 and claims that, in Emerson’s later music, “Melodies became more lyrical, rhythms clearer, forms more unified. He … learned to incorporate tonality into his own peculiar quartal language. Through study, Emerson also learned the time-proven techniques of orchestration and put them to work.”\(^9^0\) Pethel’s aim in his dissertation is “to present Emerson’s music to students of serious music and lead to a re-evaluation of the field of popular music and its derivative worth.”\(^9^1\) It is easily observed here that Pethel employs typical “classicizin’-the-rock” type interpretation (see (2) above); he believes that the increasing incorporation of “classical” materials has “improved” Emerson’s “peculiar” music. This is a typically monolithic approach based on the “dialogic” model. But overall, by offering a view of ELP’s music as being varied in style from piece to piece, Forrester’s and Pethel’s writings together provide a cornerstone for a further development

\(^8^8\) Benson, *Uncle Joe’s Record Guide*. The ELP chapter is at pp. 7-37.

\(^8^9\) Pethel, “Keith Emerson.”

\(^9^0\) Pethel “Keith Emerson,” 114.

\(^9^1\) Pethel, “Keith Emerson,” Abstract.
of stylistic studies of Emerson’s intertextual practices.

The following chapters represent an attempt to reveal six new models of musical intertextuality that are different from the “dialogic” model and essential for a better understanding of “rock-classical” intertextuality in Keith Emerson’s music. While discussing more than two intertexts and including “jazz” and “ethnic” intertexts could be one way to transcend the limits of the “dialogic” model, this dissertation rather chooses to examine multiple relations possible especially between “rock” and “classical” intertexts only, since just finding many intertexts does not necessarily enhance any better understanding of music. Thus the term “intertextuality” within this dissertation means only “rock-classical” intertextuality, unless otherwise noted. The multiple intertextual relations are modeled and shown to work in a significant manner in certain of Emerson’s pieces written in a specific time period in his career. Various kinds of intertextuality observed in the following pages are all related to Klein’s first four intertextual categories: poietic, esthesic, historical, and transhistorical, but rarely the fifth one, aleatoric. In other words, certain intertexts are chosen for a discussion when they seem to be brought in by Emerson himself (poietic) or by the society of the time (esthesic), and from his contemporary historic period (historical) or any older time of the history (transhistorical). Aleatoric intertexts would offer an interesting topic of discussion, but are discussed only once or twice within this dissertation because a discussion on aleatoric intertextuality

92 See footnote 11 above. Also, what constitutes “classical” music (and “rock” music alike) for Emerson and other prog rock musicians and their audience is an issue that needs a fully separate investigation, but it is explored in Chapter 5 to the extent to which the scope
would more than double the size of the dissertation unnecessarily. Within this limitation, Chapter 1 deals with an intertextuality that can be found fairly widely in his pieces throughout his career. Chapters 2 through 6 discuss styles of intertextuality in a chronological order, thus tracing stylistic development of his musical intertextuality. Each chapter has four sections: the first section is a theoretical definition of the model; the second section is a chronological survey of the development of the model; the third section is a detailed analysis of a specifically chosen piece that represents the model; and the final section is a brief attempt at a possible narrative interpretation of the model. As such, this dissertation is not a comprehensive study of musical intertextuality or even of Emerson’s music. Nor does it attempt to explore all the possible intertextuality and related phenomena such as pastiche, parody, irony, collage, etc. in a given piece of music. It rather aims to offer a set of pragmatic methods for an expansion of intertextuality studies as well as studies of the music of this specific musician who played a decisive role in the history of rock music.

of this dissertation allows me to do so.
CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND INTERTEXTUALITY:
REWORKING AND ADAPTATION IN “PICTURES AT AN EXHIBITION” (1971)

The intertextual style of one prog rock musician differs significantly from that of another. Keith Emerson’s intertextual music is distinguished from many others’ in terms of his consistent use of a specific device that can be termed “background intertextuality,” a mixture of different styles that occurs at the formal-structural level, regardless of what is happening on the surface of the music. Background intertextuality results from a conflation of different musical forms drawn from different styles; one common example is a conflation of “rock” forms such as an AABA form and “classical” forms such as a sonata form, as will be discussed later in this chapter. Background intertextuality should be distinguished from what can be termed “foreground intertextuality” and “interlevel intertextuality.”

---

1 In this dissertation, the terms “background” and “foreground” are used slightly differently from Schenker’s terminology; perhaps his phrases such as “earlier levels” and “later levels” correspond better to my “background levels” and “foreground levels,” respectively. Thus, background levels here mean larger-scale levels than a certain foreground level; and foreground levels mean smaller-scale levels than a certain background level. “Background” here does not imply Schenkerian fundamental structure with fundamental line and bass arpeggiation. For Schenker’s use of the phrases “earlier levels” and “later levels,” see his *The Free Composition*. 
“foreground intertextuality” results from a conflation of different musical idioms drawn from different styles on the surface of the music, regardless of the background of the music. For example, reworkings of “classical” pieces by “rock” instruments in Wendy Carlos’s *Switched on Bach* and reworkings of “rock” pieces by “classical” instruments in Kronos Quartet’s performance of Jimi Hendrix’s “Purple Haze” feature a mixture of two styles on the surface that have little impact at the formal-structural level. Interlevel intertextuality is an interaction of different styles between background and foreground levels. For example, casting a “rock” surface in a typical “classical” form, in the manner of “rock operas” such as Andrew Lloyd Webber’s *Jesus Christ Superstar*, which creates an interlevel intertextuality because the “rock” style at foreground levels interacts with “classical” style at background levels. Background intertextuality is never entirely free from some degree of interlevel intertextuality, nor is foreground intertextuality, since an intertextuality on either background or foreground levels necessarily entails a more complex kind of interaction of different styles.

2 That is, the Carlos pieces signify “rock” by timbre and “classical” by melody and harmony; the Kronos piece represents “classical” by timbre and “rock” by melody and harmony. In either case, the mixture of different styles is recognizable without a careful attention to the formal structure.

3 Theoretically speaking, the reverse is also possible; casting a “classical” surface to a “rock” form would also create an interlevel intertextuality. A “classical” style at foreground levels would interact with a “rock” style at background levels. Examples of this type are not easy to find, but some minimalist compositions may be interpreted as featuring this type of interlevel intertextuality, such as John Adams’s “Voodoo Zephyr,” for example. I am grateful to Prof. Allen Anderson for directing my attention to this example in our conversation in September 2005. Within the context of Western art music, examples of an interlevel intertextuality are not difficult to find. Some famous examples are early twentieth-century compositions by Schoenberg, Stravinsky, … whose pieces feature a Classic sonata form in the background whereas the foreground features twentieth-century materials such as twelve-tone techniques, for example, thus creating an interaction between old style in the background and newer style.
between different levels than if no intertextuality were present. Background intertextuality itself can hardly be regarded as Emerson’s own invention, but Emerson’s frequent and consistent use of background intertextuality has generated some distinctive overall intertextual styles in many of his pieces in which both background and foreground intertextuality are presented simultaneously, thus making the interlevel intertextuality significantly complex.\(^4\) Considering that other prog rock musicians did not always employ background intertextuality to the same extent that Emerson did, his persistent use of background intertextuality seems to be a key to understanding of his general intertextual style—a style that distinguishes his musical practice from that of many others. In fact, many of his intertextual pieces can be interpreted most coherently as a narrative of simultaneously presented multiple levels of conversation/interaction between “classical” and “rock” agents/personae, and any narrative interpretation of his pieces as a single conversation between them – in the manner of Bakhtinian “dialogism” – would serve to mask the real contribution of Emerson’s music to the history of “rock-classical” intertextuality.

To support the above claim, this chapter will start with a brief survey of historical context; various intertextual practices by Emerson’s rock-musician contemporaries in the 1960s and 1970s in particular are examined and shown to present intertextuality at either the background or foreground levels, and scarcely at both. A number of Emerson’s “classical” in the foreground. See Straus, *Remaking the Past*.

\(^4\) Background intertextuality itself can be found also in Western art music. For example, sonata-allegro form is sometimes mixed together with a rondo form; or, concerto form is already a mixed form. See Goetschius, *Larger Forms of Musical Composition*, 202f.
reworkings are then examined to show that he generally creates background intertextuality even when there is already an obvious foreground intertextuality at work. The next section analyzes ELP’s “Pictures at an Exhibition” to show how Emerson engages both background intertextuality and intertextuality at different hierarchic levels. In the final section of this chapter, such a simultaneous presentation of intertextuality at different levels is interpreted not in terms of “double-voiced discourse,” but more psychoanalytically in terms of the “sound of get-together”—something which may have held a fascination for Emerson since his childhood.

**Background Intertextuality in Context**

Background intertextuality as a mixture of different styles at formal-structural levels can be achieved because certain musical forms can function as signs of certain musical styles.\(^5\) In the context of rock music, some element of such forms as large binary form, large ternary form, sonata form, rondo form, and theme and variation form, as well as some sort of symphonic poem or programmatic multi-movement form, can all work as signs of “classical”

---

\(^5\) Musical texture can also work as signs, as Levy argues in her, “Texture as a Sign,” but seen from semiological viewpoints, any elements of music can be signs of something intramusical or extramusical, as many semiologically and semantically oriented musicologists have been discussing. See, for example, Meyer, *Emotion and Meaning in Music*; Nattiez, *Music and Discourse*; and Tagg, “From Refrain to Rave.”
music. On the other hand, the forms which can function as signs of “rock” styles would include: “simple verse form” (some repetition of a verse); “simple verse-chorus form” (some alternation of a verse and a chorus, with the music of chorus the same as that of verse); “contrasting verse-chorus form” (some alternation of a verse and a chorus, with the music of chorus different from that of verse); “AABA form” (three verses interrupted by a “bridge”); and “compound AABA form” (with each A containing a verse and a chorus). Because such a sign system is at work, certain formal structures can be understood as a mixture of different styles.

Though in principle there could be a variety of possible combinations of “classical” and “rock” forms for background intertextuality, one particular combination seems to have become figuratively used in the rock music scene of the 1960s and 1970s: that of a “sonata form” and a compound AABA form. The term sonata form here is parenthesized because the sonata-form connection here is highly questionable; what the rock musicians and listeners of

---

6 Large binary and large ternary forms refer to the full-movement binary and ternary forms respectively, as opposed to theme-type binary and ternary forms. These and other forms mentioned here do not exhaust all the possible formal types of “classical” music in general. But these are presumably among most important forms that writers have identified as “classical” intertexts that are used in many prog-rock pieces. See, for example, Covach 1997, Macan 1997, and Karl 2002.

7 See Covach, “Form in Rock Music,” which, to the best of my knowledge, is the only comprehensive survey of forms in rock music, though some account on AABA forms is found in Forte, The American Popular Ballad, 36-41; and Wilder, American Popular Song, 56. Covach has recently discovered in the music of the Coasters an additional interesting form which he calls “dramatic AABA form.” I am grateful to him for showing me his unpublished draft, entitled “Leiber and Stoller, The Coasters, and the ‘Dramatic AABA’ Form,” which he delivered at the 2004 annual conference of the Society of American Music in Charlottesville, October, 2004.
the time tried to combine with the AABA form has nothing to do with the actual classical
sonata form. Instead, it is their own image, or even misconception, of “sonata form.” A
glance at the way they would find a parallel relation between their “sonata form” and AABA
form in their pieces will reveal how they (mis)understood “sonata form.” As diagramed in
Example 1.1, each of the “sonata-form” sections corresponds to certain section(s) of the
compound AABA form. Namely, the “exposition” of the “sonata form” corresponds to the
introduction and the A and A’ sections of the compound AABA form; the “development” of
the “sonata form” to the interlude of the compound AABA form; the “recapitulation” of the
“sonata form” to the reprise of introduction (called “reintro”) and the

Example 1.1: “Sonata-Form” Elements and Compound AABA Form with Reintro

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“sonata form”</th>
<th>compound AABA form w/ Reintro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Exposition&quot;?)</td>
<td>Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Verse Chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td>Verse Chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Interlude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Development&quot;?)</td>
<td>Reintro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&quot;</td>
<td>Verse Chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Recapitulation&quot;?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Coda&quot;?)</td>
<td>Coda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
A” section; and the “coda” of the “sonata form” to the “coda” of the compound AABA form.

It is important that some of the crucial elements of sonata-form sections do not necessarily find their counterpart in the compound AABA form. For example, a nineteenth-century sonata-form exposition would almost always contain two contrasting key areas, but the “corresponding” sections of this compound AABA form do not always feature two contrasting key areas; the compound AABA form can exist without a single change of key throughout the piece. Similarly, a nineteenth-century sonata-form recapitulation would feature the tonal adjustment of the second key area to the home key, but such a thing would not always occur in the “corresponding” sections of the compound AABA form because there is often no second key area, to begin with. These and many other essential elements of real sonata form are simply missing in this compound AABA form. Some elements are certainly shared by the sonata form and the compound AABA form: the thematic and often tight-knit character of the first large section (the exposition and the verse-chorus); the sometimes very long and looser organization of the contrasting middle section; and the grand return to the very opening of the piece after the middle section.8 But these characteristics are not unique to sonata form; they are also found in some sort of extended period, rounded binary or simple ternary, compound ternary, and so on.9 So it is highly questionable if it is

8 “Tight-knit” and “looser” are the terms introduced by William Caplin in his Classical Forms.

9 Theorists in the turn-of-the-century Formenlehre tradition, such as Ebenezer Prout and William Henry Hadow, early-twentieth-century theorists such as Percey Goetschius and Arnold Schoenberg, and more recent theorists of musical form such as Wallace Berry and William Caplin, would all suggest some sort of binary or ternary form as more similar to the AABA form than sonata form. Indeed, some dance pieces by Chopin, for example, may
sonata form or one of these other “classical” forms that is merged with the compound AABA form.

Nevertheless, it is no less crucial that rock musicians and listeners of the 1960s and 1970s, as distinct from art-music experts, seem to have sensed “sonata form,” rather than other forms, to be merged with the compound AABA form of rock music. The people from that era indeed began to speak of it from around the mid-1980s in retrospect.\(^{10}\) Patrick T. Will, for example, mentioned in 1986 that “sonata form” was used in prog-rock group Yes’s 1972 piece “Close to the Edge.”\(^{11}\) More people have since resonated with Will’s words; both Mosbo and Macan in their late 1990s books, for example, talk about “sonata form” as a source of prog-rock forms, and go so far as to show at which point of a prog-rock piece one can find “exposition,” “development,” and “recapitulation.” As mentioned above, the occasionally feature something similar to this compound AABA form. Also the B section, if completely different from the A sections, may resemble what 19\(^{th}\)-century theorists call “free fantasia,” even though in many cases motifs of the B section is derived from the A section in the rock pieces of the time. I owe these ideas to Prof. Severine Neff. This and other alternative analogies between rock’s AABA form and “classical” forms should be thoroughly examined in a separate work in the future. For the work of the theorists just mentioned, see Prout, *Applied Forms*; Hadow, *Sonata Form*; Goetschius, *Larger Forms of Musical Composition*; Schoenberg, *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*; Berry, *Form in Music*; and Caplin, *Classical Forms*.

\(^{10}\) A number of reasons can be inferred as to why these people started talking about their experiences only after the mid-1980s and not sooner, but one reason may be that they were simply not sure exactly what sonata form is and so observing what art-music professors would say. Another reason may be that the then-young musicians and listeners of the 1960s and 1970s became old enough in the 1980s to publish something whereas those writers who were already old enough in the 1960s and 1970s rather grew up with the music of earlier generation such as the 1950s rock ‘n’ roll so that they generally did not support the prog-rock aesthetics in general. These interesting ideological-sociological issues should be the topic of a separate study.

\(^{11}\) Will, “Art Rock.” See an analysis of this piece later in this chapter.
sonata-form connection in prog rock is highly questionable, but these and other rock people enjoy relating prog-rock pieces to “sonata form” in particular and rarely refer to binary or ternary forms.\textsuperscript{12}

Perhaps such a phenomenon itself, in which writers willfully try to connect “sonata form” to prog rock at the risk of abusing the term, represents their wish to identify prog rock with something “profound” and “noble,” like “sonata form” in “classical” music.\textsuperscript{13} Perhaps they were vaguely aware of the “noble” status that “sonata form” occupies within “classical” music tradition for its emphasis on highly organized structure.\textsuperscript{14} And such a “noble” status of “sonata form” may have served as the ideal of prog rock. As will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5, prog-rock musicians and listeners of the time held the ideology that prog rock should be more advanced and serious than any other rock genres; it should be listened to and not danced to. To achieve such a privileged status, prog-rock musicians of the time

\textsuperscript{12} Covach refers to binary form in his “Progressive Rock,” but this is a rare case because he is a professor of music and not just one of many ordinary rock musicians or listeners of the 1960s and 1970s.

\textsuperscript{13} Some historical and sociological investigation of the formation of such a “noble” image about sonata form among ordinary people (i.e. non-professional musicians), especially in the 1960s and 1970s youth culture, would help understand why rock musicians and listeners of the time came to connect the rock form with “sonata form”—a study which is entirely beyond the scope of this dissertation. Some such sociological studies are found in Macan, \textit{Rockin’ the Classics}, 144-166; Frith and Horne, \textit{Art into Pop}; and Stump, \textit{Music’s All That Matters}, for example.

\textsuperscript{14} See, for example, Rosen, \textit{Sonata Forms}, 8-16, for a discussion on the status of sonata form within art music tradition. Extensive sociological studies on the image of “classical” music, and especially that of “sonata form,” within rock music tradition should be conducted separately in the future, but this analytical survey of how their misconceived image of “sonata form” actually plays roles in constructing their intertextuality in the background should also serve as further musicological studies of the reception of “classical” music in rock and popular music in general.
indeed had been striving to obtain a stronger “sense of organization” in their music.\footnote{Macan, \textit{Rockin’ the Classics}, 41. As he describes, musicians “found their answer in limiting the role of improvisation to one or two sections of a piece, and carefully organizing the rest of the material along the lines of nineteenth-century symphonic forms.”}

Example 1.2 shows how they developed rock forms from a less hierarchic organization to a highly hierarchic one. As a starting point of this developmental process, column a of this

**Example 1.2: Development from Contrasting Verse-Chorus Form to Compound AABA Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Contrasting Verse-Chorus Form</th>
<th>b. Contrasting Verse-Chorus Form with Instrumental Verse and Chorus</th>
<th>c. Compound AABA Form</th>
<th>d. Compound AABA Form with Reintro and “Sonata-form” Reference (=Ex. 1.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>(“Exposition”?) Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse Chorus</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>A Verse</td>
<td>A Verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse Chorus</td>
<td>Verse (Inst.) Chorus</td>
<td>A’ Verse</td>
<td>A’ Verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse Chorus</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>B Interlude</td>
<td>B Interlude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>(“Development”?)</td>
<td>(“Development”?) B Interlude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(“Recapitulation”?)</td>
<td>(“Recapitulation”?) Reintro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>A” Verse</td>
<td>A” Verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>Coda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

e.g. Bob Dylan, “Like a Rolling Stone” (1965)
e.g. The Rolling Stones, “Sympathy for the Devil” (1968)
e.g. Led Zeppelin, “Whole Lotta Love” (1969)
e.g. Examples 1.2-1.5 below.
example shows a normative contrasting verse-chorus form, which is basically a repetitive form made of regular alternations of verse and chorus. This contrasting verse-chorus form comes to feature instrumental verse and chorus after the second chorus, as shown in column b. This is the result of a practice that introduces contrast in the middle of a piece and helps to avoid too much repetition. When these instrumental verse and chorus are developed into an instrumental interlude played to an entirely new music, a typical compound AABA form as shown in column c is born. The musicians employed this form in order “to solve the problem of providing contrast after the second chorus in a more ambitious manner,” as Covach formulates.\footnote{Covach, “Form in Rock Music,” 74.} The form obtains a clearer hierarchic structure, unlike the flat hierarchy of contrasting verse-chorus form in a. Such a tendency toward more hierarchic structure is further intensified when, as shown in column d, “reintro” (reprise of the introduction) is introduced right before A" section. By using this device of reintro, the piece now features a grand return to the very opening of the piece, thus grouping the introduction, A, and A' sections all into one large section and the reintro and A" sections into another large section. A repetitive nature that is still found in the form in column c is further reduced in column d because now A" is not just one more repetition of A or A' section; here it is clearly a return to A section, not to A' section, because it is A and not A' that directly follows the introduction, like A" which directly follows the reintro. This further grouping of AABA sections into three larger sections adds one more hierarchic layer to the formal organization and offers the basis for their “sonata-form” association. The rock musicians and listeners may or may not
have noticed the crucial differences between sonata form and the compound AABA form with reintro, but their strong longing for the “noble” status perhaps prompted them to employ the “sonata-form” analogy at this point of formal development.

It is presumably such a misconceived “sonata form” and not other forms that rock musicians and listeners of the time had in mind when they composed, performed, and listened to their music. Perhaps they did not even know what “rounded binary” or “compound ternary” is all about, whereas they did know, if vaguely, what “sonata form” is. This means that the background intertextuality in prog rock of the time is created out of the mixture of this misconception of “sonata form” and the compound AABA form with reintro. Even though what they were doing could be better described as some binary or ternary form, what they refer to and, most importantly, what they mean in their pieces to mix “classical” and rock forms can be better interpreted as their (mis)conception of “sonata form.” Thus the prevalence of background intertextuality such as the “sonata”-AABA mixture rather represents how rock musicians and listeners received and absorbed “sonata form” in their own ways.

Many of the music of Emerson’s contemporary musicians incorporated some kind of intertextuality, either background or foreground. As mentioned above, foreground intertextuality is the surface quotation of some “classical” piece(s). But they do not always feature background intertextuality in combination with foreground intertextuality; one finds either background intertextuality with no significant foreground intertextuality, as the following four examples show, or foreground intertextuality with no significant background
intertextuality, as the next four examples show.

The first example, Example 1.3 below, is a formal diagram of psychedelic-rock group Cream’s “Spoonful” (1966, in Fresh Cream). This piece is originally a Willie Dixon tune in 1960, so the Cream version of this piece clearly creates blues-rock intertextuality. But as far as the intertextuality of “rock” and “classical” styels is concerned, the Cream recording has background intertextuality and no foreground intertextuality. The form can be seen as a compound AABA form, not because of key contrast (the song is in E-blues throughout) but because the B section as a collective improvisation contrasts clearly with more pre-composed

Example 1.3: Cream, “Spoonful” (1966, in Fresh Cream)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(“Exposition”?)</td>
<td>0:00-</td>
<td>Chorus (Intro)</td>
<td>E-blues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0:13-</td>
<td>Verse 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:49-</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td>1:24-</td>
<td>Verse 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:58-</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Development”?)</td>
<td>B 2:16-</td>
<td>Interlude guitar solo (with harmonica)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Recapitulation”?)</td>
<td>3:51-</td>
<td>Chorus (Reintro)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&quot;</td>
<td>4:10-</td>
<td>Verse 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:30-</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>6:08-</td>
<td>tacet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:10-</td>
<td>ending (-6:31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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nature of verses and choruses.\textsuperscript{17} The reprise of the introduction and the A section together right after the B section creates a particularly strong sense of return to the beginning of the piece, and not to the second A section. This in turn encourages a grouping of this reintro and A” as a “sonata recapitulation,” thus also grouping the first two A’s as a “sonata exposition” and seeing the B section as a “sonata development.” It is important to note, however, that the piece is clearly blues-oriented on the surface of the music. Both Eric Clapton’s guitar and Jack Bruce’s harmonica strongly refer to the 1940s and 1950s blues styles.\textsuperscript{18} Thus there is no foreground intertextuality of “rock and “classical” styles in this piece; here intertextuality is found only at a background level.

As shown in Example 1.4, Jimi Hendrix also creates a compound AABA form in his famous “Voodoo Chile” (1968, in Electric Ladyland), with each A section containing verse(s) and chorus. This piece achieves background intertextuality in a slightly different manner than “Spoonful” does. Unlike the Cream piece just discussed, there are several reintros, so the reintro at 10:52 itself cannot be a decisive reason to call the final large section “recapitulation.” What makes this section a decisively marked return to the beginning of the piece is rather the corresponding relations between the prelude (0:00-0:41) and the collective

\textsuperscript{17} The form of this piece may also be characterized as a contrasting verse-chorus form with an instrumental verse and chorus, b of Example 1.2 above, because the accompaniment of the B section certainly begins like a verse and ends like a chorus. But in actuality, this piece must be situated somewhere between b and e of Example 1.2, because the music of B section is roughly based on verse and chorus but mostly loses its identity as verse and chorus because of different accompaniment style.

\textsuperscript{18} See Headlam, “Blues Transformations” for a fuller analytical discussion on the surface of Cream’s styles.
**Example 1.4: Jimi Hendrix, “Voodoo Chile” (1968, in *Electric Ladyland*)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>0:00-</td>
<td></td>
<td>D-minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Exposition&quot;)</td>
<td>0:42-</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1:08-</td>
<td>Verse 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00-</td>
<td>Verse 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:52-</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:09-</td>
<td>Guitar solo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:27-</td>
<td>Reintro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
<td>3:35-</td>
<td>Verse 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:27-</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:43-</td>
<td>Guitar solo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:36-</td>
<td>Organ vs Guitar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Development&quot;)</td>
<td>6:53-</td>
<td>Reintro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7:11-</td>
<td>Verse 3</td>
<td>D-mixolydian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:06-</td>
<td>Guitar Solo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:07-</td>
<td>Collective Improvisation</td>
<td>(=reprise of the prelude?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Recapitulation&quot;)</td>
<td>10:52-</td>
<td>Reintro</td>
<td>D minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A&quot;</td>
<td>11:17-</td>
<td>Verse 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:10-</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:29-</td>
<td>Guitar Solo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>13:02-</td>
<td>Ending (-14:30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvisation (9:07-10:52); these two sections are the only sections (except for the coda) which lack strict beat or form. This collective improvisation is also the reason to consider this B section a contrasting section because this improvisation is the only portion to feature
D-mixolydian scale whereas all the other sections are played in D-blues consistently.\(^{19}\) Thus the Hendrix piece certainly creates a compound AABA form with a grand return to the beginning, making a “sonata-form” reading possible and creating an intertextuality on the formal level. But here again, it is almost totally impossible to find any reference to “classical” music on the surface of this music. Chord progression, melodies, bass lines and drumming are all strongly in “blues rock” styles except for the collective improvisation.\(^{20}\) Thus “rock-classical” intertextuality is found only within background levels, and not on the surface levels.

Interestingly enough, when Hendrix does incorporate some “classical” reference on the surface and thus creates a foreground intertextuality in his “Moon, Turn the Tides … Gently, Gently Away” (1968) through the use of “Bolero drumming,” he casts the music to a clearly “rock” form, without creating background intertextuality.\(^{21}\) The form of this piece is as follows: Prelude (0:00-) – Verse (5:36-) – Chorus (6:05-) – Postlude (7:01-8:52). The four-time version of “Bolero drumming” is brought in around 6:33 as an accompaniment of the repeated chorus. Though this piece is very long, the main body is clearly a contrasting

---

\(^{19}\) I discuss this short improvisation section as “raga” section in my forthcoming paper, “Synthesizing the syntheses.” This section features typical “raga rock” approach, thus deviating a lot from the pieces general blues rock context.

\(^{20}\) See my forthcoming paper, “Synthesizing the syntheses.”

\(^{21}\) “Bolero drumming” in this case is a 4/4 version, unlike a 3/4 time of the Ravel piece. The 4/4 version is also used in The Rolling Stones’ “Paint It Black,” Jefferson Airplane’s “White Rabbit,” and some other pieces, normally as “classical” intertext.
verse-chorus form, with no hierarchic nature.\textsuperscript{22} Thus the foreground intertextuality made by the Bolero drumming is not supported by background intertextuality; once he creates foreground intertextuality, he does not create the kind of background intertextuality found in the background of “Voodoo Chile.” For Hendrix, either foreground intertextuality or background intertextuality seems enough by itself, and both of them would perhaps have been considered too much.

King Crimson’s “21\textsuperscript{st}-century Schizoid Man” (1969, in The Court of the Crimson King), shown in Example 1.5, is another slightly different example. This piece does not offer any unmistakable cue for hearing the A" section as a “recapitulation,” because it starts exactly like A (0:28-) or A' (1:00). Even the relation between the introduction (0:00-) and the B section (2:05-) does not at first seem helpful in determining whether it is A or A' that the A" section “recapitulates,” because the introduction—which simply sounds like an ambient noise—does not correspond to the B section which is a very elaborate, highly organized section. However, a more careful look at the relation between these sections, namely, the introduction and the B section, may encourage one to hear the A" section as “recapitulation,” that is, as the return to the A section and not to the A' section. First, the B section is highly hierarchic to the extent that the listener possibly loses sight of how to

\footnote{The long prelude and postlude may not be a “rock” style but a style derived from what was known to the rock musicians as “Indian raga style.” In this sense, there is certainly an intertextuality at the background. However, that intertextuality is not a “rock-classical” intertextuality but “Indian-rock” or “ethnic-rock” intertextuality, and therefore beyond the scope of this dissertation. On the influences of North Indian classical music on rock musicians of the 1960s, see Macan, Rocking the Classics, 18-19, and n. 3 at 248-249, as well as Bellman, “Indian Resonances.”}
Example 1.5: King Crimson, “21st-Century Schizoid Man” (1969, in *The Court of the Crimson King*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Intro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Exposition”?)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0:28 Riff 1</td>
<td>C minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:46</td>
<td>Verse 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Riff 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Verse 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:34</td>
<td>Riff 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Development”?)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2:05 Riff 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:25</td>
<td>Solo (Riff 3 – Solo – Riff 3)</td>
<td>G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:36</td>
<td>Mirrors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:21</td>
<td>Riff 2</td>
<td>C minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Recapitulation”?)</td>
<td>A”</td>
<td>5:46 Riff 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:05</td>
<td>Verse 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:18</td>
<td>Riff 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:51</td>
<td>Ending (-7:20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

comprehend the direction of the music; it is framed as a whole by “riff 2” and the solo inside the section is also internally framed by “riff 3,” so the significance of the solo lies in its unfolding within a “deeper” level than any other material in the A sections.\(^{23}\) Moreover, the rhythmically highly virtuosic fast unison playing of “Mirrors” section in the key of G after the “deep” solo reinforces the incomprehensibility of the direction of the music\(^{24}\); this is so

\(^{23}\) In fact, guitarist Robert Fripp himself says that the solo is “worthwhile in context but, as a solo, not exceptional.” See Smith, *In the Court of King Crimson*, 60.

\(^{24}\) Since the interlude of this piece is given its own subtitle, it works as a section independent
because all the other sections including riffs 1, 2, and 3, verses, and the solo, are played in a relatively straightforward 4/4 time in C minor. On the other hand, the ambient noise of the introduction is equally, though in a different way, incomprehensible. It is actually the sound of air blowing through the reed organ. And it is played in a very low volume that could be heard only when the listener turns up the volume of his/her stereo; the sound lasts as long as 28 seconds, almost without any change. The A section then suddenly starts with a very high volume in a comprehensible melody in a familiar pentatonic scale by bassist and singer Greg Lake. The beginning of A" is, then, similar to the A section in that both follow an incomprehensible section. Thus, A" section surely tends to be heard as a grand return to the of developmental section. In fact, this independent interlude would be developed into an even longer section in later King Crimson pieces such as “Pictures of a Cry” (1970) and “Larks’ Tongues in Aspic, Part One” (1973), according to Karl, “King Crimson’s Larks’ Tongues in Aspic,” 124-125. Such a framed section, if it is intertextual in itself, could be discussed in relation to what I call a “framed intertextuality.” See Chapter 6 of this dissertation.

25 Smith, In the Court of King Crimson, 59.

26 Guitarist Robert Fripp says, “Well, the first few notes – Daaa-da-da-daa-daa-daaaa – were by Greg Lake, the rest of the introduction was Ian McDonald’s idea, I came up with the riff at the beginning of the instrumental section, and Michael Giles suggested we all play in unison in the very fast section toward the end of the instrumental.” Quoted in Tamm, Robert Fripp, 34. Lake’s melody is widely recognized among the listeners for its comprehensibility and simplicity; indeed, he has even been both praised and criticized for the simplicity.

27 But a difference between the introduction and the B section still exists, of course. The “Mirrors” section in G is followed by the “Riff 2” in C which smoothly connects the “Mirrors” to the return of the Riff 1 at 5:46, as Prof. Allen Anderson suggests, whereas the introduction does not connect to the Riff 1 at 0:28 smoothly in any sense. One might also point out that this Riff 2 at 5:21 works like the “retransition” of “sonata form” because the key already returns to the home key though the material does not yet return to the Riff 1. Since there is nothing like this at the end of the introduction of this piece, I mention in the text that there is no unmistakable cue for the “recapitulation.” Concerning the word “incomprehensibility” in the text, Meyer’s psychologically oriented “ambiguity” theory
A section, encouraging a sonata-form listening. There is certainly background intertextuality in this piece.

As was the case in the previous examples, however, there is no significant foreground intertextuality other than the use of horns, though horns might be considered a “jazz” intertext rather than a “classical” one. Some listeners might mention that the guitar solo incorporates some sort of Hungarian scales, which may betray an influence of Bartók on guitarist Robert Fripp. It seems difficult, however, to consider his solo in this piece as having a “classical” intertext; it may rather be an “ethnic” intertext. Thus an explicit “rock-classical” intertextuality is found only at background levels.

In the case of Yes’s “Close to the Edge” (1972, in Close to the Edge), shown in Example 1.6, a background intertextuality is created in an even more elaborate manner, and interestingly, there is also a foreground intertextuality in the piece. As for the background, first, compound AABA form is clear in the background because each A section contains verses and choruses and the music of B section is obviously contrasting with other sections. Second, a “sonata-form” reading is also possible. Though there is no reintro, the

should be understood. “Ambiguity” arises when conventionally normative progression of the music is interrupted by some means and the listener’s “expectation” or the music’s “implication” is “prohibited” so that a delayed “realization” of the original expectation/implication would be felt like a “delayed gratification.”. See Meyer, Emotion and Meaning in Music.

28 Tamm, Robert Fripp, 15-16, 25.

29 The diagram shows “verse” at 9:48, but their music is different from those verse in the A sections, though it has some connections with the A-section bridges. See Covach,
Example 1.6: Yes, “Close to the Edge” (1972, in Close to the Edge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:00-</td>
<td>stream and bird sounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I</td>
<td>0:56-</td>
<td>bass scales and ostinatos</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:58</td>
<td>“Close to the Edge” theme</td>
<td>D/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(“Exposition”?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3:54</td>
<td>verse and chorus</td>
<td>a dorian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:24</td>
<td>bridges and chorus</td>
<td>F to C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td>6:03</td>
<td>verse and chorus</td>
<td>a dorian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:10</td>
<td>bridges and chorus</td>
<td>G to D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>“Close to the Edge” fugato</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II (“Development”?)</td>
<td>B 8:28</td>
<td>static interlude</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:48</td>
<td>verses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:10</td>
<td>church organ interludes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:11</td>
<td>“Close to the Edge” theme reset</td>
<td>F#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(“Recapitulation”?)</td>
<td>A&quot; 14:59</td>
<td>instr. verses and choruses</td>
<td>a dorian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15:53</td>
<td>verses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16:33</td>
<td>bridge and chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17:36</td>
<td>fade to bird and stream sounds</td>
<td>Bb to F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(-18:38)

Correspondence of the introduction and the B section is significant in terms of motifs, tonal centers, and thematic developments. All of these in turn relate A to A" as the sections following the introduction and the B section respectively. But the A" section as a whole is actually more directly related to both the A and A' sections, because of specific metric connections between A verses (3:54-) and instrumental A" verse (14:59-) and between A'...
verse (6:03-) and vocal A” verse (15:53-).\textsuperscript{31} This metric connection also supports a “sonata-form” reading.\textsuperscript{32} But the classical reference goes further in this piece; as Covach finally shows, the piece seems to be further divided into two large parts, with Part II beginning at 8:28 especially because of the aforementioned corresponding relation between the introduction and the B section, thus referring to a “classical” extended binary form.\textsuperscript{33} Thus the background intertextuality of this piece is created in a very elaborate manner.\textsuperscript{34} In terms of the surface of the music, it is interesting that there is also a foreground intertextuality especially at 8:00 where what Covach calls “the ‘Close to the Edge’ fugato” appears.\textsuperscript{35} Since this Baroque texture is created by rock instruments including the drums, electric guitar and bass, and a Hammond organ, the foreground intertextuality at this point is very clear. Though it is significantly short, it is important that Yes features a foreground intertextuality when they also elaborate on a background feature. This is perhaps one of the elements that prompt many listeners to find parallel relations between Yes and ELP.\textsuperscript{36} However, the two intertextualities occur together quite temporarily and only at some moments during the piece.

\textsuperscript{31} Covach, “Progressive Rock,” 16-17.

\textsuperscript{32} For such an interpretation, see Will, “Art Rock”; Mosbø, \textit{Yes}; and Macan, \textit{Rockin’ the Classics}, 99-104.

\textsuperscript{33} Covach, “Progressive Rock.”

\textsuperscript{34} The diagram in \textbf{Example 1.6} is from Covach, “Progressive Rock,” 12, though it is presented here in an abbreviated form and with my additional words such as exposition, development, etc.

\textsuperscript{35} Covach, “Progressive Rock,” 10-12.

\textsuperscript{36} For a discussion on parallel relations between Yes and ELP, see Macan, \textit{Rocking the Classics}, 104-105.
They rather create contrasts with other sections as a whole, thus contributing to intertextuality at formal-structural levels and not so much on the surface. Intertextuality is presented mostly at background levels and not particularly at the foreground.

Despite the similarities between ELP and Yes, there are nonetheless differences in style between Emerson and Yes keyboardist Rick Wakeman. A quick look at Yes’s “Cans and Brahms” (1972, in Fragile) will reveal Wakeman’s procedure in reworking a “classical” piece. Wakeman plays a portion of the third movement of Brahms’s Fourth Symphony (the first 92 of the 357 measures in the movement) on his electric keyboards, creating an unmistakable foreground intertextuality throughout the piece. But he makes almost no significant changes other than adding a cadence at the end. It is certainly interesting to find that Brahms’s original music at mm. 89-92 is a return to the opening theme; Wakeman carefully chooses a portion of the “classical” piece that could be roughly viewed as a “sonata form” because of the return to the beginning. However, he does not make any further effort to adapt the “classical” piece more neatly to the mixed background form that the band used for “Close to the Edge.” There is no compound AABA form in the Brahms excerpt. Thus, there is no background intertextuality in this reworking; there is only a foreground intertextuality, since the background remains unchanged from the classical-music original.

As the preceding examples show, when background intertextuality is created, there is in most cases no significant foreground intertextuality. And when a musician uses

---

37 The electric keyboards Wakeman uses on this track are: electric piano which plays the strings part; grand piano electric harpsichord which plays the reeds part; and synthesizer which plays the contra bassoon part, according to the liner notes to CD, Yes, Fragile.
foreground intertextuality, there tends not to be much evidence of background intertextuality. This is not only the case with Hendrix or Wakeman; it was a general tendency of the day, as the next four examples will illustrate. The first of these is the Beatles’ “All You Need Is Love” (1967), shown in Example 1.7. In this piece, Bach’s “Invention No.8” is incorporated, along with the jazz standard “In The Mood” by Glenn Miller and the folk song “Greensleaves” as well as the Beatles’ self quotation from “She Loves You,” into the final coda section of the piece. The piece’s instrumentation (heavier use of horn section) may also contribute to the foreground intertextuality. The piece itself is, however, clearly cast

Example 1.7: The Beatles, “All You Need Is Love” (1967, in Magical Mystery Tour)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>“Le Marseillaise”</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:08</td>
<td>cemballo and chorus and string quartet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:27</td>
<td>Verse 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:45</td>
<td>Verse 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:01</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:19</td>
<td>Verse: Guitar Solo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:36</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:53</td>
<td>Verse 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:28</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:44</td>
<td>Coda: “Love is all you need” repeated with “She Loves You”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:53</td>
<td>Bach Invention no.8 (mm. 1-6, transposed from F to G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:01</td>
<td>“In The Mood” (the opening, transposed from Ab to G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:13</td>
<td>“Greensleaves” (the opening, e-dorian version with G emphasized)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:24</td>
<td>Bach Invention 8 (mm. 1-6, transposed from F to G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:35</td>
<td>“In The Mood” (the opening, transposed from Ab to G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:42</td>
<td>“Greensleaves “(the opening, e-dorian version with G emphasized)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-3:48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Covach, “"The Rutles” and Holm-Hudson, “The Future Is Now” for a brief discussion on the self quotation from “She Loves You” in “All You Need Is Love.”
in a contrasting verse-chorus form with an instrumental verse (cf. Example 1.2b). Indeed it is not possible to see this piece even as a compound AABA form, partly because the instrumental verse is no different from other verses except for the instrumentation, and partly because it is not clear whether the third verse is a return to the first verse or to the second or both. Thus it is difficult to find background intertextuality in this piece.\(^{39}\) A “classical” piece is quite neatly adapted in one short section of a purely “rock” form in this case.\(^{40}\)

The next example is “Roll Over Beethoven” (1973, in Electric Light Orchestra II) by the Electric Light Orchestra (ELO). This piece represents a more explicit example of

\(^{39}\) Some might still be tempted to analyze 0:27-1:19 as the “exposition,” 1:19-1:53 as the “development,” 1:53-2:44 as the “recapitulation,” and 2:44-3:48 as the coda. However, this song is cast into a very typical, conventional, contrasting verse-chorus form with an instrumental verse; an instrumental verse has been a regular practice even from the time of blues in the 1940s and 1950s. Moreover the piece is very short (less than four-minute long). All these things rather discourage us from attempting to find any background reference to “classical” styles. On the blues origin of rock music, see, for example, Cohn, Rock from the Beginning; Hatch and Millward, From Blues to Rock; and Middleton, Pop Music and the Blues, among many others.

\(^{40}\) It would be interesting to see this Beatles piece in terms of pastiche or collage, especially because of the juxtaposition of widely different pieces at the end. It is, however, also interesting to see how the Beatles adapted these quoted materials to their song’s tonality, G major. Bach’s piece is transposed from F major to G major; Miller’s piece is transposed from Ab to G major; and, interestingly enough, the Beatles chose the e-dorian version of “Greensleaves” among so many different versions and almost begins with the second note of the song, G, around 3:15, de-emphasizing the real opening note E before the G. This procedure for “Greensleaves” was taken because they wanted a major-third interval at the beginning but the song is transmitted as either minor or dorian, featuring a minor third at the beginning. This problem was solved by almost starting with the second note of the song, because thereby a major third can be featured at the beginning instead. Note also the similarity between the Bach piece and the Miller piece; both these pieces trace G-major triad in an ascending order. Because of this consistency in Bach and Miller materials, the Beatles also adapted the “Greensleaves” to a kind of “major” version. Then, it can be said that they avoided jarring juxtaposition among the quoted materials. For another discussion of this piece, see Everett, Beatles as Musicians: Revolver, 124-126.
“classical” incorporation. As diagramed in Example 1.8c, this piece starts and ends with the

Example 1.8: “Roll Over Beethoven” by Chuck Berry (1956, *His Best, Vol. 1*) and Electric Light Orchestra (1973, in *Electric Light Orchestra II*)

a: Chuck Berry (1956)  b: editing process  c: Electric Light Orchestra (1973)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Verse (Gt.)</td>
<td>Beethoven 0:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:08</td>
<td>Verse 1</td>
<td>1:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:16</td>
<td>Verse-1</td>
<td>1:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:31</td>
<td>Verse 2</td>
<td>1:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:47</td>
<td>Verse 3</td>
<td>1:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:02</td>
<td>Verse-4</td>
<td>2:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>Verse 5</td>
<td>2:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:34</td>
<td>Verse-5</td>
<td>3:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:49</td>
<td>Verse-6</td>
<td>3:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:03</td>
<td>Verse-7 (-2:22)</td>
<td>4:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10</td>
<td>Bridge 3 transitory</td>
<td>5:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:11</td>
<td>5:32</td>
<td>6:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:32</td>
<td>6:14</td>
<td>Bridge 2 transitory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:14</td>
<td>Bridge 2 transitory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:20</td>
<td>6:37</td>
<td>6:51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:37</td>
<td>6:51</td>
<td>Bridge 3 transitory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:51</td>
<td>7:03</td>
<td>7:18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
opening motif of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, transposed up a half step, and materials from it reappear often over the course of the eight-minute piece. Beethoven’s music appears roughly in alternation with the verses drawn from rock ‘n’ roller Chuck Berry’s 1956 song, “Roll Over Beethoven” (in *His Best, Vol. 1*) which is diagramed in Example 1.8a. The alternation is very quick; every one-minute-and-a-half, the listener hears both Berry and Beethoven material. Thus, foreground intertextuality is very explicit. Example 1.8c shows ELO’s reworking. However, a careful look at formal structure reveals that there is no significant “rock-classical” background intertextuality in this ELO piece. The formal structure of this ELO version becomes apparent when it is compared with the source of this piece, the Berry song. Berry’s song is originally in a simple verse form, as Example 1.8a shows. Example 1.8b shows a likely reworking process of the Berry piece (Ex. 1.8a) into...

---

41 The Beatles also covered and played the Berry song on stage already around 1960 and released a studio version in their album *With the Beatles* in 1963, so one might speculate that the ELO piece should be based on the Beatles version and not the Berry one. In fact, ELO’s treatment of Berry’s Verse 4 may certainly derive from the Beatles’s version, because the Beatles changes accompaniment style at Verse 4 just as ELO does so. But the Beatles’ version is no different from Berry’s version in terms of formal structure; it remains a simple verse form which can be formally parsed in the following way: Verse (Gt., 0:00-) – Verse 1 (0:17-) – Verse 2 (0:34-) – Verse 3 (0:53-) – Verse 4 (1:11-) – Verse (Gt., 1:29-) – Verse 5 (1:46-) – Verse 6 (2:04-) – Verse 7 (2:22-2:43). Perhaps the only other significant differences of the Beatles version from the Berry version are some rhythmic nuances and the final chord which Everett discusses in his *The Beatles as Musicians: The Quarry*, 62-63, 123, and 186. Therefore, it is still possible to regard the Berry piece as the source of the formal structure of the ELO version. For discussions on different versions of “Roll Over Beethoven,” see Kneif, “Roll Over, Beethoven.”

42 The foreground mixture of these materials may be discussed in terms of Jamesonian “pastiche” or Gatesian “Signifyin(g),” but again, tonal adjustment is worth a note. Beethoven’s motif, originally G-G-G-Eb in c minor, is transposed up a half step to G#-G#-G#-E, to adapt it to the piece’s key, E major (not c# minor!). The ELO seems to have avoided a jarring effect of juxtaposing the original motif with the E-major Berry song.
the ELO version (Ex. 1.8c). ELO likely first arranges Berry’s form into a more organized
tripartite structure, with each part beginning with an instrumental verse. Only at this point
did ELO perhaps extrapolate Beethoven materials at the beginning of each part and at the end
of the piece. The final result shown under c is reached from here by only a small step; ELO
simply inserted bridges around the Beethoven materials and expanded some instrumental
verses. Therefore, the underlying formal structure of ELO’s version remains that shown
under b, which might be called a “compound verse form” since each “verse” is made of a
complex of different materials. There is certainly a hierarchic aspect in this form, but
predominantly repetitive nature of the music, with every verse strictly built on a twelve-bar
form, may tend to discourage any “classical” interpretation of the formal structure; in this
piece, “rock” aspects seem to outweigh “classical” aspects at background levels, despite the
clear references to Beethoven on the surface.

Example 1.9 shows a formal diagram of “Für Elise & Moonlight Sonata” (1968, in
The Beat Goes On) by American prog-rock group Vanilla Fudge.\textsuperscript{43} This piece features even
more explicit “classical” references on the surface of the music. As the title of the piece

\textsuperscript{43} The choice of such “classical” pieces as these Beethoven pieces already complicates
matters, because these pieces have already been “popularized” among the public and
obtained some kind of “pop” status. It follows that this type of pieces have already been
perceived in terms of “pop-classical” intertextuality by then, as Prof. Severine Neff rightly
points out. And since what prog-rock musicians generally took as their source of reworking
tends to be this “pop” type of “classical” pieces, the result is “pop-classical-rock”
intertextuality. This wider issue lies beyond the scope of this dissertation; as mentioned in
the introduction, this dissertation focuses on the various intertextual relationships possible
between just two intertexts: “rock” and “classical.” See Chapter 5 for a more detailed
account of the general tendency in the choice of prog-rock music’s “classical” intertexts.
Example 1.9: Vanilla Fudge, “Für Elise & Moonlight Sonata” (1968, in *The Beat Goes On*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>0:00-</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ?</td>
<td>0:22-</td>
<td>“Verse”? Moonlight (mm. 1-12, transposed from c# to c) organ + bass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:57-</td>
<td>“Bridge”? hard rock materials band</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:04-</td>
<td>“Chorus”? Elise (mm. 1-20, transposed from a to c) piano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’ ?</td>
<td>3:46-</td>
<td>“Verse”? Moonlight (mm. 1-8, transposed from c# to c) piano + chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:43-</td>
<td>“Chorus”? Elise (mm. 1-8, transposed from a to c) piano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:56-</td>
<td>“Chorus”? Elise (mm. 1-8, transposed from a to c) organ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:15-</td>
<td>“Chorus”? Elise (mm. 1-8, transposed from a to c) organ + band</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:28-</td>
<td>“Chorus”? Elise (mm. 16-20, transposed from a to c) band + harpsichord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>5:44-</td>
<td>“Chorus”? Elise a motif repeated (-6:37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

shows, this piece incorporates two pieces by Beethoven. The two pieces are presented alternately, and it is possible to detect a bipartite form, consisting of A (0:22-) and A’ (3:46-). But it may also be possible to see a contrasting verse-chorus form, assuming a verse-like function in “Moonlight” materials and a chorus-like repetition of “Elise” materials.

However, the reading of this piece as a collage of different materials might better characterize the form of this piece. “Moonlight” returns at 3:46 in a totally different instrumentation and the fragments of the “Elise” materials from 4:43 on are presented differently each time. Even if one wishes to force an analysis of the piece as having a background intertextuality of “classical” binary form and “rock” verse-chorus form, a collage aspect seems to stand out clearly. Thus the foreground intertextuality is not backed
by background intertextuality in this case.⁴⁴

**Example 1.10** is from Sky’s “Tocatta” [*sic.*] (1980, in *The Best of Sky*) which is a reworking of J.S. Bach’s famous “Tocatta and Fugue in D minor” with typical rock instruments such as distorted electric guitar, electric bass, rock drum kit, and a synthesizer. The foreground intertextuality is quite obvious throughout.

However, the background intertextuality is not as obvious; perhaps “rock” verse-chorus form may be detected as in the diagram, but no “classical” form in particular. The reintro at 2:54 certainly clarifies a strong sense of a return to the opening, but it does not encourage a “sonata-form” reading because there is no contrasting section before that (the “B?” section in the diagram does not clearly contrast with other sections because it is derived from mm. 16-19 of the Bach piece, the same origin as other “chorus” sections). It may certainly be possible to think of a reference to a “sonata without development” instead, and to

---

⁴⁴ On the one hand, a glance at Vanilla Fudge’s general style would further support the interpretation of this piece as collage; for example, “Phase One” of their album *The Beat Goes On* is purely a collage of as many as ten different quotations, all of which they explicitly credit on the album sleeve. Those ten pieces include: Mozart’s Divertimento No. 13, nineteenth-century traditional tune “Old Black Joe,” Cole Porter’s “Don’t Fence Me In,” Elvis Presley’s “Hound Dog,” The Beatles’s “I Want to Hold Your Hand,” and “She Loves You.” All the ten pieces are quoted and presented in chronological order of the origin, and every quotation is confined to less than a minute. Such a procedure is a typical collage, so that no hierarchic structure can occur. On the other hand, their “Fur Elise & Moonlight Sonata” also adjusts the key of the quoted materials consistently to c minor, which would rather argue against the collage interpretation. One important issue here is the extent to which a tonality works as a unifying force within a piece of music, an issue which is extremely important for any studies of musical intertextuality but which lies beyond the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>0:00-</td>
<td>mm.1-10 synth and bass</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Exposition?)</td>
<td>1:12-</td>
<td>“Intro” 16th-beat drumming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1:17-</td>
<td>“Verse” mm. 12-14 guitar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:31-</td>
<td>“Chorus 1” mm. 16-17 guitar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td>1:44-</td>
<td>“Verse” mm. 12-14 guitar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B ?</td>
<td>2:06-</td>
<td>“Chorus 2” augmentation of m.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:19-</td>
<td>“Chorus 2” augmentation of m.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Recapitulation?)</td>
<td>2:33-</td>
<td>“Bridge” materials from mm.16-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A”</td>
<td>2:54-</td>
<td>“Reintro” 16th-beat drumming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>3:01-</td>
<td>“Verse” mm. 12-14 guitar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:24-</td>
<td>“Chorus 2” augmentation of m.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B?</td>
<td>3:37-</td>
<td>“Bridge” materials from mm.16-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>3:54-</td>
<td>“Intro” 16th-beat drumming w/gt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:09-</td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

consider an intertextuality of it with verse-chorus form. However, the specific use of reintro in this relatively newer piece rather discourages any “classical” reading. A reintro was formerly a device to make a grand return to the opening after a long contrasting section, but in this piece a reintro is used only to return to the opening of the piece without a contrasting section. The “grand” character is greatly reduced here because of this. Thus the reintro here represents the band’s revision of the past rock idiom, and the revision demands the listener’s attention. So, despite an evident foreground intertextuality, the background rather shows a scope of this dissertation.

45 This interpretation is possible because Sky is a kind of second generation prog-rock group; they debuted in 1979 when most of the first generation prog-rock musicians lost their
very strong connection of the piece to past rock music; no significant background intertextuality is encouraged. Thus, foreground intertextuality in this piece is not necessarily backed by background intertextuality.

Unlike these contemporaneous pieces in which foreground intertextuality and background intertextuality rarely coexist, Emerson’s pieces tend to present intertextuality simultaneously at different structural levels. He mixes styles on both foreground and background levels within a piece, almost as if he is obsessed by some formal-structural models without which he could not finish – or start – recording.

In fact, there seems to be a formal-structural model that Emerson faithfully adheres to and that I have elsewhere referred to as the “Emerson model.” Like many other contemporary rock musicians, Emerson also chooses “classical” “sonata form” and “rock” AABA form and conflates them synchronically. But many of Emerson’s pieces employ a version of the model that does seem to be a mixture of “sonata” and AABA forms, as

---

popularity in the mainstream. Thus the style of Sky can be understood as some kind of revision of earlier prog-rock pieces because that is the way the second generation prog rock musicians could survive. For some biographical information about this group, see Black, “The Story of Sky.” For the second generation prog rock musicians, see also Covach’s description of the 1980’s prog rock scene in his “Progressive Rock,” 4-6; “Echolyn,” 16-38; Macan, Rocking the Classics, 179-219; Stump, Music’s All That Matters, 234-291; and Martin, Listening to the Future, 247-298. See also Chapter 3 of this dissertation about revisionism.

46 Kawamoto, “Beyond ‘Cover’.”
Example 1.11 suggests.\footnote{Some of the following analyses in this section are partly, but not entirely, derived from my “Beyond ‘Cover’,” though they are here largely revised.}

The Emerson model, shown under \textit{a}, consists of “exposition,” improvisation, “recapitulation,” and coda, with improvisation and “recapitulation” interchangeable. This means that there are two patterns of realization of the model, one without the interchange and the other with the interchange. Pattern 1, shown under \textit{b}, thus proceeds from “exposition” through improvisation to “recapitulation,” followed by coda, creating a clearer reference to a “sonata form.” In contrast, pattern 2, shown under \textit{c}, proceeds from “exposition” through

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{a:} “Exposition”
\item \textbf{b:} “Exposition” A “Exposition” A
\item \textbf{c:} “Exposition” A’
\item Improvisation B “Recapitulation” A’
\item (interchangeable)
\item “Recapitulation” A” Improvisation B
\item Coda Coda Coda A”
\end{itemize}
“recapitulation” to improvisation followed by coda, in which case improvisation functions like a cadenza of a concerto and a “sonata” reference becomes weaker because there is nothing that corresponds to “development” between “exposition” and “recapitulation.” 48

The way AABA is mixed into pattern 1 is very different from that of pattern 2. In pattern 1, A and A’ correspond to the “exposition,” B to the improvisation, and A” to the “recapitulation.” On the other hand, in pattern 2, A corresponds to the “exposition,” A’ to the “recapitulation,” B to the improvisation, and A” to the coda. Therefore, while pattern 1 features AABA in a more foreground level than the model itself, pattern 2 features AABA at the same level as the model as if AABA is simply another way of referring to the pattern itself.

This model suggests that Emerson regards these organizational patterns only as background molds and disregards the details of the original forms. In fact, the Emerson “exposition” is simply a place where he presents musical ideas; it is not necessarily a section consisting of two contrasting themes in two different key areas like a sonata form, nor does he always create a verse or two in a twelve-bar blues form or thirty-two-bar AABA form like AABA form. The Emerson improvisation is usually a ragtime-like keyboard improvisation on a riff derived from the “exposition,” so it is not a “sonata-form development” with sequential progressions, a prolongation of the home-key dominant, “pre-core/core

---

48 The phrase “sonata without development” has been used particularly in Tovey, The Forms of Music, 229; Webster, “Sonata Form,” 506; and Caplin, Classical Form, 216, but the idea itself has been discussed, according to Caplin, by Berry, Form in Music, 197-198; Green, Form in Tonal Music, 230-231; Kohs, Musical Form, 291-96; Rosen, Sonata Forms, 120-121; Schoenberg, Musical Composition, 190; and Ratz, Musikalische Formenlehre, 36.
techniques," and so on, nor is it the B section of AABA, which is usually a structurally subordinate "bridge" section. The "recapitulation" of the Emerson model is sometimes a simple repetition but in many cases a significantly varied and/or truncated reiteration, and does not always function as a confirmation of the home-key tonic in the way a "sonata recapitulation" attempts to adjust the second key area to the tonic key; nor does his "recapitulation" always resemble the last A of AABA forms, because some significant transformation often occurs. Some might think that such ignorance to the details of "sonata" and "AABA" forms might reflect Emerson’s poor understanding of these forms, but such a claim cannot be supported in the face of the fact that Emerson had played many Classic piano sonatas from childhood until his piano teacher advised him to continue studying piano at London Royal Conservatoire of Music, though he did not go there finally; he also had played many kinds of popular AABA tunes, as well as more recently developed compound AABA forms popular in many “rock” pieces during the 1960s. Emerson probably knew the details of these forms to some significant degree, even though he may not have been taught them officially. What he does in background levels of his music can thus

49 See Covach, “Form in Rock Music,” 69-71, for a discussion on the function of the bridge section in AABA forms. For a most recent and fuller account of a Classic sonata-form development, and on “pre-core/core technique,” see Caplin, Classical Form, 139-159.

50 Though length of the last A section is shorter than the first two A’s, one may add that in sonata, too, the recapitulation is sometimes shorter than the exposition.

51 Hanson, Hang on to a Dream, 13-14; Forrester et al. Emerson, Lake and Palmer, 15-20; Covach, “Form in Rock Music,” 74-76.

52 According to Emerson, his piano teachers did not even teach him chord names such as A minor, G-seventh, etc, but played many Bach pieces as well as piano pieces of Mozart and Beethoven. He was encouraged by his last piano teacher to go to London Royal
be seen as a deliberate conflation of “sonata” and AABA forms as molds; in order to mix them in a certain way, it was perhaps necessary for him to discard the details of them to a significant degree.53

Emerson’s adherence to his model and thus to background intertextuality may be confirmed especially in his “classical” reworkings, in which despite evident foreground intertextuality he never gives up creating background intertextuality. Example 1.12 shows four of his “classical” reworkings in which he adapts the original forms to the first pattern of his model. In each example, the form of the original “classical” piece is compared with that of Emerson’s reworking of the piece.

In “The Great Gates of Kiev” (1971, in ELP, Pictures at an Exhibition), shown as Example 1.12a, Musorgsky’s original form has A-A'-A"-Coda, but Emerson deletes a particular three-measure portion (mm. 111-113) of Musorgsky’s music and instead plays a long improvisation with his Moog Ribbon Controller with no accompaniment from 2:50 to 4:13, thus inserting a clearly contrasting B section so that an AABA form and a sonata form reference can be created. Copland’s “Fanfare for the Common Man” (1977, in ELP, Works, Conservatoire of Music, but he chose not to do so. Judging from these facts, it is unlikely that Emerson was formally taught details of sonata principles. Yet all this does not negate Emerson’s knowledge from his real experiences of these forms.

53 This is not to say one always has to discard some details in order to conflate two forms, but in certain circumstances and for certain purposes it is better not to stick to the details of both forms—at least this seems to be what Emerson understands.
Example 1.12: Examples of Pattern 1 of the Emerson Model
("//" = a double-bar line; "/:;" and "/://" = repetition; "I" = introduction)


Musorgsky:  
A  A'  A" Coda  
mm.  1  81  111  114  162-174 //

Emerson:  
A  A'  B  A" Coda  
timing  0:00  2:17  2:50  4:13  5:14-5:49 //

“Exposition”  Improvisation  “Recapitulation”  Coda


Copland:  
A  A'  
mm.  1-  22-46 //

Emerson:  
A  A'  B  A" Ending  
timing  0:00  2:00  3:22  8:00  8:55-9:46 //

“Exposition”  Improvisation  “Recapitulation”  Coda


Janacek:  
A  B  A'  
mm.  1-  34  47-84 //

Emerson:  
//: A :// B  C  A" Ending  
timing  0:00  1:50  2:16  3:59  4:47-5:09 //

“Exposition”  Improvisation  “Recapitulation”  Coda

d. “Intermezzo from the Karelia Suite” (cf. *Example 2.8*) (1968, in The Nice, *Ars Longa Vita Brevis*):

Sibelius:  
Prelude  A  Postlude  
mm.  1  53  122-157 //

Emerson:  
Prelude I //: A :// B  I A" Ending  
timing  0:00  1:20  1:29  4:13  7:18  7:38  8:28-8:52 //

“Exposition”  Improvisation  “Recapitulation”  Coda
Vol. 1), shown as Example 1.12b, is more explicitly adapted to pattern 1 of his model; Copland has only A and A' sections (beginning at mm. 1 and 22 respectively), but Emerson adds a long improvisation at 3:22 after those sections, repeats one A section at 8:00 after the improvisation, and puts a coda at 8:55. “Knife Edge” (1970, in ELP, *Emerson, Lake and Palmer*), shown as Example 1.12c, is also an explicit example in which the A section (m.1-) and B section (m. 34-) of Janacek’s Sinfonietta are taken as three A sections (0:00-, 0:57-, 3:59-), and B section (1:50-) of the ELP piece, and a long improvisation is inserted at the “right” place for pattern 1 of the Emerson model. “Intermezzo from the Karelia Suite” (1968, in The Nice, *Ars Longa Vita Brevis*), shown as Example 1.12d, is yet another very explicit adaptation of a “classical” piece to the Emerson model. Sibelius’s music has only a prelude, an A section that makes up the torso of the piece, and a postlude, but Emerson takes this torso section as his three A sections (1:29-, 2:52-, 7:38-) and again inserts a long improvisation at the “right” point to complete the first pattern of his structural model. The third A section is even preceded by a reintro, so that a sense of the return to the beginning of the piece can be intensified.

Examples of pattern 2 of the Emerson model are shown in Example 1.13. As Example 1.13a shows, Bartok’s “Allegro Barbaro” (1970, in ELP, *Emerson, Lake and Palmer*), is originally a simple bipartite form, but after the B section of the Bartok piece, Emerson returns to the beginning of the piece, plays an improvisation after that, and puts a coda using materials from the A section, so that pattern 2 of his model can be created (more on this piece in Chapter 6). Tchaikovsky’s Symphony No. 6, 3rd movement is reworked by
Example 1.13: Examples of Pattern 2 of the Emerson Model


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bartók:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101-224 //</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerson:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A'</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>timing</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>1:26</td>
<td>2:47</td>
<td>3:22</td>
<td>3:51-4:26 //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Exposition” (A)</td>
<td>“Recapitulation” (A')</td>
<td>Improvisation (B)</td>
<td>Coda (A')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tchaikovsky:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A'</th>
<th>B'</th>
<th>A&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>316-347 //</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerson:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A'</th>
<th>B'</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>timing</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>1:48</td>
<td>3:21</td>
<td>5:28</td>
<td>8:24</td>
<td>8:53-9:07 //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Exposition” (A)</td>
<td>“Recapitulation” (A')</td>
<td>Improvisation (B)</td>
<td>Coda (A')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tchaikovsky:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A'</th>
<th>B'</th>
<th>A&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>316-347 //</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerson:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A'</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>timing</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>2:26</td>
<td>4:28</td>
<td>5:41</td>
<td>6:34-6:52 //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Exposition” (A)</td>
<td>“Recapitulation” (A')</td>
<td>Imp (B)</td>
<td>Coda (A')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. “Mars, the Bringer of War” (1986, in Emerson, Lake and Powell, *Emerson, Lake and Powell*):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holst:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B'</th>
<th>A'</th>
<th>C'</th>
<th>B&quot;</th>
<th>A&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>167-185 //</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerson:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>B'</th>
<th>A'</th>
<th>C'</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>timing</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>1:38</td>
<td>2:39</td>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>4:38</td>
<td>5:36</td>
<td>5:57</td>
<td>6:43-7:55 //</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Exposition” (A)</td>
<td>“Recapitulation” (A')</td>
<td>Improvisation (B)</td>
<td>Coda (A')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emerson twice, once with an orchestra and once without it. In the orchestral version (1970, in The Nice, *Five Bridges*), shown as **Example 1.13b**, he keeps the original almost intact, except for having his drummer, Brian Davison, play an improvisation at 8:24 in place of Tchaikovsky’s beginning of the coda at mm. 316–337, so that his second pattern clearly results. In the version without orchestra (1970, in The Nice, *Elegy*), shown as **Example 1.13c**, he starts with Tchaikovsky’s A’ section (m. 139) and this time continues to the beginning of the coda up to m.333 so that a “recapitulation” can be achieved, then inserts an organ improvisation and a drum improvisation, and returns to Tchaikovsky at 6:35. “Mars, the Bringer of War” (1986, in Emerson, Lake and Powell, *Emerson, Lake and Powell*), shown as **Example 1.13d**, is mostly played intact, but replacing the B” section (m. 143) with an improvisation (5:53) Emerson neatly adapts the Holst piece to his model, pattern 2.

As these above examples suggest, Emerson manipulates the formal structure of a piece and adapts it to his model in a variety of ways in many of his “classical” reworkings. Unlike many other rock musicians of the day, Emerson never forgets to rework the formal structure and to adapt it to his model until he obtains background intertextuality. The Emerson model truly seems to adhere to his compositional mind.
More could be learned about Emerson’s background intertextuality if one looks at his 1971 reworking of Musorgsky’s “Pictures at an Exhibition” in some detail. Emerson not only intuitively sticks to background intertextuality, but perhaps also creates it on purpose. In fact, the Emerson model is adopted in many ways within this single piece very carefully. First, the entire piece is very skillfully adapted to the first pattern of the Emerson model, as shown in Example 1.14.

As this example shows, Emerson radically changed Musorgsky’s formal structure. Musorgsky originally presents six promenades (in italics) and ten pictures alternating somewhat like ritornello or rondo form, with variation form also playing a role in recurring promenades, as Emilia Fried, Micheal Russ and others describe. But Emerson probably

---

54 Though this reworking was released only at the end of 1971 and hit the charts early in the next year, ELP had already been playing this reworking on stage even before their debut album was release in November 1970. Their performance of the piece on “The Isle of Wight Festival” on August 29, 1970, has been released on CD and we can hear their still rough performance of this piece. They also continued playing this piece on stage, and in 1998 they released a studio version of the piece in Return of the Manticore, which will be discussed later in this section of the text (see Example 1.20).

55 Fried, Notes, 2; Russ, Musorgsky, 34; and Hübsch, Modest Mussorgskij, 17-25.
Example 1.14: Musorgsky, *Pictures at an Exhibition* (1874) and ELP, “Pictures at an Exhibition” (1971, in *Pictures at an Exhibition*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Musorgsky</th>
<th>ELP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Movement (section)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Key</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Promenade #1</td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The Gnome</td>
<td>eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Promenade #2</td>
<td>Ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* The Old Castle</td>
<td>g#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade #3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuileries</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>g#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade #4</td>
<td>d to F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“the Unhatched Chicks”</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Samuel&quot;</td>
<td>b-flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Promenade #5</td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Market</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catacombae</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* “Baba Yaga” (a) g octatonic?</td>
<td>8. The Hut of Baba Yaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) e octatonic?</td>
<td>9. The Curse of Baba Yaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a’) g octatonic?</td>
<td>10. The Hut of Baba Yaga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emerson once said, “It [=Musorgsky’s Pictures at an Exhibition] was like nothing else I’d ever heard in classical music. … It was very daring for a classical piece. I knew this was something that could merge with rock music.” See Pilato, “Isle of Wight Festival,” 3.

56 Emerson once said, “It [=Musorgsky’s Pictures at an Exhibition] was like nothing else I’d ever heard in classical music. … It was very daring for a classical piece. I knew this was something that could merge with rock music.” See Pilato, “Isle of Wight Festival,” 3.
additional tracks, he fit the overall structure into A-A'-B-A"-Coda, which is then reinterpreted as “Exposition,” Improvisation, “Recapitulation,” Coda, pattern 1 of the Emerson model.

This adaptation of the largest-scale form is indeed carefully done. The return of the A at the A" section in ELP’s version, for example, is partly effected by “Promenade #3,” which is a clear return of “Promenade #1” in the same key (Bb) and with the same instrument (the Hammond organ) at least at the beginning. Though, as the parenthesized asterisk suggests in the example, ELP’s Promenade #3 might be an allusion to Musorgsky’s Promenade #5 because of the same key, form, and approximate location, Emerson actually repeats Promenade #1 strictly rather than playing Musorgsky’s Promenade #5, which is slightly different from his Promenade #1. Emerson also relates his “The Gnome” (track 2) to his three “Baba Yaga” tracks (tracks 8, 9, and 10), formally, motivically, and melodically. Formally, as Example 1.15a shows, “The Gnome” (both Musorgsky’s and ELP’s) is tripartite, and its three sections can be seen to correspond formally to the three “Baba Yaga” tracks, since these “Baba Yaga” tracks were originally not separate from each other; they were originally three inner sections of Musorgsky’s “The Hut of Baba Yaga.” Thus, the three sections of “The Gnome” and the three “Baba Yaga” tracks formally correspond to each other. Motivically, material from the second section of The Gnome, which I call the “Gnome motif,” unexpectedly returns during the second “Baba Yaga” track. This reinforces the corresponding relation between three sections of “The Gnome” and the three “Baba Yaga” tracks. Melodically, a long-range analogy can be found between them, especially up to the appearances of the “Gnome motif,” as shown in Example 1.15b.
Example 1.15: *Pictures at an Exhibition*: Relation between A and A”

a. Formal and Motivic Concordance between A and A”

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c}
& \text{1 Promenade #1} & \text{2 The Gnome} & \text{3:28 (m72)-} & \text{a'} & \text{1:03 (m38)-} & \text{b “Gnome motif”} \\
\hline
1 & 0:00 (m1)- & a & & & & \\
2 & 1:03 (m38)- & b “Gnome motif” & & & & \\
3 & 3:28 (m72)- & a' & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

b. Long-Range Melodic Analogy between A and A” up to “Gnome motif”

Emerson seems to have picked up the motion Gb-Eb-Bb-Eb from the beginning of the Gnome to the Gnome-motif, and, another motion, G-E-B-E, a half-step higher than the previous one, from the 1st “Baba Yaga” track to the reappearance of the Gnome motif.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{57} The notes picked up for the motions Gb-Eb-Bb-Eb and G-E-B-E are either emphasized melodic pitches or tonal centers: Gb is the emphasized pitch and G is the tonal center of respective portions; Eb and E are both tonal centers; and Bb and B are both emphasized notes at the end of respective portion. These four-note motions, both featuring a descending fourth in the middle, may have something to do with a general stylistic feature of Russian folk tunes, a feature which often plays important roles in pieces by Russian composers such as
The grouping of A and A' sections as an exposition is also carefully done. These are connected by a paired contrast between “The Gnome” and “The Sage.” Indeed the contrast in texture between “The Gnome,” an electrified section, and “The Sage,” an acoustic song written and inserted by bassist-singer Greg Lake, is quite conspicuous because it is the kind of acoustic-electric contrast that Macan describes as one of the genre-defining features of progressive rock.

Tracks 5 and 6 are grouped together, partly because both of these tracks are mostly improvisation, and partly because Musorgsky’s “The Old Castle” is virtually split into these two tracks of ELP’s reworking. As Kevin Holm-Hudson points out, two themes of Musorgsky’s “The Old Castle” (mm. 8-15 and 29-37) find their way into “Blues Variation.” They also find their way into ELP’s “The Old Castle” and that is why this track

Tchaikovsky, Musorgsky, and many others. Note also that Emerson generally favors fourth progression throughout his career. Thus he may be very sensitive to intervals of fourth. For Russian folk tunes, see Calvocoressi. Survey of Russian Music. On Emerson’s words about fourth, see Sasagawa, Keith Emerson Interviews, passim.

58 For more on the relations among the “promenades” of this piece, see a brief discussion in Chapter 2.

59 Macan, Rockin’ the Classics, 43.

60 Holm-Hudson, “Tell Mussorgsky the News.” As Holm-Hudson indicates, Moore overlooked this relation between Musorgsky’s “The Old Castle” and ELP’s “Blues Variation” in his Rock: The Primary Text, 2001, 91. I have to admit that my previous work on this piece, Kawamoto, “Beyond Cover,” also overlooked this connection. “The Old Castle” finds its way in “The Sage” in their studio-reworking of “Pictures at an Exhibition” released in 1994 in their album In the Hot Seat. This raises another question concerning whether “The Sage” was originally born out of their reworking of “The Old Castle” or not. If that is the case, then we would have to group “The Sage,” “The Old Castle,” and “Blues Variations” all together for this reason.
is still entitled “The Old Castle,” even though the connection is vague. As Examples 1.16a and b suggest, the key of Musorgsky’s music, g#, is surely retained in this ELP track, with an emphasis on the tonic and the dominant notes. But there is yet another reason why tracks 5 and 6 are to be grouped together; these two tracks are semantically both highly allusive. A comparison between Examples 1.16b and c suggests that ELP’s “The Old Castle” is virtually identical to their “Tank,” which was released in the band’s debut album in 1970. Perhaps when ELP started rehearsing “The Old Castle” in the studio, they enjoyed varying the Musorgsky movement over and over, and ended up playing something very different. This is quite evident especially because Carl Palmer’s characteristic drumming and Greg Lake’s bass playing are together almost identical to that of ELP’s “Tank” (1970, in Emerson, Lake and Palmer).61 Also, within “Blues Variation,” themes from Musorgsky’s “The Old Castle” interplay with themes from Bill Evans’s “Interplay” (1962, in Interplay). Thus these tracks are allusive enough to be grouped together.

Emerson allowed singer Greg Lake to contribute significantly to this largest-level

---

61 It is not known which was composed first, “Tank” or their version of “The Old Castle,” thus one cannot tell whether the band incorporated “Tank” into “The Old Castle” or, conversely, “The Old Castle” into “Tank.” “Tank” was certainly released earlier on ELP’s debut album, Emerson, Lake and Palmer, in November 1970, while “Pictures at an Exhibition” was released on their third album, Pictures at an Exhibition, in late 1971. However, ELP were playing the music of “Tank” in “The Old Castle” even before their first album was released. Evidence is found in their performance of this piece in August 29 at the Isle of Wight Festival, which was recently released. But since March 1970 they had been rehearsing for their first album, so it is also probable that they already had this material even before August. This is thus an interesting example of an intertextuality that is understood


```
\[ \text{Andante molto cantabile e con dolore} \]
```

b. ELP, “The Old Castle” 1:03- (Bass and Drums only)

```
\[ \text{Bass and Drums only} \]
```

c. ELP, “Tank” 4:12- (Bass and Drums only)

```
\[ \text{Bass and Drums only} \]
```

“The Old Castle” from “Pictures at an Exhibition.” Music by Modest Musorgsky. ©1992 Henle Verlag, München, used by permission.


quite differently according to the audience’s prior knowledge of ELP’s pieces.
structure, and Lake does so in a vivid way with the lyrics he provided to the three songs, “Promenade #2,” “The Sage,” and “The Great Gates of Kiev.” The lyrics are shown in Example 1.17. Comparing the bracketed concluding lines of these songs, one may find a long-range “problem-solving” relation between the first two songs on the one hand and the last song on the other. “Promenade #2” sings the protagonist’s adolescent regret at life’s limit. “The Sage,” the next song, suggests some sort of sensual pleasure and escape from reality. To these two songs that raise “problems,” the last song declares a “solution” by affirming that “there’s no end to my life, no beginning to my death; death is life.” Note that, both of the first two “problem” songs are in the A’ section, and the “solution” song is in the coda section. By placing these songs in this way, Lake has been able to make a forceful textual link between the A’ section and Coda, thus carefully rescuing the A’ section from being eclipsed by the powerful A and B sections.

In addition to creating background intertextuality at the largest scale levels, Emerson creates several different layers for his models, so that background intertextuality occurs at

---


63 The lyrical format, “Question-Question-Answer,” may be derived from twelve-bar blues. Therefore, this textual relation may be felt particularly strongly by blues-oriented listeners. No matter whether this is derived from blues or not, it seems clear that Lake tried to make some connection among the texted movements. Lake indeed talks about the connection of songs in “Tarkus” in Forrester et al. *Emerson, Lake & Palmer*, 64. Also for the blues lyrical format, see Covach’s discussion in his “Form in Rock Music,” 66-67.
Example 1.17: *Pictures at an Exhibition*: Lyrics

3. Promenade #2

Lead me from tortured dreams,  
childhood themes of nights alone.  
Wipe away endless years,  
childhood tears as dry as stone.  
From seeds of confusion, illusions  
dark blossoms have grown.  
Even now in furrows of sorrow,  
the dance still is sung.  
My life's course is guided,  
deided by limits drawn  
on charts of my past ways,  
and pathways since I was born.

4. The Sage

I carry the dust of a journey  
that cannot be shaken away  
It lives deep within me  
for I breathed it every day  
You and I are yesterday's answers  
the earth of the past come to flesh  
Eroded by time's rivers  
to the shapes we now possess  
Come share of my breath and my substance  
and mingle our streams and our times  
In bright infinite moments  
our reasons are lost in our eyes

11. The Great Gates Of Kiev

Come forth, from love's spire  
Born in life's fire, Born in life's fire.  
Come forth, from love's spire  
In the burning, all are [of our] yearning, for life to be.  
And in pain there will [must] be gain, new Life!  
Stirring in, salty streams,  
And dark hidden seams, where the fossil sun gleams.  
They were, sent from [to] the gates  
Ride the tides of fate, Ride the tides of fate.  
They were, sent from [to] the gates,  
In the burning all are [of our] yearning, for life to be.  
There's no end to my life, No beginning to my death:  
Death is life.

those levels. As **Example 1.18** shows, the Emerson model can be found at the smaller-scale levels, creating a nested structure. First, the entire first half (tracks from 1 to 6, which are the whole Side A of the original LP release) can be viewed as A-A’-B-Coda, which can then be reinterpreted as “Exposition”-“Recapitulation”-Improvisation-Coda, the pattern 2 of the Emerson model. Indeed, “Blues Variations” can be viewed as an extended “Blues Coda,” one of their clichés, found also on their *Trilogy* album.  

**Example 1.18: “Pictures at an Exhibition”: Nested Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Side A)</th>
<th>(Side B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Gnome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promenade #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Sage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Old Castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Blues Variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Side B)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Hut Of Baba Yaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Curse Of Baba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Hut Of Baba Yaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

64 For a thorough analysis of *Trilogy*, see Kevin Holm-Hudson, “A Promise Deferred.”
A-A'-B-A" because the coda is hardly related to an A section, still A-A-B-coda is also a varied form of AABA and thus can work as a “rock” intertext. Second, on Side B, tracks from the first “Baba Yaga” to “Kiev” can be seen as A-A'-B-A"-coda, if we label the first half of “The Curse of Baba Yaga” A', and the second half of it B because the second half is an improvisation. This can be reinterpreted as “Exposition” – Improvisation - “Recapitulation” - Coda, pattern 1 of the Emerson model. This means the largest-scale structure of the piece discussed above is repeated in the second half of the opus in a smaller-scale level. Third, “The Great Gates of Kiev” contains yet another occurrence of the model within itself, as discussed earlier in relation to Example 1.12a above. This track, which serves as the Coda of the largest level, again repeats the entire structure of the piece within itself, in an even shorter form, further replicating the structural model.

ELP released a studio version of “Pictures at an Exhibition” in their 1993 album The Return of the Manticore. The style changes of each member over the course of the years between 1971 and 1994 are strongly reflected on this recording, but a quick look at the formal structure, shown in Example 1.19, reveals that the Emerson model can still be found at a background level, though not as multi-layered as in the 1971 version.

The number of movements is clearly smaller, and the overall length is now 15:29, less than half of the 1971 version (which was 33:22), and piece contains no improvisational section at all. Thus the background model here is not strictly an Emerson model, but still

---

65 The version in the Isle of Wight Festival album was 34:56 long. The piece has a history of
Example 1.19: Pictures at an Exhibition, 1993 Studio Version (in *The Return of the Manticore*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Stems</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Exposition”?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Promenade #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Gnome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promenade #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Development”?</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>The Sage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Recapitulation”?</td>
<td>A'</td>
<td>The Hut of Baba Yaga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>A&quot;</td>
<td>The Great Gates of Kiev</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

there is a tendency to create some sort of a large AABA or a “sonata”-like form. Since

“Promenade #2” is now played in the original key of E-flat, and there is no connection from the E-flat ending of it to the a-minor beginning of “The Sage;” there is a strong gap of a tritone between “Promenade #2” and “The Sage.” And “The Sage” is now a kind of acoustic interlude, thus working like a contrasting middle section. This is followed by “The Hut of Baba Yaga,” which contains a riff similar to, but not identical with, the Gnome motif, and which thus can work as a “recapitulation.” The final movement, “The Great Gates of Kiev” is now clearly divided into four parts and the original improvisation is totally deleted, so an Emerson model is not as explicit as before. But one can still see a remnant of Emerson’s background model.\(^66\)

becoming shorter and shorter, and less and less improvisational.

\(^66\) One of the reasons that this dissertation does not touch on many ELP pieces after 1977 is that Emerson’s contribution to this group became less clear and Emerson himself almost admits it himself, partly because of their internal conflict, and partly because Emerson’s illness in his right arm in the 1990s. In fact, this 1994 version of “Pictures at an Exhibition”
It seems apparent that Emerson not only sticks to a background intertextuality but that he also often deliberately presents intertextuality at background levels. His structural model is indeed found everywhere at different levels, as just discussed. This suggests that Emerson perhaps has some image of hierarchic musical intertextuality; because of such an image, he cannot help creating background intertextuality when there are other levels of intertextuality. Simultaneous presentation of intertextuality seems to be Emerson’s almost deliberate effort and not by a mere coincidence. And in this way, he can be considered to distinguish himself – sometimes even self-consciously, perhaps – from other contemporary musicians. His style of intertextuality on the surface of the music certainly changes over the course of his career, but he keeps creating intertextuality on the background levels for decades.

**Background Intertextuality in Interpretation**

The preceding analyses show that background intertextuality is found in many of Emerson’s pieces, and this results in simultaneous presentation of foreground and background intertextuality. Intertextuality is often understood narratively as a dialogue. But here one sees at least two simultaneous occurrences of intertextuality at different levels. It follows from this that there are at least two simultaneous dialogues in a possible narrative of the piece. This should be clearly distinguished from two simultaneous voices that are credited to Musorgsky, Lake, and Palmer, without Emerson (!). Thus one possible reason for the lesser degree of contribution of the Emerson model in this version might simply be that Lake and Palmer mostly remade it almost without Emerson.
Bakhtin’s “double-voiced discourse.” If one dialogue is made up of two voices, then two dialogues must be made up of four or more voices. To understand the significance of this, it would be helpful to review the basics of musical narratology briefly.

A basic narrative analysis of music can be found in Gregory Karl’s analysis of Beethoven’s “Appassionata” sonata.67 Here he analyzes the piece in the manner of Russian Formalist Vladimir Propp, formulating some narrative “roles” of musical themes and narrative “functions” of their unfoldings.68 As roles, Karl supposes protagonist and antagonist and, as functions, refers to enclosure, disruption, subversion, counteraction, interruption, integration, divergence, withdrawal, realization, and transfiguration.69 By analyzing the 257-measure movement carefully, he diagrams a narrative of the piece mostly as an unfolding of a dialogue between protagonist and antagonist. But in this case, although the dialogue is conducted between two characters, it is ultimately what Bakhtin would call “monologism,” in which a protagonist’s hopes are crushed.70 The story analyzed is a tragedy of a single protagonist. Other roles, such as antagonist, are not the main character.

To the extent that the Beethoven piece under investigation has little to do with intertextuality, there is no problem in Karl’s methodology. Once intertextuality becomes

67 Karl, “Structuralism and Musical Plot.”

68 Propp, Morphology of the Folktale.

69 Karl, “Structuralism and Musical Plot,” 19-20. He also considers what he names “goal state” as an additional role.

prominent, however, such a monologic analysis of musical narrativity becomes particularly suspect. For, as Robert Hatten articulates, there occurs what he calls “shifts in discourse levels” in intertextual music. This occurs especially when there are certain kinds of musical contrasts. Of course, as he says, “sudden contrasts in Beethoven’s music are not in themselves unusual,” but if one finds “extreme contrasts that occur past the point where they can be explained as thematic contrast,” such contrasts can be explained as a shift in level of discourse. A shift in level of discourse “may take one out of prevailing discourse and provide for a critical perspective on the preceding music”; it also “reveals a deeper persona that in turn places all of the previous musical discourse in a new perspective.” And as one example of “extreme contrasts,” Hatten cites the famous Turkish march from the Finale of the Ninth Symphony, a famous intertextual passage in Beethoven’s music. If intertextuality occurs, therefore, the prevailing discourse such as the one Karl elucidates would be viewed more critically and understood more ironically. This is the point where Bakhtin comes in; his idea of dialogism is concerned with discourse at this raised level. What he calls “dialogue” is a dialogue between Beethoven and Turkish March, for example, and not between protagonist and antagonist as inferred from the musical themes and their developments. In intertextual music, that higher level of discourse becomes prominent.

74 In the case of the Beethoven piece, some might certainly want to narratively interpret the first theme of the first movement as Beethoven and its second theme as Turkish March.
Emerson’s simultaneous presentation of intertextuality at different levels may be viewed as being even more “double.” If one occurrence of intertextuality elicits a shift of discourse levels, then two or three simultaneous occurrences of intertextuality at different levels of music should elicit a double or triple shift of discourse levels. If a shift in discourse levels creates an irony, then a double or triple shift in discourse levels should create a double or triple irony. What Emerson presents is not just one “double-voiced discourse” but a multitude of them.

Then, if a “double-voiced discourse” is further doubled or tripled and an irony is accordingly doubled or tripled, how much can an irony keep its edge? Perhaps not very well. A conceivable result would be a significant weakening of original ironies, and rather a kaleidoscopic presentation of various kinds of irony. And so the focus of attention is shifted away from a single dialogue towards various combinations of those dialogues. Indeed, Emerson tends to create foreground and background intertextuality at the same time. If a dialogue between “rock” and “classical” agents or personae is presented in a background, and if another such dialogue is presented in a foreground, then there are at least two simultaneous dialogues in the narrative scene.

One should be reminded of Emerson’s own earliest memory of music that he could

---

Especially the second theme has been very often discussed in terms of the finale Turkish March by many writers because of the similarity in materials. But such a procedure of incorporating an external style into the second theme of the first movement is exceptional in many other Beethoven pieces.
trace back: that “sound of get-together” by his father and fellows. Although the details of that sound is not known, it is not difficult to imagine a highly intertextual situation in the music played there. One performer starts playing, with some “double-voiced” kind of ironical or comical effect, joined by another player who adds another, “double-voiced,” ironical edge to the performance and yet another who further ironizes the music in a “double-voiced” manner, and so on. Because of these multiple layers, and because of the “get-together” nature, none of the ironies may retain the edge for long. Emerson used to sleep to such a sound when he was a little child, and he still remembers that experience well. One might rightly speculate that simultaneous presentation of intertextuality at different levels may be a result from Emerson’s obsessive image of music as “sound of get-together.”

As long as a simultaneous presentation of intertextuality constitutes an important part of Emerson’s music and characterizes his unique intertextual style, it is important to explore background intertextuality, foreground intertextuality, and interlevel intertextuality, and their mutual relations in intertextual pieces, in order to dig deeper the essence of his music. Such a further exploration would surely reveal a number of important aspects in intertextual music. As emphasized in the Introduction, not every intertextuality is of the same kind. And distinctions among intertextuality at different structural levels would surely help obtain a more sophisticated understanding of much progressive rock music as well as intertextual

---

75 Review Introduction, n72.

76 Again, “sound of get-together” may also intersect Jamesonian “pastiche,” though it needs to be discussed from a broader viewpoint in the future.
practices in other areas. An even more detailed and systematic study of intertextual music according to structural levels is in order separately. Some musicians, such as Keith Emerson, indeed can be better understood only when such a perspective is employed.
 CHAPTER 2

DIALECTIC INTERTEXTUALITY:
BORROWING AND JUXTAPOSITION IN “INTERMEZZO FROM THE KARELIA SUITE” (1968)

To fully understand the style of a musician, it is often necessary to trace his or her stylistic development in an attempt to discover the logic of that development. And in order to do this in the case of Keith Emerson’s musical intertextuality, it is crucial to recognize a characteristic that will here be called “dialectic intertextuality,” which is his earliest distinct style of intertextuality, and which would become a basis of his subsequent stylistic development. “Dialectic intertextuality” in Emerson’s music occurs at the middleground level and is typically made of a “classical” section as “thesis,” a “rock” section as “antithesis” and a “classical+rock” section as “synthesis.” Two often-cited Hegelian dialectic principles are at work here.¹ First, a process from the contradiction of

¹ Hegel’s basic thought about the dialectic is well known, but a brief note about the difference between his dialectic and Socratic dialectic may be helpful for the purposes of a later discussion. Dialectic as Socrates’s method of finding a truth requires only a series of questioning and answering, but Hegel’s dialectic requires a high-level sublation of contradictory theses. In Hegel’s dialectic process, a synthesis itself then becomes a thesis of an even higher-level dialectic process, thus creating a chain of dialectic until a perfect knowledge is obtained.
thesis and antithesis to a sublation of them as synthesis is expressed in Emerson’s dialectic intertextuality as a process from a contrast between “rock” and “classical” sections to a coordination of them. Second, the Hegelian principle of a higher-level sublation is expressed in Emerson’s dialectic intertextuality as a coordination that occurs at a raised dynamic level with thicker texture. In short, there is a process that moves from a contrast to a high-level coordination of “rock” and “classical” materials. The Hegelian dialectic itself has long been discussed in relation to sonata form beginning with A. B. Marx in the mid-nineteenth century; the first two themes of the exposition have been likened to thesis and antithesis and the recapitulation to synthesis because of the adjustment of the second-theme key to the home-key tonic. Emerson did the same, though not with first and second themes but rather with “classical” and “rock” materials. Because of the complex nature of the dialectic itself and its specific use in Emerson’s music, dialectic intertextuality offers a number of diverse possibilities for narrative interpretation that would, as a whole, figure into his later stylistic development but that would be missed if one clings to the “dialogic” model.

To suggest dialectic intertextuality as Emerson’s earliest style of intertextuality that would form the basis for the following stylistic development, this chapter will first explore Emerson’s earliest intertextual experiments as a preparation for the formation of a dialectic

---

2 On A. B. Marx’s views towards sonata forms, see Marx, “From The Theory of Musical Composition”; Bent, Music Analysis in the Nineteenth Century, 213-217; and Analysis, 28-30. The influence of Hegelian thoughts and/or dialectic ideas on musicological writings on sonata form is discussed in Biddle, “Hegel” and Webster, “Sonata Form.”
intertextuality in his music making. The next section will then analyze a typical instance of dialectic intertextuality in his “Intermezzo from the Karelia Suite” (1968). In the final section, some possibilities for narrative interpretation of dialectic intertextuality will be explored.

**Dialectic Intertextuality in Context**

Though dialectic intertextuality in Emerson’s music started to take shape sometime around 1967-68, certain elements of it had already appeared separately in many earlier pieces. As mentioned above, the essence of dialectic intertextuality is a process from a contrast between “rock” and “classical” materials to a coordination between them. Therefore, one element of this dialectic is a sense of musical contrast, while another is a sense of coordination. And as Example 2.1 shows, one can further distinguish between two kinds of contrast and two kinds of coordination according to musical dimension: horizontal contrast (diachronic contrast between different sections); vertical contrast (synchronic contrast between different simultaneous voices); horizontal coordination (diachronic coordination between different sections); and vertical coordination (synchronic coordination between different simultaneous voices).

For example, the earliest recording of his piano performance, entitled “Medley,” which was recorded at the age of fourteen and released for the first time in *Emerson Plays*
Example 2.1: Contrast and Coordination in Musical Intertextuality

a. Horizontal Contrast
material A ←→ material B

b. Vertical Contrast
material A

material B

c. Horizontal Coordination
material A ↔ material B

d. Vertical Coordination
material A

material B

Example 2.2: Emerson, “Medley” (c1958, in Emerson Plays Emerson)

0:00- 0:38- 1:20- 2:08
“Nicola” ↔ “Silver Shoes” ↔ “I’ll See You In My Dreams”
(Steve Race) (Winifred Atwell) (Jones / Kahn)

G Eb G

“Horizontal contrast”

*Emerson* (2003), already projects a horizontal contrast. As Example 2.2 shows, this piece juxtaposes three different pieces consecutively through a remote key, bVI, and very different tempo and rhythm, making for a sharp horizontal contrast.³

³ This piece sounds slightly lower than G-Eb-G but that is perhaps because of the tendency of old recordings to play slower, so here I posit that the key of the piece is G-Eb-G. Also,
An early example of a vertical contrast arose when Emerson played jazz during his high school days, according to Emerson himself. As shown in Example 2.3, Emerson remembers that he used to play “modernist style” with his right hand and “traditionalist style” with his left.\(^4\)

**Example 2.3: Emerson, Early Jazz Performance: Vertical Contrast**

Emerson further exploited the possibilities of these devices with Gary Farr and the T-Bones,\(^5\) The V.I.P.’s, P. P. Arnold, and The Nice. In The Nice’s “Rondo” (1967, in one might argue that the key contrast by way of bVI alone can no longer be strongly contrasting on the ground that it has often been used in the middle section of the ABA form since the Romantic era, and I agree that the key *alone* cannot make the intertextual contrast in question but I also argue that it can still help the middle section sound contrasting. One should be reminded that in the context of such country-piano repertoire in the 1950s, bVI remains a remote key, and this sense of remoteness can work together with other elements mentioned in the text to create a sharp horizontal contrast.

\(^4\) See Sasagawa, *Keith Emerson Interviews*, 32; and Emerson, *Pictures of an Exhibitionist*, 28. Though Emerson does not specify actual pieces for these styles and therefore it is not possible to give definitions to these styles, the fact that he remembers such a vertical contrast itself is important because it is to be understood as one of his compositional devices.

\(^5\) This British group, Gary Farr and the T-Bones, is not to be confused with the American group that had a top-10 hit in 1965 with “No Matter What Shape.”
The Thoughts Of Emerlist Davjack), which is partially diagramed in Example 2.4, a Bach quotation (4:38-), which works as “classical,” is contrasted horizontally with the framing “rock” sections by texture, and vertically with the bass by key conflict.

Example 2.4: The Nice, “Rondo” (1967, in The Thoughts Of Emerlist Davjack): Vertical and Horizontal Contrasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“rock”</th>
<th>“classical”</th>
<th>“rock”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organ:</td>
<td>ad. lib. on Am</td>
<td>Quotation from J.S. Bach, Toccata and Fugue in Dm (BWV. 565) mm.30-38 “classical”</td>
<td>Am/E to Gm/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitar:</td>
<td>ad. lib on Am (rest)</td>
<td>ad. lib on Am</td>
<td>“rock”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass:</td>
<td>~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ repetition of a three-note riff (A-E-E) ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~</td>
<td>8 beat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drum:</td>
<td>8 beat (rest)</td>
<td>8 beat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the same period, Emerson also cultivated coordination of “classical” and “rock” materials. In The Nice’s “Tantalising Maggie” (1967, in The Thoughts Of Emerlist Davjack), which is shown in Example 2.5, the keyboards’ imitation of a typical “classical” symphonic ending style (3:56-) is coordinated horizontally with the framing “rock” sections through cadential motion, and vertically with the guitar through the use of the same harmonic pattern. This vertical coordination in particular is realized at a very loud dynamic level, with all the instruments playing at the same time to create a very dense texture, indicating a coordination at a higher level.
Example 2.5: The Nice, “Tantalising Maggie” (1967, in *The Thoughts Of Emerlist Davjack*): Vertical and Horizontal Coordinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano &amp; Organ: Main Motif</td>
<td>Viennese Classic symphonic ending style on harmonic pattern of I-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitar:</td>
<td>8-beat I-power chord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass:</td>
<td>8 beat on ^1 and then on ^5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drum:</td>
<td>16 beat on the snare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While in early years these elements of dialectic intertextuality tended to appear only at local points, Emerson also experimented with employing these intertextual elements in larger-scale levels. In “The Thoughts of Emerlist Davjack” (1967, in *The Nice, The Thoughts Of Emerlist Davjack*), which is shown in Example 2.6, horizontal contrasts are made between longer sections by instrumentation, key changes, and Baroque/Bach allusions.⁶

---

⁶ “The Thoughts of Emerlist Davjack” is an example of those Emerson pieces in which the Emerson model does not explicitly appear, though if another verse followed the final chorus one would find a kind of implicit Emerson model with the interlude as an allusion to
Example 2.6: The Nice, “The thoughts of Emerlist Davjack” (1967, in *The Thoughts Of Emerlist Davjack*): Longer Horizontal Contrast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>timing</th>
<th>0:00-</th>
<th>0:26-</th>
<th>1:05-</th>
<th>1:26-</th>
<th>1:42-</th>
<th>2:49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>section</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Interlude</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>force</td>
<td>choir</td>
<td>vocal</td>
<td>vocal</td>
<td>organ</td>
<td>choir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>harpsichord</td>
<td>harpsichord</td>
<td>organ</td>
<td>harpsichord</td>
<td>harpsichord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organ</td>
<td>guitar</td>
<td>guitar</td>
<td>organ</td>
<td>organ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bass</td>
<td>drums (0:52-)</td>
<td>bass</td>
<td>drums (1:40-)</td>
<td>bass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drums</td>
<td></td>
<td>drums</td>
<td></td>
<td>drums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>gm</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style</td>
<td>rock</td>
<td>Baroque</td>
<td>rock</td>
<td>Bach allusion</td>
<td>rock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type</td>
<td>“rock”</td>
<td>“classical”</td>
<td>“rock”</td>
<td>“classical”</td>
<td>“rock”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this way, Emerson experimented with elements of dialectic intertextuality already in his early years, but separately; and it seems it was only when he reworked Sibelius’s “Intermezzo from the Karelia Suite” in 1968 (in The Nice, *Ars Longa Vita Brevis*) that Emerson first employed a full dialectic intertextuality, as discussed in next section.

---

an improvisation. But the Emerson model was still being formed during this period, as Emerson was generally working toward his own style.
Dialectic Intertextuality in “Intermezzo from the Karelia Suite” (1968)

Emerson arrived at dialectic intertextuality by creating a process that moved from an initial horizontal contrast between “classical” thesis and “rock” antithesis toward a vertical coordination that synthesizes these contrasts, as shown in Example 2.7.

Example 2.7: Emerson’s Dialectic Intertextuality

Horizontal Contrast ————> Vertical Coordination

“The earliest and most typical example of this more thoroughgoing form of dialectic intertextuality is found in The Nice’s reworking of Sibelius’s Intermezzo from his “Karelia” Suite; Emerson extracts this single—but probably most-famous—movement from the multi-movement suite and reworks it while employing dialectic intertextuality. As shown in Example 2.8, Sibelius’s piece has a prelude, a main section, and a postlude, but The Nice repeats the main section three times and treats these iterations as three
instrumental verses, seen enclosed with thick-line boxes in this example. It is important to note, however, that these three verses are not treated as simple repetitions; the first verse function as thesis of “classical” material, the second as antithesis of “rock” material, and the third synthesis of “classical” and “rock” materials, creating a clear instance of dialectic intertextuality:

**Example 2.8: Sibelius and The Nice, “Intermezzo from the Karelia Suite”**

**Sibelius (1893)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Prelude</th>
<th>Body Section</th>
<th>Postlude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsection</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>122</th>
<th>157</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**The Nice (1968, in *Ars Longa Vita Brevis*)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing:</th>
<th>0:00-</th>
<th>1:20-</th>
<th>1:29-</th>
<th>2:51-</th>
<th>4:13-</th>
<th>7:18</th>
<th>7:38</th>
<th>8:28</th>
<th>8:52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>Verse 1</td>
<td>Verse 2</td>
<td>Impro</td>
<td>Reintro</td>
<td>Verse 3</td>
<td>Postlude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melody:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a’</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a’</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialectic</td>
<td><strong>Thesis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Antithesis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Synthesis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thesis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Antithesis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Synthesis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thesis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Antithesis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Synthesis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A’</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A”</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A’</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A”</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson model</td>
<td>“Exposition”</td>
<td>Impro.</td>
<td>“Recapitulation”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this version, the piece’s main concern is no longer with the internal thematic contrast among a, b, and a’ sections within one verse, but rather with the contrast among the
three verses. As this example shows at the line marked “melody” in the example, the first verse of The Nice piece employs Sibelius’s melody, which is “classical,” whereas the second verse plays Emerson’s melody, which is “rock” (or, more precisely, “non-classical”) and the third verse returns to the “classical” Sibelius melody. And as the line marked “sound” suggests, the first verse of The Nice piece employs a moderate “classical” sound color to imitate a medium-size orchestra, the second verse employs a brighter “rock” sound to refer to electric “rock” sound, and the third verse employs a brighter “rock” sound color again. Thus, the third section interestingly mixes a “classical” melody and a “rock” sound, so that this section can work as a synthesis of “classical” and “rock” materials.

Not only is there a process from contrast to coordination, but one may also detect the musical expression of a high-level synthesis. As Example 2.9 shows in more detail, the first verse is derived from Sibelius’s chordal melody, whereas the second verse is basically a single-line melody, and Emerson employs the high notes and brighter sound in this second verse to compensate for the decrease in volume caused by the use of the single-line melody. At the third verse, even though there is no need for such a timbral compensation

7 The melody Emerson plays in the second verse of this piece tends to sound jazz, rather than rock; hence “non-classical” may be a more precise expression. But here I still mention it as “rock” partly because a clear distinction between jazz and rock solos is difficult to make and partly because this dissertation is concerned only with rock-classical intertextuality.

8 Technically speaking, this wide range/ brighter timbre may have been partly produced by drawing the “2nd harmonic drawbar” on the Hammond L100 or A105 to the level of 8 when Emerson played the verse 2 and 3 so that an overtone an octave higher is emphasized. For Emerson’s “stage rig” of this period, see Hanson 2002, p.101. For the Hammond’s drawbars, see Irwin 1939; and Vail 1997, pp. 42-43.
Example 2.9: The Nice, “Intermezzo from the Karelia Suite” (1968, in Ars Longa Vita Brevis)

Sibelius:
Body section a’, m. 92-

The Nice:
Verse 1-a’, 2:16-

Verse 2-a’, 3:38-

Verse 3-a’, 7:56-

in dynamics, since he returns to Sibelius’s chordal melody, Emerson nevertheless employs the high notes and brighter sound of the second verse in this third verse. The result is an increased dynamic level and a thicker texture compared to the preceding sections;
high-level resolution is expressed by the extraordinarily raised volume and thicker texture found in this third verse. Such higher-level coordination can be better understood if one imagines other possibilities for coordination. If coordination of the first two verses is the sole purpose of the third verse, then playing the single-line melody of the second verse with moderate sound of the first verse would also serve the purpose. Or playing Sibelius’s chordal melody with the sparing rhythmic accompaniment of the second verse would also serve the purpose. But Emerson does not choose either of these options, because both would remain at the same volume and density level as the first two verses. In this third verse, Emerson chooses to rise above the level of the first two verses in volume and texture. Thus the synthesis is not just a temporary agreement of thesis and antithesis, but a transcendence to a higher level than found in the first two verses.

As Example 2.8 above also suggests, such a dialectic intertextuality certainly occurs against a background intertextuality made by the Emerson model and reinforces the “classical” sonata-form aspect of the model. Indeed, a dialectic intertextuality tends to occur among the three A’s of an AABA form, therefore placing both thesis and antithesis

---

9 Because a physical increase in volume in one particular section of a piece is relatively rare in rock-music recordings, such a dynamic increase makes the section of the song under discussion here an especially marked case of a high-level resolution. In fact, the volume level is usually set at the highest level from the outset and remains constant from the beginning to the end in most of the rock recordings; further, all the tracks on an album normally keep the same volume level from piece to piece. “Tantalising Maggie” also begins at approximately the same volume as the other pieces on the album, but nevertheless the music rises above that volume level at the section under discussion, even risking becoming an uncomfortable noise. Even though the noise problem is somehow fixed in
within the exposition and synthesis at the recapitulation, quite in the same manner as the Marxian sonata-form dialectic does. And yet, within a dialectic intertextuality itself, the synthesis of “classical” and “rock” is maximally emphasized.

When Emerson performed this piece with an orchestra in 1970, he emphasized the dialectic intertextuality further. In the recording of this performance, the main melody is played by “classical” orchestra at verse 1, by the “rock” Hammond organ at verse 2, and by both “classical” orchestra and the “rock” Hammond organ at verse 3, thus maximizing the contrast between “classical” and “rock” section by totally different instrumentation and emphasizing the higher-level coordination by extraordinary volume.10

Other pieces from The Nice period also adopt dialectic intertextuality in different ways. For example, in their reworking of Tchaikovsky’s Pathetique symphony (the 1970 version with orchestra in Five Bridges, see Example 1.12b), the A section (0:00-) is mostly played by a “classical” orchestra with only sparing accompaniment of electric bass and drums, thus presenting “thesis.” The A’ section (3:21-), on the other hand, begins with the “rock” Hammond solo and continued to some short improvisation with orchestral

the digitally remastered version, the original noise is still perceptible and the particularly dense texture of this section remains unmistakable in the CD version.

10 On the other hand, the “rock-classical” dialectic was no longer clear in the performance of this piece in The Nice’s 2002 reunion concert or The Keith Emerson Band’s May 2004 live in New York that I witnessed. These performances may be interpreted partly as a result of Emerson’s stylistic revision in early ELP period and partly as a result of his most recent stylistic evolution. See the next chapter for his revision in early ELP period and the subsequent chapters for his subsequent development.
accompaniment, emphasizing the “antithetical” aspects. In the B’ section at its final subsection (7:05-), the “synthesis” is unmistakably presented through the performance of the Tchaikovsky music with both “classical” orchestra and the “rock” Hammond.

Another example of a dialectic intertextuality is The Nice’s “Five Bridges Suite” (1970, in Five Bridges). This piece shows a very complicated intertextuality with so many important aspects, but one of them is surely the dialectic structure that is found in the first three “Bridges”; the “First Bridge” is played by orchestra (“thesis”), the “Second Bridge” by the band (“antithesis”), and the “Third Bridge” by both orchestra and the band (“synthesis”).

Dialectic intertextuality continued to be in use even in very early ELP pieces such as “The Barbarian” (1970, Emerson, Lake and Palmer) and “Pictures at an Exhibition” (1971, Pictures at an Exhibition). In “The Barbarian” (see Example 1.12a), the A section is played by the Hammond (“thesis”), the B section by piano (“antithesis”), and the A’ section by both Hammond and piano (“synthesis”). In “Pictures at an Exhibition” (see Example 1.13), “Promenade” appears three times, once with the “classical” church-organ sound (“thesis”), second time with Lake’s “rock”-style vocal (“antithesis”), and the third with the “classical” organ and the “rock” band (“synthesis”).

Though dialectic intertextuality disappears after ELP’s first album (as the next chapter will show), Emerson returned to dialectic intertextuality later in different ways.
One example of such a return is “Karn Evil 9” (1973, in *Brain Salad Surgery*), as Chapter 4 will show, while a further example is “I Believe In Father Christmas” (1977, in *Works, vol. 2*). In this latter piece, Prokofiev’s melody from the Lieutenant Kije Suite appears three times, the first time literally with “classical”-orchestra sound on synthesizer (0:53-), the second time with “rock” acoustic guitar (1:46-), and the third time with both “classical” synthesizer and “rock” guitar (guitar at 2:40-; piano at 2:59-), though this synthesis at the end is not made by a vertical coordination but rather by a horizontal coordination.\(^{11}\) These

\(^{11}\) There is an earlier version of this piece: the 1975 Greg Lake version (in *The Best of Emerson, Lake and Palmer*). This version is accompanied by an orchestra and features dialectic structure is clearly featured: the first occurrence of the Prokofiev melody (0:54-) is played by the “classical” sound of synthesizer; the second (1:47-) with “rock” sound of guitar; and the third (2:41-) with “classical” orchestra and “rock” drums. There is also a later version of this piece: the 1993 reunion version (in *The Return of the Manticore*). This version rather reflects Emerson’s style change between the 1970s and the 1990s; all the three occurrences of the Prokofiev melody (0:54-; 1:48-; and 2:42-) are presented in almost exactly the same manner with the Hammond organ with the guitar playing only chordal accompaniment. This comparison among different versions of the same piece suggests that the dialectic intertextuality retrospectively returned around the mid-1970s but did not return when Emerson reunited with ELP in the 1990s. It is true that this piece is Greg Lake’s and not Emerson’s, but this change clearly reflects Emerson’s changing ways of relating to Lake’s songs. Indeed, a look at yet another reworking of the Prokofiev piece, entitled “Troika” (in *I Believe In Father Christmas*) done almost exclusively by Emerson himself in 1995, suggests that Emerson was not into the dialectic intertextuality in the 1990s; the dialectic intertextuality is here obscured at best. The Prokofiev melody in this piece occurs ten times and the first two (0:00- and 0:41-) and the next two occurrences (1:10- and 1:51-) may certainly suggest “classical” and “rock” contrast because the first two are played by “classical” synthesizer while the next two are also played by the synthesizer but now accompanied by “rock” bass and drums. But this synth-bass-drums instrumentation is recontextualized and reinterpreted as “classical” at the fifth through ninth occurrences of the melody; the fifth through seventh occurrences of the Prokofiev melody (2:38-; 2:52-; and 3:06-) are played by the same synth-bass-drums instrumentation with another synthesizer improvising on it, while the eighth and ninth occurrences of the melody (3:20- and 3:33-) are played by an even more “rock” instrument such as electric guitar accompanied by bass and drums, with yet another “rock” electric guitar improvising on the melody. Because of this recontextualization and reinterpretation of the same material.
retrospective returns to dialectic intertextuality support the idea that dialectic intertextuality was indeed one of Emerson’s favorite early styles of intertextuality. The use of a dialectic intertextuality thus characterizes this early period of Emerson’s stylistic development.¹²

**Dialectic Intertextuality in Interpretation**

Dialectic intertextuality can elicit a number of narrative interpretations according to which aspect of it the interpreter hears in particular. The different interpretations that can arise may at first seem mutually incompatible, but they actually are compatible with each other. In this section I will show three different possibilities for narrative interpretation of dialectic intertextuality, and then suggest an understanding of dialectic intertextuality as a complex of those different narrative interpretations.

First, interpretation is based on the internal construction of dialectic intertextuality (bass-and-drums instrumentation) at different points within the same piece, the dialectic structure, if any, is obscured. This reflects one of his later intertextual styles which I call subtle intertextuality in Chapter 4. See that chapter for a more detailed discussion on the term recontextualization.

¹² The idea that the dialectic is Emerson’s style and not the other Nice members’ would be reinforced if one looks at pieces by Refugee (Patrick Moraz, and the ex-The Nice members Lee Jackson and Brian Davison). In ‘Ritt Mickley’, for instance, the ‘classical’-‘non-classical’ contrasts made by harmonic allusion to Pachelbel or Baroque style at the choruses are never synthesized; the order of sections such as Verse-Chorus-Chorus-Verse rather emphasizes the symmetrical design. See the next chapter for a brief analysis of this piece.
itself, and understands the music as a “story” in which a “rock” and a “classical” \emph{personae} are first separated but later unified at a higher level than in the earlier separation. This interpretation is overtly modeled on A. B. Marx’s highly narrative description of the sonata form as can be found in the following:

\begin{quote}
Because they [=sonata forms] combine main and subsidiary themes into a more unified whole, especially in the third part [=recapitulation], where they bring them back … closely bound together by the main key, one recognizes in these forms another, higher, orientation: the \emph{separate} themes no longer matter in \emph{isolation}; rather, the intimate union of individual themes in a whole—the \emph{whole} in its inner \emph{unity}—becomes the main concern.  
\end{quote}

Marx’s emphasis on such words as “separate” and “unity” seems to suggest that he interprets sonata form as a narrative or a drama, in the sense that those emphasized words are well beyond the realm of objective description of physical sound. He clearly draws on a typical Hegelian dialectic for his narrative interpretation and virtually likens two themes to two \emph{dramatis personae}. First, Marx sees in the recapitulation a \emph{unity} of two \emph{personae} that were originally \emph{separated} in the exposition. The reverse is not the case in

\footnote{Marx, “From \textit{The Theory of Musical Composition},” 1223. Emphases original.}

\footnote{That Marx’s description is highly narrative can be understood if one notices that two given themes cannot be “separated” physically unless there is a silence between them and that no two themes can be seen as a physical “unity” unless a “separation” is defined physically. Such a narrative interpretation is partly derived from the fact that Marx was a self-proclaimed Hegelian and thus one of the uncompromising organicist musicologists of the mid-nineteenth century. But not only Marx, but also most of our music-analytical language is full of such narrative description, which led Fred Maus to argue that music has long been understood as a drama or a narrative. For Marx’s position in the history of music analysis, see Bent, \textit{Analysis}, 28-32; and \textit{Music Analysis in the Nineteenth Century}, 213-217. On Maus’s arguments, see his “Music as Drama.”}
Marx’s understanding; a separation is always the beginning of the story and a unity is always the conclusion of the story. Second, Marx sees such a concluding unity occurring at a higher level than the level of a separation; thus superficial conflicts between two personae no longer matter at the end of the story. A unity of two personae is achieved not because one overcomes the other but because such a conflict itself is resolved. In short, a strong emphasis is placed on the unity of two personae, not on their separation, in Marx’s interpretation. To the extent that Emerson’s dialectic intertextuality evidently features the Hegelian principles as Marx finds them in sonata form and that Emerson creates dialectic intertextuality not with two themes but with “classical” and “rock” sections, one can interpret Emersonian dialectic intertextuality as a “story” beginning with a separation of “classical” and “rock” personae and concluding with their union at a higher level where no more superficial conflict between them matters. Such an interpretation seems close to Emerson’s own interpretation of his early crossover experiments with dialectic intertextuality. Concerning his collaboration with a “classical” conductor Joseph Eger for The Nice’s Five Bridges, Emerson indeed writes:

[The Nice and Eger have been] combining together the music from our different backgrounds forming sometimes a fusion, and other times a healthy conflict between the orchestra, representing possibly the establishment, and the trio, representing the non-establishment ...

It is clear that Emerson here refers to elements of dialectic intertextuality such as a “conflict” (contrast) and a “fusion” (coordination) between “establishment” (“classical”)

---

15 Emerson, Liner notes to Five Bridges. Emphases added.
and “non-establishment” (“rock”). Though he does not refer to a process from separation or conflict to unity or fusion, he does seem to emphasize the collaborative aspects when he says that he and Eger were “combining together” “rock” and “classical” music, and not adapting one to the other; these musicians were attempting to present a higher-level unity of these musics where no more superficial contradiction matters. Emerson indeed tries to avoid any antagonistic impression that the word “conflict” may evoke, by adding an adjective “healthy” before “conflict” and suggesting a productive result of the conflict.

A second narrative interpretation is related particularly to the treatment of “classical” materials and finds in Emerson’s dialectic intertextuality a story in which a “rock” and a “classical” personae are represented by the “rock” version itself and the original “classical” piece itself respectively and in which the “rock” persona attempts to minimize the importance of the “classical” persona. This interpretation is based on an observation that the thematic contrast inherent in the borrowed “classical” material becomes less conspicuous when the “classical” material as a whole is intertextually contrasted with a “rock” material in the reworking. For example, the internal thematic contrast among a, b, and a′ of the main section of Sibelius’s “Karelia” no longer plays as significant roles in The Nice’s “Karelia” because the intertextual contrast among the “classical,” “rock,” and “classical+rock” sections far outweighs the internal thematic contrast of the original “classical” material. The a-b-a′ contrast that is the focus of the main section of the Sibelius piece (see Ex. 2.8 above) is reduced to only a minor contrast in The Nice’s reworking of it because now the main section features a larger contrast between verses on
the one hand and the improvisation (4:13-) on the other. In this way, the “rock” persona is seen to try to minimize the “classical” persona. Such an interpretation is indeed a basis of Paul Stump’s observation that in the progressive rock of the late 1960s “[a]nything that appeared to insult the tastes of the preceding generation ... was courted and welcomed.” If the “preceding generation” appeared to be insulted by The Nice’s music, that is perhaps because the current generation interpreted the music as insulting “the tastes of the preceding generation.” So the current generation interpreted the music as a story in which the classical persona is minimized by the rock persona. Thus this type of narrative interpretation, which is unlikely to be supported by Emerson himself, is likely to be supported by Stump’s current and preceding generations.

A third narrative interpretation of Emersonian dialectic intertextuality is related to the original context of “classical” materials and finds a story in which a “rock” and a “classical” personae are represented by the “rock” version itself and the original “classical” piece itself respectively, but in which a “rock” persona is rather trivialized. This results

16 Stump, Music’s All That Matters, 72-73.

17 “The preceding generation” in Stump’s description amounts to what is called “the implied reader” in literary theory. The implied reader is the opposite of the implied author, which was briefly discussed in Introduction. The implied reader is the reader whom the real reader imagines to be the intended reader as distinct from the real reader him/herself. In the case of Stump’s story, “the preceding generation” is nothing but a fictional invention by “the current generation,” and so the former is the implied reader while the latter the real reader. But despite the conceptual difference between the implied and real readers, the implied reader tends to overlap the real reader, because the implied reader is imagined by the real reader him/herself and therefore represents one aspect of the real reader him/herself. For a discussion on the asymmetry between implied author and implied reader, see Genette, Narrative Discourse Revisited.
from the fact that in many cases Emerson creates a dialectic intertextuality out of only short material extracted from a larger “classical” piece. In the case of The Nice’s “Karelia,” the material used is only one particular movement (“Intermezzo”) from Sibelius’s much larger suite (the Karelia Suite). Emerson’s reworking of the Sibelius piece is focused only on this small movement and does not engage the entire work. The “rock” version of this “classical” piece may then be interpreted simply as a bombastic renditon of only a small portion of a “classical” piece. One might imagine a story in which a “rock” persona works very hard on a certain thing that is only trivial for a “classical” persona—the kind of story which would be strongly supported by so-called Gesunkenes Kulturgut theory, which believes all the popular/folk tradition is nothing more than popularized version of the past elite culture. 18

In this way, one’s interpretation of Emerson’s dialectic intertextuality seems to vary significantly according to which aspect of it one hears particularly. Considering our ability to perceive very complex musical relations, however, I would suggest that the narrator of the story presents all these and other narrative possibilities together. In fact, these possible interpretations do not conflict with one another. At the level of the historical origin of dialectic intertextuality, it is narrated that “rock” is trivialized; at the level of internal treatment of “classical” materials, it is narrated that “rock” attempts to

---

18 The gesunkenes Kulturgut theory is the underlying theory for the German terms U-Musik or trivialmusik, as Philip Tag says in his “Popular Music Studies.” For some examples of relying on this idea for music studies, see Sorce-Keller, “Gesunkenes Kulturgut”; and Naumann, Grundzüge der deutschen Volkskunde.
minimize “classical”; and at the level of dialectic intertextuality itself, it is narrated that both “classical” and “rock” are unified. And if we continue the “get-together” analogy with which we started the previous chapter, we may conclude this chapter by interpreting The Nice’s “Karelia” as a “get-together” scene in which there is a constant background conversation between a “rock” and a “classical” *persona* while in a middleground there is a “rock” *persona* who works hard on a trivial thing but also tries to minimize a “classical” *persona*, finally arriving at a sublime unity with a “classical” *persona*. If any part of this “get-together” scene is felt “unreliable” (in the manner of Gulliver’s narration about the strife between countries over the egg, for instance), the listener may try to ascribe this “get-together” scene not to the narrator (or the music itself) but to the implied author (or composer) who is sane and deliberately presenting such an “unreliable” party for some different purposes.\(^{19}\) But such a doubt about the “reliability” of the narrative may rather reveal the listener’s narrow range of imagination. Music is not always narrated by a single voice or just by a double voice; in fact, Emerson seems to try out a multitude of double-voiced discourses at different levels, as well as at different point of a single level. In order to understand such a rich presentation of intertextuality, it is important to explore how different occurrences of intertextuality within a piece are combined with one another and to discover the inner logic of that combination as this chapter has attempted to do. The essence of intertextuality does not lie in the intertextuality itself, but rather in the inner logic of intertextual presentation. In fact, it is such a logic as dialectic that would become

\(^{19}\) See the Introduction for discussion of the “unreliable” story narrated by Gulliver.
the basis of Emerson’s stylistic development in the subsequent years, as the following chapters will demonstrate.
CHAPTER 3

REVISIONARY INTERTEXTUALITY:
INFLUENCE AND REVISION IN KNIFE EDGE (1970)

Keith Emerson’s style of intertextuality around the beginning of the ELP era (the early 1970s) can be characterized by the term “revisionary intertextuality.” By “revisionary intertextuality,” I mean an intertextuality that is recognized as virtually “revising” another intertextuality to lead to a newer intertextuality. To understand this concept, at least four of its important aspects should be noted here. First, since an intertextuality is often obtained through a revision of one piece in another, a revision of such an intertextuality can also be termed a revision of a revision, or a “second-generation revision,” as distinct from a “first-generation revision,” which is a revision of a specific piece.¹ Second, “revision” in this case is to be understood in the broadest sense and not in a limited sense. One can revise not only his/her own piece but also another composer’s piece, and revise into not only an explicitly revised version of the same piece but also into a

¹ This idea of “revision of revision” is partly inspired by Richard Taruskin’s important review of Bloomian studies of music by Korsyn and Straus; the review is entitled “Revising revision.”
totally different piece. Similarly, one can also revise one’s own or another’s intertextuality into its revised version or a different intertextuality. Third, a revisionary intertextuality can be a distinct style in itself when it revises an earlier style as a whole; a revisionary intertextuality may not be a distinct style, conversely, when it revises only some aspects of an earlier style. That is, if an earlier style of intertextuality – such as dialectic intertextuality – as a whole is revised significantly, then the revisionary intertextuality itself may be viewed as a style distinct from the earlier one; if some aspects of an earlier style are revised without affecting the style itself, then the revisionary intertextuality may not be seen as a distinct style but as a variant of the earlier style. Fourth, as long as a revisionary intertextuality is a revision of something for the purposes of a newer style, its meaning is dependent partly on the earlier intertextuality and partly on a later

---

2 For example, Bruckner’s First Symphony was first composed in 1855/56 but later revised by the composer himself in 1890/91 into a revised version of the same piece. On the other hand, Haydn’s Piano Sonata in C, Hob. XVI: 22/iii might have been “revised” by Mozart later into his Piano Sonata in C, K. 279/iii, as long as there is a line of influence, as John Irving says in his “Haydn’s Influence on Mozart’s Sonatas,” 137-140. For the issue of the influence of Haydn on Mozart, see also Bonds, “The Sincerest Form of Flattery?” and Brown, “Haydn and Mozart’s 1773 Stay in Vienna,” among numerous others.

3 For example, Walter (Wendy) Carlos’s Switched On Bach album, which features an intertextuality created by the use of twentieth-century synthesizers and Baroque music, can be seen to be revised in her own later work such as The Well-Tempered Synthesizer, or Isao Tomita’s similar but different attempts in Snowflakes are Dancing, or even Glenn Gould’s very different recordings in the 1970s. Both Gould and Tomita can be seen to be influenced by Carlos. For Gould, see the liner notes to Wendy Carlos, Switched-On Boxed Set, Book Two: Original Notes, 11. For Tomita, see his autobiography Tomita Sound Cloud, 86-91.

4 For this reason, it is always important to define at which level one discusses style change. On a broader topic of “musical change” in general, see Blacking, “The Study of Musical Change.” Also on the importance of levels of discussion in style theories, see Meyer, Style and Music, 3-37; and Covach, “Stylistic Competencies” and “The Rutles.”
intertextuality; in short, it can be best characterized as a transitory style that bridges an earlier style to a later one.\(^5\)

While some procedures for a first-generation revision have been formulated by a few scholars, most notably Leonard B. Meyer and Joseph Straus, methods for a second-generation revision have not been formulated thus far.\(^6\) Meyer formulates such terms as “permutation” (reordering of components), “combination” (novel joining of components from different entities) “displacement” (change in the placement of a pattern), “retrenchment” (simplification through elimination of components), “transcription” (re-creation of the sound of one medium by another), “mimicry” (simulation of non-musical sound), and so on. Joseph Straus also formulates such terms as “motivicization” (intensification of motivic content), “generalization” (transformation of motive into its unordered pitch-class set), “marginalization” (relagation of central elements to the periphery), “compression” (synchronous presentation of diachronic elements),

\(^5\) In this connection, it is important to understand that a revision always carries two aspects: “revision as novelty” and “revision for novelty.” The former apparently assumes that revision is already novelty whereas the latter assumes quite conversely that revision is not novelty in itself because it is made for the sake of novelty. These aspects, which at first seem to be incompatible with each other, do not actually contradict one another; they only refer to different aspects of the same thing. When one work is compared with its revised version, the revision may seem novel in itself; when the revision is in turn compared with its impact on a later work, the revision may not seem novel in itself but look like a means to an end. A revisionary intertextuality, therefore, is novel on the one hand when it is compared with an earlier intertextuality, but on the other hand a revisionary intertextuality is not novel when it is compared with a later intertextuality. This is why a revisionary intertextuality can be considered a transitory style that leads an earlier intertextuality to a later one.

“fragmentation” (separation of elements), and so on. But the need for a different terminology is evident when one thinks of the applicability of these terms to a second-generation revision. For example, Meyer can identify a certain revisionary method as “displacement” and another method as “transcription,” but if the former is revised into the latter, he offers no term to describe the revision. Similarly, Straus may be able to identify a certain revisionary method as “motivicization” and another method as “compression,” but if the former is revised into the latter, he does not have a term to identify the revision. To identify some methods for a second-generation revision, a more general, inclusive theory is necessary. And it is for this reason, and because of the lack of a more refined terminology, that it seems useful to apply literary scholar Harold Bloom’s poetic theory of “anxiety of influence” and to use his well-known “six revisionary ratios.”

While Bloom’s theory was originally devised for a first-generation revision, but because of the generality and inclusiveness of the theory, it is useful in theorizing second-generation revision. Bloom sees the development of poetic history as analogous to

---

7 The attempts of Korsyn and Straus in particular to use Bloom’s theory for the study of music have given rise to numerous criticisms. One type of criticism is against any application of literary theory to music. Another type of criticism is against the narrowness of Bloom’s theory. Yet another type of criticism is against a kind of abuse of the theory just to make one’s study look up-to-date. While I am completely sympathetic to this last type of criticism, I do not agree with the first two kinds of criticism, since Bloom’s usefulness lies precisely in its focused approach and Bloom never claimed his theory to be comprehensive. Unfortunately, there is much criticism that can be categorized in the second group. For example, see Irving “Haydn’s influence on Mozart’s sonatas”; Brown “Haydn and Mozart’s 1773 stay in Vienna”; Yudkin “Beethoven’s ‘Mozart’ Quartet”; Murphy “Jazz improvisation”; and Whitesell “Men with a Past.” See also my “Can You Keep Your Balance?,” 223-227, for a more detailed theoretical discussion on Bloom and music studies.
Sigmund Freud’s idea of “family romance,” and sees a young poet revising a poem of his precursor poet to defend himself psychically from “anxiety of influence.”

Bloom formulates the “six revisionary ratios” as important revisionary methods a young poet may employ to revise a precursor poem. These ratios are related to rhetorical tropes and psychic defenses, as shown in Example 3.1.

As long as Emerson’s intertextual style keeps developing, all kinds of intertextuality found in his music may certainly be understood as instances of revisionary intertextuality and thus explained through Bloomian revisionary ratios. However, Emerson’s style of intertextuality around the beginning of the ELP era can be particularly characterized as

---

8 See Bloom, Anxiety of Influence, 7-11; Map of Misreading, 86; Freud Inhibitions, Symptoms, & Anxiety; and Freud, A. Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense. One might argue against Bloom’s Freudian aspects by quoting Bloom saying, in the preface to the 1997 edition of The Anxiety of Influence, “I never meant by ‘the anxiety of influence’ a Freudian Oedipal rivalry, despite a rhetorical flourish or two in this book.” See Bloom, Anxiety of Influence, 2nd ed., xxii. But it is nothing other than the centrality of Freudian ideas in Bloom’s original theory that has had a great impact upon literary and music scholarship. Therefore this dissertation deals only with his theory before the 1997 revision. For a discussion on Bloom’s revision of his own ideas in 1997, see Desmet and Sawyer, Harold Bloom’s Shakespeare, 10-12.

9 Bloom connects the names of the ratios from ancient Greek myths. See his Anxiety of Influence, 11 and 14-6. He relates the ratios to rhetorical tropes in response to Paul de Man’s ideas. See De Man, “Review of Bloom”; Bloom, Map of Misreading; and also Barzilai, “Review of Paul de Man’s ‘Review of Harold Bloom’. ” Psychic defense mechanisms themselves were theorized rather by Anna Freud and later scholars than by her father, Sigmund Freud, and Bloom relies on later formulations, as his use of the terms such as ‘turning-against-the-self’ or ‘defense’ (in place of Sigmund’s terms such as ‘repression’, or, ‘protection’ or ‘self-preservation’) suggests. See Bloom, Anxiety of Influence, 8; Map of Misreading, 86 and 92; and Freud, A. Ego and Defense Mechanisms.
Example 3.1: “Six Revisionary Ratios” in Bloom’s Theory of Poetic Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisionary Ratios</th>
<th>Rhetorical Trope</th>
<th>Psychic Defense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinamen</td>
<td>Irony</td>
<td>Reaction-Formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tessera</td>
<td>Synecdoche</td>
<td>Reversal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosis</td>
<td>Metonymy</td>
<td>Undoing, Isolation, Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daemonization</td>
<td>Hyperbole, Litotes</td>
<td>Repression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askesis</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Sublimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apophrades (return of the dead)</td>
<td>Metalepsis</td>
<td>Introjection, Projection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

revisionary intertextuality, because the revisionary methods employed in this period are used to revise the dialectic intertextuality that characterizes Emerson’s most important intertextual style in the preceding period, as discussed in Chapter 2. Revisionary intertextuality found in the early ELP period can thus be seen to form a distinct style in and by itself. As will be discussed in greater detail below, there was the need for Emerson to change his style in the early ELP period, and Emerson even seems to have been anxious over being influenced by his own past style, which may have indeed driven him to change his style. And his style of intertextuality around this period can be seen to bridge his older style such as dialectic intertextuality to a newer intertextual style such as a “subtle intertextuality” which will be discussed in the next chapter.

In order to propose a revisionary intertextuality as a distinct intertextual style of Emerson’s music at the beginning of the ELP era, this chapter first explores some revisions
made already during The Nice period and argues that most of these early revisions are made to create dialectic intertextuality. The next section then discusses revisionary intertextuality in ELP’s “Knife Edge” as a distinct style because it revises dialectic intertextuality. This chapter concludes with a possible narrative interpretation of revisionary intertextuality to suggest the importance of realizing such an intertextuality as a distinct style of intertextuality which would not be well elucidated by the dialogic model.

**Revisionary Intertextuality in Context**

A revision of an earlier intertextuality had been made a number of times already in The Nice period, but the purpose of revision is presumably to provide for variety within a style rather than to produce style change, since the revisions in The Nice period do not undermine dialectic intertextuality or even its elements such as “rock-classical” contrast or coordination. Far from undermining dialectic intertextuality, the revisionism of The Nice tends rather to reinforce the elements of dialectic intertextuality or even to create it. The following three sets of examples in Example 3.2 illustrate this point. The first set of

---

10 These three pieces are all instrumental, which is why the designations such as verse and chorus are all within quotation marks in the example. Also, the formal designations such as “exposition” and “recapitulation” are provided in order to show background intertextuality as it is discussed in Chapter 1 and, I remind the reader again, not to analyze these sections as sonata-form sections in the nineteenth-century sense. These terms only represent rock audience’s (mis)conceptions.
Example 3.2: The Nice, versions of “Rondo”

a. “Rondo” (1967)

“Exposition”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:21</td>
<td>“Verse” 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:49</td>
<td>“Verse” 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:17</td>
<td>“Verse” 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:55</td>
<td>“Chorus”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:09</td>
<td>“Chorus”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2:23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improv on guitar and then on organ
(4:39-4:53: Toccata und Fugue (BWV565), mm.30-40)

“Recapitulation”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:42</td>
<td>“Verse” 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:08</td>
<td>“Verse” 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:46</td>
<td>“Chorus”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:59</td>
<td>“Chorus”   (-8:19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. “Rondo 69” (1969)

“Exposition”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:22-</td>
<td>Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:01</td>
<td>“Verse” 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:25</td>
<td>“Verse” 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>“Verse” 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:21</td>
<td>“Chorus”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:34</td>
<td>“Chorus”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2:43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improv on organ
(3:35-3:37 Holst, Mars, The Bringer of War, mm.45-)
(3:50-3:55 Holst, Mars, The Bringer of War, mm.45-)
(4:09-4:34 Dukas, L’Apprenti Sorcier, mm.72-80)
(4:45-5:00 Bach, Partita #3 (BWV 1006), mvt.1)
(5:29-5:40 Toccata und Fugue (BWV565), mm.30-40)
(5:35-5:40 Bach, Brandenburg #3, (BWV 1048) mvt.1)

“Recapitulation”?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:57</td>
<td>“Verses” 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:16</td>
<td>“Chorus”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25</td>
<td>“Chorus”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40</td>
<td>ending note (-7:45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. “Rondo” with Prokofiev’s “Lt. Kije Suite” (in *Here Come The Nice*)

- **0:00-** MC  
  “Exposition”?  
  - **0:08-** Orchestra: Lt. Kije Suite  
  - **1:05-** The Nice: Rondo: Verse 1  
  - **1:29-** Orchestra: Lt. Kije Suite  
  - **1:52-** The Nice: Rondo: Verse 3 second half  
  - **2:12-** The Nice: Rondo: Chorus  
  - **2:23-** The Nice: Rondo: Chorus

- **2:36-** Impro on organ  
- **2:49-** Bach, Toccata and Fugue in d (-3:04)  
- **3:42-** Orchestra+The Nice  
- **6:16-** Orchestra+The Nice

- **6:34-** The Nice+Orchestra: Rondo: Verse 3 second half  
- **6:55-** The Nice+Orchestra: Rondo: Chorus  
- **7:06-** The Nice+Orchestra: Rondo: Chorus  
- **7:19-** ending (-7:33)

Examples includes versions of The Nice’s “Rondo.”\(^\text{11}\) As **Example 3.2a** shows, the 1967 version of the piece (in *The Thoughts Of Emerlist Davjack*) features a Bach quotation in the improvisation. Since that is the only “classical” quotation within the piece, the quotation functions as the highlight of the whole piece. And in this sense, the Bach quotation may be described in terms of what Straus would call “centralization” (the use of peripheral element as the structural center), because the Bach excerpt, which is not necessarily the

\(^{11}\) “Rondo” features a reworking of Dave Brubeck’s “Blue Rondo Alla Turka” (1959, in *Time Out*) at the verses, and this is why the title of the piece is “Rondo.” Though Brubeck’s piece “is in classical rondo form” according to Steve Race and Brubeck himself, at least Emerson’s version cannot be considered to be in a rondo form. In any event, one may note that this Brubeck material makes “jazz” an intertext within the Emerson version. For Race’s and Brubeck’s commentaries, see Race, “Liner Notes,” and Brubeck, “Time Out.”
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central element of the original piece, is made to play a key intertextual role in the piece.\textsuperscript{12} But in “Rondo 69” which is a 1969 version (in Nice), there are a lot of “classical” quotations during the improvisation, as Example 3.2b suggests.\textsuperscript{13} Since the Bach quotation can no longer play the key role because it is now only one of many “classical” quotations, the revisionary procedure may be described as what Straus would call “marginalization.” This change from centralization to marginalization, seen as a second-generation revision, may be described as Bloom’s \textit{tessera}, particularly because \textit{tessera} is related to the psychic defense of “reversal into the opposite.” Also an essence of this revision is to create a stronger sense of “rock-classical” contrast, which is an important element of dialectic intertextuality. By adding many “classical” quotations, the contrast between “rock” verses and choruses on the one hand and “classical” improvisation on the other hand is made more overt. Yet another revision of “Rondo” (in \textit{Here Come The Nice}) is made with a more explicit aim at creating a dialectic intertextuality. As Example 3.2c suggests, this version is played in alternation with an orchestra that plays Prokofiev’s “Lieutenant Kije” Suite. This alternation between the band and the orchestra

\textsuperscript{12} Here I may be slightly extending Straus’s term; the Bach excerpt is not necessarily “peripheral” and it does not necessarily play “structurally central” roles in The Nice piece. Yet, at least the excerpt is not the center of the original, and it plays a very important role in The Nice piece, so the phenomenon is apparently similar to Straus’s “centralization.” Therefore, even though this may be an extension of his term, I would rather propose such a flexible extension of the terms to facilitate discussions on the musical revision of various sorts, primarily because of the desperate lack of useful terms for musical revision in the existent literature. And I even think the significant contribution of his theory partly lies in the wide applicability and flexibility of his terms, as well as the original theoretical rigor.

\textsuperscript{13} Between the quotations, such as between 3:37 and 3:50, bass and drums keep the riff of the piece and Emerson just improvises.
creates an unmistakable “rock-classical” contrast. And at the end the band and orchestra play together, which creates a “rock-classical” coordination, thus completing a dialectic intertextuality. These are certainly revisions of an earlier intertextuality in themselves and therefore can certainly be described as instances of a revisionary intertextuality. But because the result is always related to a dialectic intertextuality, these revisions cannot be seen as being independent of a dialectic intertextuality. These revisions are variants of a dialectic intertextuality.

Another set of examples demonstrating a revised intertextuality in The Nice period includes two multi-movement pieces. In “Ars Longa Vita Brevis” (1968, in *Ars Longa Vita Brevis*), which is probably Emerson’s first multi-movement piece with an orchestra, he actually does not use orchestra to a significant degree; most of the movements other than the prelude, the third movement, and the coda, are not even joined by the orchestra, as Example 3.3a shows. The third movement certainly features interesting “rock-classical” contrasts by using excerpts from Bach’s Brandenburg Concerto. But because the excerpts are scattered and interlaced with rock texture within the movement, the way the Bach material is revised in this Nice piece can be described as what Straus calls “fragmentation.” On the other hand, in “Five Bridges Suite,” Emerson sets the first movement for only orchestra and piano, the second movement for the band, the third movement for both orchestra and the band, the fourth movement for mostly piano and drums, and the final movement for orchestra and the band, as Example 3.3b shows. Each movement has a different combination of instruments, and in this sense the revisionary strategy used in this

a. “Ars Longa Vita Brevis”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>1:48</td>
<td>Orchestra + Organ + Bass + Drums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>3:58</td>
<td>Drums (w/ Gongs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>4:28</td>
<td>Guitar, Organ, Piano (jazzy), Bass, Drums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>4:43</td>
<td>Orchestra, Organ, Bass, Drums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>3:21</td>
<td>Organ + Bass + Drums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>0:46</td>
<td>Orchestra + Organ + Bass + Drums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. “Five Bridges Suite”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Instrumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>6:08</td>
<td>Orchestra + Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3:59</td>
<td>Organ + Bass + Drums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Orchestra + Piano + Bass + Drums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>1:02</td>
<td>Piano + Drums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>3:34</td>
<td>Wind Instruments + Organ + Bass + Drums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

piece can be described as what Meyer terms “combination.” And the second-generation revision of “fragmentation”—which is itself a revision—in “Ars Longa Vita Brevis” into “combination”—which is itself another revision—in “Five Bridges Suite” may be described in terms of Bloom’s *daemonization*, especially because it is related to the rhetorical tropes hyperbole (exaggeration for effect) and litotes (deliberate understatement). That is, in “Five Bridges,” the “classical” intertext represented by piano and orchestra is emphatically used for hyperbole while the “rock” intertext represented by the band’s
electric instruments is presented to a lesser extent than in “Ars” for litotes. But this second-generation revision also serves the purpose of making a dialectic intertextuality clearer. Indeed, the instrumentation of the movements tells us that the first movement is “classical” thesis, the second movement is “rock” antithesis, and the third and fifth movements are a synthesis of “rock+classical” materials. Again, revisionism here cannot be considered in separation from dialectic intertextuality, and therefore it is not possible to talk about a revisionary intertextuality as a distinct style.

A third set of examples includes The Nice’s reworkings of Bob Dylan tunes: “She Belongs To Me” (1969, in Nice) and “Country Pie” (1970, in Five Bridges). In “She Belongs To Me” of 1969, The Nice use three verses out of Dylan’s five and insert a long improvisation in which many “classical” excerpts are quoted, as Example 3.4 shows. Here the Dylan tune, originally in a simple verse form, is revised through what Meyer calls “combination” into something like “Rondo 69” in terms of form. On the other hand, “Country Pie” features an interesting middle section in which the Dylan song is sung with accompaniment of the Bach music. More precisely, Dylan’s melody line is fragmented and motivicized in order to be matched with the Brandenburg Concerto. Thus, The Nice’s “Country Pie” at first looks just like another Dylan reworking, but actually the approach is

---

14 The Nice reworked one more Dylan song, “My Back Pages” (1970, in Elegy) but it is not discussed here because this reworking features no “classical” intertext but instead employs a “jazz” intertext to create “jazz-rock” intertextuality, which is beyond the scope of this dissertation, as mentioned in the introduction.

### a. “She Belongs To Me”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>0:00-</th>
<th>0:40-</th>
<th>1:14-</th>
<th>2:11-</th>
<th>2:26-</th>
<th>9:07-</th>
<th>9:58-</th>
<th>10:16-</th>
<th>10:49-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Exposition”</strong> ?</td>
<td>Intro:</td>
<td>Verse 1 w/ internal intro</td>
<td>Verse 2 w/ internal intro</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>Reintro</td>
<td>Verse 3</td>
<td>Bachian phrase 2</td>
<td>Bachian phrase 3 (-11:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2:37-2:50 Elmer Bernstein, The Magnificent Seven)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4:22-4:32 Bach, Partita III (BWV1006), Prelude, mm.1-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4:35-4:53 Bach, Partita III (BWV1006), Prelude, mm.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5:58-6:23 Bach, WTC1, Prelude #5 (BWV850))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8:15-8:22 Copland, Hoedown)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b. “Country Pie/ Brandenburg Concerto no.6”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>0:00-</th>
<th>0:37-</th>
<th>1:14-</th>
<th>1:22-</th>
<th>2:00-</th>
<th>2:19-</th>
<th>2:45-</th>
<th>3:38-</th>
<th>4:14-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intro.</strong></td>
<td>Verse 1, Verse 2, Bridge 1, Verse 3</td>
<td>transitory</td>
<td>Brandenburg mm.1-17 w/ lyrics</td>
<td>Bridge 2, Verse 4</td>
<td>Brandenburg mm.17-28</td>
<td>Intro reprise. w/17mm of impro</td>
<td>Verse 1, Verse 2, Bridge 1, Verse 3</td>
<td>Improvisation (-5:33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

very different. The revisionary strategy in “Country Pie” can be seen as the revision of

15 The music between the quotations, such as between 2:50 and 4:22, is improvised over the
the revisionary strategy in “She Belongs To Me.” And this second-generation revision can be characterized through Bloom’s *clinamen*, because it is related to a rhetorical trope irony; “Country Pie” is both connected to and disconnected from “She Belongs To Me” at the same time. But this second-generation revision cannot establish a distinctly new style because this revision simply serves the purpose of creating a vertical coordination of “rock” and “classical” materials, which is an essential element of a dialectic intertextuality. No matter how a revision is made during The Nice years, most of the revisions are more or less related to dialectic intertextuality in this way. Revisions in this period are thus mostly for the purpose of creating variety within a style and do not prompt style change. In this respect, one still cannot see a revisionary intertextuality as a distinct style of intertextuality during The Nice period.

*Revisionary Intertextuality in “Knife Edge”*

A revisionary intertextuality comes to stand out as a distinct style around the beginning of the ELP period, because revisions are made to revise the very dialectic intertextuality that characterizes The Nice’s style. This change did not come suddenly, however; various reasons for style change may have come to Emerson one by one. When Emerson dissolved The Nice in March 1970 and formed Emerson, Lake and Palmer during riff maintained by bass and drums.
the next month, “Emerson was [still] confident that this new band [ELP] would enable him to expand on the musical possibilities of The Nice.”\textsuperscript{16} He first wrote music in his old style and, as mentioned in the previous chapter, continued to employ dialectic intertextuality in such pieces as “The Barbarian” and “Pictures at an Exhibition.” It gradually came to light that his new bandmates, Carl Palmer and Greg Lake, did not like Emerson’s old style with The Nice. Indeed, Palmer later recalled his discontent vividly:

I didn't really want to be a part of something that had been done before. Keith had been so much into classical music and had just broken up a three-piece band, and it seemed strange that he was thinking of forming another one. This disturbed me a little ...

Lake is also said to have “worried that the new band would be no more than a glorified version of Keith’s former outfit.”\textsuperscript{18} Lake’s worry had to be taken especially seriously, since Lake was the kind of person to quickly leave a band if someone else controls it; hence his departure from King Crimson was the result of Robert Fripp’s dominance.\textsuperscript{19} In order to keep Lake in the band, Emerson had to avoid creating an impression that ELP was a

\textsuperscript{16} Forrester et. al. 2001, p. 51.

\textsuperscript{17} Quoted in Forrester et al., p.42

\textsuperscript{18} Forrester et al., 51. Emerson also said, “It was very tricky in the early days deciding what we could play. Greg was adamant that it shouldn’t be like a new Nice, but at the back of my mind that was exactly what it was going to be.” See Hanson, \textit{Hang On To A Dream}, 148.

\textsuperscript{19} Fripp’s dominance is not the only reason Lake left King Crimson; Emerson himself actually invited Lake to join his new project. Emerson knew the circumstances of Lake’s departure from King Crimson very well and thus also knew how quickly Lake could decide to leave a band.
group led by Emerson, with Lake and Palmer playing secondary roles\textsuperscript{20} – an impression that might be easily created if Emerson continued with The Nice’s style.\textsuperscript{21} Presumably for the first time in his career, Emerson, an experimentalist by nature and used to looking forward rather than backward, self-consciously and objectively began to consider what his own former style was like, and to struggle against it musically in order to get along with his new band.\textsuperscript{22}

In order to consider how to please Lake and Palmer musically, Emerson perhaps started reviewing their former musical styles and discovered their fundamental difference from his was in their lack of enthusiasm for dialectic intertextuality. In fact, Lake’s former style, or more precisely, the style of King Crimson in which Lake used to play, is very different from dialectic intertextuality. As Example 1.4 above suggests, King Crimson’s most representative work at the time, “21st-Century Schizoid Man,” does not

\textsuperscript{20} Emerson said, “He [=Lake] basically wanted it [=ELP] to be his band, and I felt a bit of an ego problem there right from the beginning. I’d never played in this kind of set-up with anyone else before.” Quoted in Hanson, Hand On To A Dream, 148.

\textsuperscript{21} As can be heard in many live albums, ELP came to perform The Nice’s “Rondo” and “America” on stage, but King Crimson’s “21st Century Schizoid Man” was also played on stage, probably in an effort by Emerson to avoid creating the impression that ELP is Emerson’s band.

\textsuperscript{22} In an additional endeavor to keep Lake in the band, Emerson infamously gave Lake producer credit for the whole first album (1970, Emerson, Lake and Palmer), and credited him as the sole composer of “Take a Pebble” and “Lucky Man,” even though Emerson and Palmer both contributed to the songs to a significant degree. Moreover, as long as Lake contributed to a piece to some extent, Emerson never forgot to credit him as co-writer, even if Emerson played the central role in arrangement; e.g., “The Barbarian” and “Knife-Edge.” Emerson credited himself as the single composer only when he played a piece almost all by himself; e.g. “The Three Fates.”
particularly feature dialectic intertextuality, since the first two verses are simply repetitions and do not show a sharp “rock-classical” contrast. The same holds true with Carl Palmer’s former style, or more precisely, the style of Atomic Rooster in which Palmer had played. As Example 3.5 shows, the formal structure of one of their pieces, “Banstead” (1970, in *Atomic Rooster*), is not similar to dialectic intertextuality at all since there is no significant contrast between the first two verses and no synthesis at the end:

**Example 3.5: Atomic Rooster, “Banstead” (1970, in *Atomic Rooster*)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>0:00-</th>
<th>Verse 1</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0:29-</td>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A’</td>
<td>0:44-</td>
<td>Verse 2</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:17-</td>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1:32-</td>
<td>Interlude</td>
<td>c–G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Recapitulation”</td>
<td>A”</td>
<td>2:29-</td>
<td>Verse 3</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:59-</td>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:18-</td>
<td>Outro (-3:33)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once Emerson realized that dialectic intertextuality was a kind of “problematic” idiosyncrasy, everyone he had played with might have started to look somewhat hostile to him. He might have looked back upon his old bandmates in The Nice, bassist Lee Jackson and drummer Brian Davison, and remembered how they were not always cooperative, especially towards the end of The Nice period. According to Emerson himself, “The Nice fell apart because of their changing artistic attitudes. It’s got nothing
to do with set-ups.” While Emerson developed his dialectic intertextuality, Jackson and Davison perhaps did not want to keep up with it. They were quite likely not mature enough to refrain from expressing their honest feeling against dialectic intertextuality directly to Emerson in the studio. Indeed, after The Nice broke up and when Jackson and Davison formed a new group called Refugee with a new keyboardist, Patrick Moraz (who would become the replacement keyboardist of another progressive-rock supergroup, Yes), they played in a totally different style, almost as if they were saying that this was the very thing they actually wished to do for a long time. As Example 3.6 shows, Refugee’s “Ritt Mickley” (1974, in Refugee) almost caricaturizes the dialectic style by disrupting the dialectic relation and rather reorganizing the music symmetrically.

A more general artistic reason for style change should also be mentioned here.

---


24 Lee Jackson, born on January 8th, 1943, was 26 years old and Brian Davison, born on May 25th, 1942, was also 26 years old while Emerson, born on November 2nd, 1944, was 25 years old, in the late 1969 when the band already had internal conflicts.

25 Though this is a style in which Jackson and Davison would play later, their stylistic preferences were perhaps already palpable to the eyes of Emerson when they were still playing with The Nice. The real reason The Nice broke up is then probably Emerson’s dialectic intertextuality, and not Jackson’s slow progress in bass playing or Davison’s bad personal relationship with Emerson, as some have mentioned. If this is so, it was Jackson and Davison and not Emerson who first left The Nice artistically, though it was Emerson who physically left The Nice. Presumably, Emerson was sensitive enough to notice their artistic divergence from his direction while they were working together in the studio, and felt too uncomfortable to keep working with them any longer. This situation might have been remembered by Emerson when his wish to continue The Nice’s direction was virtually rejected by his new band as well.
Example 3.6: Refugee, “Ritt Mickley” (1974, in Refugee)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Chord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Exposition”</td>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:13</td>
<td>Verse 1</td>
<td>F-C-F-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:11</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>F-G...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>3:02</td>
<td>Interlude</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Recapitulatin”</td>
<td>3:44</td>
<td>Chorus</td>
<td>F-G...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:28</td>
<td>Verse 2</td>
<td>F-C-F-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:22</td>
<td>Outro (-5:57)</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a larger stylistic transition in the progressive rock movement around 1971-72. According to Stump, “the Progressive music phenomenon that the Underground and counter-culture had spawned was now being mainstreamed ... [It was] the transition to the consecration of Progressive rock ideology as cultural and consumer commodity.”

In this process of commodification, it was necessary that the countercultural ideology formerly represented as “insult” to the establishment be “misread”; i.e. it would still be referred to but at the same time it would be revised to some extent. As long as the music was sold with the label of “progressive rock,” it could be perceived as retaining some quality of the underground ideology. But at the same time, to the extent that it was mainstreamed, it could also be perceived as something more sophisticated and polished. Many prog-rock groups of the late 1960s generally felt obliged to change their style as this grand transition unfolded. They had to, and did, revise their older style for newer

[26] Stump, *Music’s All That Matters*, 107-08
versions.  

For a number of reasons, Emerson had to change his style, regardless of his preference. His own past thus became a burden, acquiring a status that is equal to that of an influential poetic precursor in Bloom’s theoretical picture in his *Anxiety of Influence*. Emerson now had to confront and overcome the anxiety of influence of The Nice, his own past. Thus the present Emerson (as child) was now attempting to replace his precursor, the past Emerson (as father).  

Emerson started revising dialectic intertextuality in pieces such as ELP’s “The Barbarian,” in which the “rock” section comes first and the “classical” section follows. Though the particular revision only concerns the order of these intertexts and there is still a

---

27 Edward Macan explains this general transition as a style change from what he calls “the first wave” (The Nice and other pre-1970 groups) to “the second wave” (groups after 1970-71 including ELP) of the progressive rock movement. According to him, pieces in “the second wave” are longer, formally more involved, more virtuosic, and more complex harmonically, texturally, and rhythmically. See Macan, *Rocking the Classics*, 23-29.

28 Interestingly, Emerson, speaking of the spring and summer of 1970, says, “The following transient months made me fraught with anxiety.” Quoted in Emerson, *Pictures of an Exhibitionist*, 173.

29 Certainly Bloom’s main discussion is about the relations between two different poets, and not about those between the past and the present of a single poet. However, Bloom’s theory should actually be understood as covering the latter kind of relations as well. In fact, he calls his 1975 book, *A Map of Misreading*, an “antithetical completion” to his previous book, *The Anxiety of Influence*. “Antithetical completion” is called *tessera* in his theory of influence, and *tessera* is the second of his six revisionary ratios (see Example 3.1 above). Thus Bloom clearly applies his theory to his present relations to his past, the kind of relations between the past and the present of a single person. See Bloom *Map of Misreading*, ‘acknowledgments’, and Brzovic, “Papa’s Nazi Past.”
full-blown dialectic intertextuality with conspicuous “rock-classical” contrast and coordination, the change of order may be a first step toward revision of dialectic intertextuality. A big next step was taken when ELP played The Nice’s “Rondo” in the Isle of Wight Festival. As shown in Example 3.7, they shortened the piece to a significant degree by deleting whole “verses” and “choruses” from the “exposition” and shortening the length of “improvisation” significantly. There is only one “classical” quotation at 0:15- left to this ELP version. Though a “rock-classical” contrast can still be found because of this quotation, the dialectic intertextuality that was clear in the “Lieutenant. Kije” version of “Rondo” is significantly undermined in this piece because

Example 3.7: “Rondo” in the Isle of Wight Festival (1970, in The Isle of Wight Festival)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00-</td>
<td>“Exposition”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:16-</td>
<td>Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:51-</td>
<td>Italian Concerto (-1:06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:09-</td>
<td>Drum solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:53-</td>
<td>Improvisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:28-</td>
<td>“Recapitulation”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:46-</td>
<td>“Verse” 3 second half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:57-</td>
<td>“Chorus”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:08-</td>
<td>ending note</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:13-</td>
<td>drum solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:28-</td>
<td>Ending note (-3:38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 Once again, quotation marks and question marks are used to designate the terms such as exposition and recapitulation because they are not the same as classical sonata-form sections; quotation marks are employed also for the terms verse and chorus because they lack vocal parts.
there is no “rock-classical” coordination at the end.

Through a number of such revisionary efforts, Emerson finally arrived at a distinct revisionary intertextuality sometime in the summer and fall of 1970. To summarize the change, consider Example 3.8. Out of a given form such as verse 1, verse 2, interlude, and verse 3, The Nice would typically create dialectic intertextuality by using the three verses as discussed above; ELP, by contrast, would create a different kind of dialectic according to a scheme comprising an exposition (including both verses 1 and 2), an improvisation (interlude), and a recapitulation (verse 3). The clear-cut dichotomy of “rock” and “classical” materials is now confined to the interlude and any possibility for dialectic intertextuality by means of “rock” and “classical” intertexts is thus fully undermined.

Example 3.8. Summary of style change from The Nice to ELP

The Nice

- "Exposition" Improvisation "Recapitulation" Coda
  - "Thesis" "Antithesis" "Synthesis"
  - ‘classical’ ‘non-classical’ ‘classical’ + ‘non-classical’

a given form: Prelude Verse 1 Verse 2 Interlude Verse 3 Postlude

ELP

- "Exposition" Improvisation "Recapitulation" Coda
  - "Thesis" "Antithesis" "Synthesis"
  - ‘classical’ + ‘non-classical’
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This change first appeared in a most evident manner in “Knife-Edge,” from the band’s debut album, *Emerson, Lake and Palmer* (1970, see Example 3.9). There are three verses in this song and “classical” materials such as Janacek’s Sinfonietta and Bach’s French Suite are certainly used; but none of the verses can be called “classical” or “rock,” though the interlude contains a short “classical+rock” section. The balance that had previously been kept between “rock” and “classical” materials in the verses is now gone. To Lake’s question in this song, “Can you still keep your balance?” (the penultimate line of the song’s lyric; see the bottom score of Example 3.11), Emerson seems to have answered

**Example 3.9: ELP, “Knife Edge” Form and Derivations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Janacek</th>
<th>J.S. Bach, <em>French Suite No.1 in d</em> (BWV812), Allemande (1722)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Sinfonietta</em>, mvt. 1 (1893)</td>
<td><em>French Suite No.1 in d</em> (BWV812), Allemande (1722)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm.</td>
<td>mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>section A: Allegretto B: Allegro A’: Maestoso</td>
<td>section A: V vi V i V vi ... B:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmony Db: V IV ii IV V/V V i</td>
<td>harmony d: V vi V i V vi ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP ‘Knife-Edge’ (1970, in <em>Emerson, Lake and Palmer</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timing 0:00-0:57-1:50-2:16-3:20-3:59-4:47-5:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>section A: Verse 1 A**: Verse 3</td>
<td>Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>source Janacek Janacek</td>
<td>Janacek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase 3mm 3mm</td>
<td>3mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unit “non-classical” + “classical”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson model “Dialectic” “Exposition”?</td>
<td>“Recapitulation”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Thesis”</td>
<td>“Synthesis”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td><em>Antithesis</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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“No” with his new style. And Lake appeared pleased to hear Emerson’s musical answer, for Lake later remarked: “‘Knife Edge’ was written right at the end of the album; for most of the album the direction of the group was still being formed, and this track is an indication of what we’ll be doing in the future.” Thus the stylistic shift Emerson made in “Knife-Edge” marks an important and tell-tale departure from The Nice’s style.

31 One might wonder to what extent this change should be attributed to Emerson’s stylistic shift and to what extent Lake contributed to the piece. For example, Emerson certainly said, “my ideas for vocals were rarely accepted. It was almost as if that was his [=Lake’s] territory and I, a mere keyboard player, had no right to intrude upon it.” See Emerson, Pictures of an Exhibitionist, 176. But this remark seems to indicate that Emerson first shared his ideas for vocals with Lake before Lake had decided what he would sing. Thus it is highly likely that Lake simply chose one of Emerson’s ideas and therefore the resultant vocal line is Emerson’s and not Lake’s. Even if it is Lake’s, it can still be understood as reflecting Emerson’s style change, since this vocal line is the one Emerson finally accepted.

32 Forrester et al., Emerson, Lake & Palmer, 58. Lake’s point is perhaps that there is no longer a dialectic intertextuality. Drummer Carl Palmer seems ignorant of the absence of dialectic intertextuality, but he notices it in “Tarkus.” Palmer says: “I prefer to think of Tarkus as being the first album we cut as a band ... We were so much together on those sessions and playing without any pressures, whereas our first album was more or less a proving point to initially show what we were capable of doing. On Tarkus we did it.” Quoted in Forrester et al., 65. Note that “Tarkus” was recorded shortly after “Knife Edge” was recorded, and that “Tarkus” is also among the earliest ELP pieces without dialectic intertextuality. Thus Palmer’s observation does not necessarily conflict with Lake’s; both find a style change around the end of ELP’s first album or the beginning of their second album.

33 This change is not necessarily well described by Macan’s general description from the first wave to the second wave discussed above. Some of the qualities Macan enumerates do not explain the real stylistic change from The Nice to ELP, since, compared with “Knife-Edge” (5:09), “Karelia” (8:53) is much longer, more involved in terms of form if one emphasizes the “classical-nonclassical” dialectic, and more complicated in terms of rhythm at least at some points because of Davison’s virtuosic drumming. In other words, the stylistic change from The Nice to ELP was not altogether straightforward, and within the broader context of Emerson’s stylistic evolution it represents one of the most complicated, even twisted, moments.
This overall change is so conspicuous that the listener of this piece who is also very familiar with the music of The Nice cannot help comparing it with The Nice pieces in general and noting the significant revisionary procedures Emerson employed. For example, the audience might have noticed in “Knife Edge” Bloom’s clinamen, which is “initial swerve from the precursor.” The precursor, The Nice, used to start composing by imitating “classical” material in the first verse so that a later transformation in the second verse would make a contrast with the first verse as “classical” thesis and “rock” antithesis. In order to make this “classical-rock” contrast obvious, it is crucial not to transform the “classical” material in the first verse, but instead to retain the “classical” quality in that section of the piece as much as possible. ELP is now composing by transforming the “classical” source at the very first verse, however, which disrupts the essence of “classical-rock” contrast. As Example 3.10 shows with arrows and boxes, ELP seem to choose some note groups from Janacek’s music first, then combine them differently in an editing process, transpose everything down a tritone, and pick up only some notes for the vocal and bass while eliminating other notes. As a result, the “classical” quality that the Janacek piece would convey is significantly destroyed. For example, Janacekian irregular phrase structure, the 3+2+2 on the tubas (with a half-note length being ‘1’, see the brackets in the example above) though written in 2/4, becomes a more regular one, 3+3, in ELP’s version, with the second 3 further subdivided into two’s.

34 Needless to say, I am here not arguing that the rock audience should know Bloom’s theory. The phenomenon which Bloom theorizes, however, can be noticed and recognized as such by anyone who does not know Bloom’s theory, of course.
Example 3.10. Transformation of Janacek’s material into ELP’s “Knife Edge”

Janacek, mm. 8-14

Trumpets

Tenor tubas

Bass trumpets and timpani

Db: V? IV? ii? IV ii
ab: i? VII? V? VII v
eb: iv? III? i? III i

(editing)

ELP, 0:12-0:18

Vocal

Bass

Just a step, cried a sad man take a look down at the mad man

G: V 9 11 IV 9 ii
d: i 9 11 VII 9 v
C: ii 9 11 I 9 vi
a: iv 9 III 9 i

Copyright renewed. All rights reserved. Used by permission of European American Music Distributors LLC, U.S. and Canadian agent for Universal Edition Vienna.
The uncertainty of chord qualities in Janacek’s characteristic parallel open fifths (hence ‘?’s in the example) became more certain in “Knife-Edge” because of the clearer chord qualities and functions. And Janacek’s original suspended tonality is undermined significantly.\(^{35}\)

While the tonality of these measures of Sinfonietta can be interpreted in at least four different ways—Db major, Ab minor, Gb major, and Eb minor—ELP’s version, which is transposed down a tritone, does not allow such a wide variety of interpretations and thus is not as “suspended” harmonically as Janacek’s piece; among the four corresponding keys—G major, C major, D minor, and A minor (allowing for transposition)—G major and C major cannot be the key of “Knife-Edge.”\(^{36}\) In terms of melody, the intervallic and rhythmic content of the main trumpet motif Bb-Db-Bb-Ab-Eb-Gb is kept intact in its transposed version, E-G-E-D-A-C, but this and other melodic elements are retained probably because they show some quality of the minor pentatonic scale, which was common in rock styles of the time, and not necessarily because they sounded “classical.”\(^{37}\)

\(^{35}\) For Janacek’s suspended tonality, see Novak “What’s folk about Janacek?” 257, 259, and 270.

\(^{36}\) Here are few more details of my harmonic interpretation: G major, transposition from Db major, is impossible because Emerson did not employ Janacek’s A’ section; originally Janacek’s movement can be interpreted most coherently in Db major because of the Db-major cadence in the A’ section (see Example 3.9). C major is impossible because a C major chord comes only once and then at a metrically weak point. D minor is not only possible, because D is the beginning note, but also preferable, because it is the key of Bach’s *French Suite* quoted later in the piece. A minor is also possible because of the prevailing A-minor pentatonic melody.

\(^{37}\) When Emerson showed his idea of reworking the Janacek piece to Lake, Emerson suggested that “the riff from ‘Simpsonieta’ [sic.] might be turned into a hard-rock vocal.” See Emerson, *Pictures of an Exhibitionist*, 176. Also for the melodic motif in the Janacek piece, see Bird, “Folk Material.”
Thus, the “classical” quality of the original is undermined to a significant degree in this reworking.\textsuperscript{38} This, in turn, destructs the essence of “classical-rock” contrast. In Meyer’s terms, The Nice’s procedure can be described as imitation, whereas ELP’s can be viewed as combination, displacement, and retrenchment.\textsuperscript{39} The change from imitation to these latter strategies can be described as Bloom’s \textit{clinaman}, since this change initiates the essential swerve from The Nice’s dialectic intertextuality. In rhetorical terms, it amounts to irony; the ELP approach to intertextuality is like that of The Nice, because both groups have a “classical” model in front of them; but ELP does not imitate the model, and instead transforms it in a manner unlike The Nice reworkings. This ironic relation of ELP to The Nice can also be related to the Freudian psychic defense of reaction-formation: Emerson transformed the classical material to satisfy his superego’s guide to what is acceptable among his bandmates, rather than to satisfy his ego’s wish to exhibit his skill in imitating the original precisely and to continue, therefore, The Nice’s style.\textsuperscript{40}

The audience might also have noticed in “Knife Edge” what Bloom calls \textit{tessera}, the second revisionary ratio, especially when one hears J. S. Bach’s \textit{French Suite} at the end of the interlude. \textit{Tessera} is taken “from the ancient mystery cults, where it meant a token of

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{38}] That Emerson did not try very hard to emphasize the “classical” origin of the piece is reflected to the fact that ELP did not even try to credit Janacek as the original composer when their debut album was first released in 1970. See Forrester et al, \textit{Emerson, Lake & Palmer}, 57-58.
\item[\textsuperscript{39}] For these terms, see the earlier discussion in the introduction to this chapter.
\item[\textsuperscript{40}] For Freudian terms such as ego, superego and so on, see, for example, Freud \textit{An Outline of Psychoanalysis}.
\end{itemize}
recognition, the fragment say of a small pot which with the other fragments would reconstitute the vessel.  

This makes a “rock-classical” contrast within the interlude because the interlude features a very “rock” improvisation and the “classical” quotation occurs right after that. This is evidently a new element, because The Nice’s interlude had nothing to do with “rock-classical” contrast. The reason this element can be seen to “antithetically complete” a dialectic intertextuality can be understood if “rock” and “classical” contrast or coordination are imagined as a figure against a ground; The Nice piece presents the figure in all the three verses whereas the ELP piece presents the figure only in the interlude, thus reversing the figure-ground relation. This reversal is analogous to the psychic defense of “reversal into the opposite.” This new relation can also be explained in terms of a rhetorical trope synecdoche, which is a reference to a whole by mentioning a part of it. In The Nice piece there are all components of a dialectic intertextuality, namely “rock-classical” contrast and coordination. But in the ELP piece, there is only a “rock-classical” contrast and no coordinating aspects stand out, because of the sharp contrast between the first and second parts of the interlude. 

Therefore the ELP

---

41 Bloom, Anxiety of Influence, 14.

42 The first part of the interlude is certainly strongly “rock” whereas the second part of the interlude is strongly “classical” because of the Bach quotation. However, this is not to disregard “rock-classical” coordinating aspects. Even in the first half, the improvisation is played on the riff which is itself derived from Janacek’s music, so “classical” intertext is certainly there. Also, the Bach quotation in the second half of the interlude is accompanied by an electric bass and drums, if sparingly, so there is “rock” intertext as well. But, those coordinating aspects are found not only in this interlude but also in the verses of the ELP piece because of the transformation of the “classical” material so these aspects do not particularly characterize this particular interlude. What characterizes this interlude is rather the overall contrast between the first and second halves of the interlude, and this
piece mentions only a part of the whole dialectic intertextuality as a synecdoche. The interlude is not just something new: it is revisionary.

The revisionary ratio, kenosis, may also have been noticed by the audience of “Knife Edge.” Kenosis is “a movement towards discontinuity with the precursor,” Bloom says, by way of Freudian “undoing,” and “regression,” for example. By just repeating the first verse in the second, Emerson “undid” the “rock-classical” contrast in the first two verses, thus discontinuing one of the most important aspects of dialectic intertextuality. This discontinuity may also be understood as a Freudian “regression” to an earlier state in which Emerson had not yet arrived at employing a “rock-classical” contrast in the first two verses; i.e., by canceling the contrast Emerson returns to a developmental point before he established dialectic intertextuality. Indeed, there are now only two verses toward the beginning of the piece. Beginning a song with two verses is a fairly common procedure for most rock musicians prior to this time. By returning to this old and more conventional practice, Emerson seems to be denying his “progress” to dialectic intertextuality. Since the two verses are attributes of a “rock-classical” contrast, rhetorical trope metonymy can be found to work here. Metonymy is a reference to something by its attributes (e.g., a reference to “king” by mentioning “crown”). The lack of contrast is not a lack of meaning; rather, the deletion of the contrast functions as a metonymical reference to a part

contrast also stands out in relation to The Nice’s style because The Nice did not have such a contrast in the interlude.

43 Bloom, Anxiety of Influence, 80.
of dialectic intertextuality. The contrast is present—and thus meaningful—in its absence.

Not only the lack of “rock-classical” contrast at the first two verses, but also the lack of a “rock-classical” coordination in the third verse may also have been detected by the audience and recognized in accordance with Bloom’s fourth revisionary ratio, daemonization. Bloom writes that daemonization is “to generalize away the uniqueness of the earlier work.”44 In fact, the third verse is mostly a repetition of the first and second verses. As Example 3.11 shows, the first two verses (shown at the top staff) are almost entirely repetition, and the third verse is also mostly a repetition of the first two verses, except that the melody is varied and that the accompaniment pattern drawn from the interlude is employed. In dialectic intertextuality, the uncompromising, higher-level synthesis of “rock” and “classical” materials in the third verse is a climax of dialectic intertextuality. But this climax is simply generalized away here because of the near repetition of verses, leaving all three verses now equal in terms of intertextual references; no verse can be called a “classical” or a “rock” section, as mentioned above. On the one hand, this can be seen in terms of the Freudian psychic defense called “repression”; the high-level synthesis is repressed as if the synthesis was the ego’s aggressive instinct. On the other hand, rhetoric “litotes” might also be seen to characterize this relationship. Litotes is a deliberate understatement that is used as a means to gain an audience’s favor (e.g., “no small accomplishment” instead of “great accomplishment”). By deliberately

44 Bloom, Anxiety of Influence, 14.
Example 3.11. Alternative dialectic in ‘Knife Edge’

Verse 1, 0:30- and Verse 2, 1:24- (x2)

V.  
1. Only fear breaks the silence, As we all kneel, pray for guidance.  
2. Our machines feed the furnace, If they take us, they will burn us.  

B.  

D.  

Impro, 2:23-

K.  

B.  

D.  

Verse 3, 4:17-

V.  
3. Can you still keep your balance?  

K.  

B.  

D.  

suppressing the “rock-classical” coordination at the end, Emerson might be rather suggesting a possible “rock-classical” coordination here. Thus the lack of “rock-classical” coordination cannot be simply considered a lack of dialogue between “rock” and “classical” intertexts; the piece can instead be understood to refer to the dialogue that was present in the music of The Nice by a deliberate understatement of synthesis at the final verse.

These revisionary ratios as a whole may have led Emerson’s audience to further notice Bloom’s fifth revisionary ratio, *askesis*, which Bloom rephrases as self-curtailment and separation from the precursor. A key feature of this ratio is a substitution, since Bloom connects this ratio to both Freud’s concept of sublimation (a substitute gratification of aggressive instincts) and the rhetorical trope of metaphor (substitute expression for a direct expression). Indeed, in “Knife Edge,” Emerson substitutes an alternative dialectic for The Nicean dialectic (see Examples 3.8 and 3.11); the third verse synthesizes a variation of the vocal lines of the first two verses on the one hand and the full-handed organ chordal playing of the improvisation on the other. As a result, a thesis-antithesis-synthesis relationship is alternatively established between the exposition (including the first two verses), improvisation (interlude), and recapitulation (the final verse), rather than between the three verses. This substitution finally separates Emerson from his past, because this alternative dialectic in itself has nothing to do with “rock-classical” intertextuality except as a substitute expression, metaphor. The countercultural ideology as described by Stump has lost its edge and is somehow softened, and ELP’s music was now ready to be safely commodified for the consumer.
If all or some of these revisionary ratios thus far have been noticed by some members of the audience, then the audience might also notice Bloom’s final ratio, *apophrades*. Bloom describes this ratio as “the return of the dead.” He argues that all of the strongest poets “achieve a style that captures and oddly retains priority over their precursors, so that the tyranny of time almost is overturned, and one can believe, for startled moments, that they are being *imitated by their ancestors.*” One’s perception of the lack of a dialectic intertextuality from the Emerson model can create a series of fictional feelings that the dialectic is *still* missing, that the dialectic has yet to be provided, and that the model must have been created originally as the framework for the dialectic. Though this bare Emerson model is the result, not the cause, it is now perceived as if these elements are in a reverse order. Thus time is imaginatively overturned and one might believe that ELP had, in fact, provided a stylistic basis for imitation by The Nice. For Emerson, this process might have been a Freudian “projection,” because the unacceptable feeling of imitating the

---


46 This kind of special perception is reflected in the following description of the group in an encyclopedia article: ‘Besides providing the blueprint for Emerson, Lake and Palmer, the Nice was a link between the early experimentalism of late-Sixties psychedelia and classical-influenced art rock. As Keith Emerson’s initial platform, its snickering desecration of the classics ... helped expand the form ... of rock’ (Romanowski and George-Warren, *New Rolling Stone Encyclopedia*, 711; I am grateful to Prof. Kevin Holm-Hudson for bringing this quotation to my attention). The Nice is perceived here as retaining something missing in ELP—something that is here called a “snickering desecration of the classics” which, in the present context, is the dialectic structure. The audience seems to have indeed been driven to listen to The Nice in search of something missing in ELP, as the price of The Nice’s bootleg records/CDs used to be very high among collectors until the availability of recent remastered releases brought the prices down. This characteristic phenomenon is one example of the radical reversal of the time by *apophrades.*
precursor would now have been inverted into the feeling of being imitated by the precursor.
Also relevant here is a rhetorical trope, metalepsis, which is a metonymy of a metonymy, according to Bloom (e.g. a reference to “a driver” by mentioning “a foot,” by way of “something that kicks the accelerating pedal of a car”).\footnote{Bloom, Map of Misreading, 102.} The music of ELP is now the metalepsis of that of The Nice by way of the bare Emerson model, for the bare Emerson model signifies the dialectic via the fictional feelings, and the dialectic in turn signifies The Nice.

Since dialectic intertextuality is so significantly undermined, a revisionary intertextuality does not easily escape the audience’s attention. Indeed, it becomes difficult to find an example of dialectic intertextuality in pieces released after “Knife Edge.” As will be mentioned in later chapters, dialectic intertextuality will certainly come back later in a slightly different form with such pieces as “Karn Evil 9” and “I Believe In Father Christmas.” But pieces other than these do not seem to feature dialectic intertextuality. Thus intertextuality in many of the early ELP pieces may have been heard as a revised version of The Nicean intertextuality. In other words, the pieces in new styles may have been heard with special reference to the past. Thus the intertextuality presented in pieces such as “Knife Edge” can be considered a typical example of revisionary intertextuality. A revisionary intertextuality as discussed here is a revised version of dialectic intertextuality, but of course, it can be a revised version of a different kind of intertextuality.

When Emerson quit ELP several years later, he again tried to change his style, thus giving
birth to revised versions of different kinds of intertextuality. A revisionary intertextuality is an intertextuality that is understood particularly in relation to some other kind of intertextuality. We should also remember that it was these early ELP pieces—including “Knife Edge”—that really raised ELP’s status to that of a “supergroup,” making them an act capable of filling big concert halls and stadiums for many years and one that would rack up a string of gold records. A new style is sometimes important because of its revised aspects, and because of its relation to the past.

**Revisionary Intertextuality in Interpretation**

As mentioned above, Bloom’s revisionism is related to Freudian psychic defense, and poetic revision is likened to what Freud calls the “family romance.” To the extent that Freudian concepts can illuminate the revisionary ratios that are present in Emerson’s pieces, one is justified in interpreting the narrative of “Knife Edge” in terms of family romance.

Freud’s idea of the family romance originates in his reading of the tragedy *Oedipus the King* by Greek writer Sophocles (496-406 BC). This is a story in which the protagonist Oedipus kills his father, Laius, King of Thebes, without knowing Laius is his

---

48 English translation of this play is found in Sophocles, *Theban Plays.*
father, and then, on knowing later that Laius is his real father, Oedipus blinds himself.\textsuperscript{49} Freud interprets the universal power of this story to move the readers of different centuries as deriving from the inner life of most children. He says that the story of Oedipus’s killing his father “is only the fulfillment of our childhood wish.”\textsuperscript{50} A small child first wishes to be big like his parents but, as intellectual growth increases, he begins to doubt the incomparable and unique quality that he has attributed to them.\textsuperscript{51} The child eventually imagines himself free from his parents and able to replace his father with another. But, according to Freud, “the whole effort at replacing the real father by a superior one is only an expression of the child’s longing for the happy, vanished days when his father seemed to him the noblest and strongest of men … [H]is phantasy is no more than the expression of a regret that those happy days have gone.”\textsuperscript{52} Thus when Freud reads the story through to the point where Oedipus blinds himself, Freud says “the family romance undergoes a

\textsuperscript{49} In this one-sentence summary of Sophocles’s long story, it is impossible not to eliminate many other crucial events of the story, such as Oedipus’s marriage to his mother, Jocasta. Freud also emphasizes this event in the Sophocles tragedy. Freud’s point in his reading of the story is actually that a child tends to hate the parent of the same sex and desires the other, a point which derives from Carl Gustav Jung’s theory and which has elicited so many positive and negative responses to this day, including the ones by Jacques Lacan, Alfred Adler, Judith Butler, Michel Foucault, Gilles Deleuze, and Felix Guattari. A reverse concept of the Oedipus Complex is called the “Electra Complex,” discussed by Jung. For a concise discussion on the Oedipus Complex, see, for example, Keitlen, \textit{Oedipus Complex}. Also, the influence of Freud’s male-oriented theory upon Bloom and its consequence in the Bloomian studies of music, see Whitesell, “Men with a Past.”

\textsuperscript{50} Freud, \textit{Interpretation of Dreams}, 202.

\textsuperscript{51} Freud, “Family Romances,” 237-238.

\textsuperscript{52} Freud, “Family Romances,” 240-241.
curious curtailment: it contents itself with exalting the child’s father … .”53 Because such a family romance can be commonly found in “our inner life,” Freud concludes that Oedipus’s “fate moves us only because it could have been our own as well … .”54

Though Bloom tends to quote Freud’s family romance as an agonistic story of a boy’s “wish to be the father of himself,” Bloom’s revisionary ratios show themselves as evidence to his deeper understanding of Freud.55 In fact, *apophrades* is a good example of Bloom’s understanding of Freudian child’s actual “exalting” of his father through attempts at replacing him with another. *Apophrades* is indeed paraphrased as “the return of the dead,” as mentioned above, meaning that the ultimate stage of poetic revision reveals an ultimate and inescapable influence of the precursor. Bloom’s influence theory is, therefore, not one that discusses a general “negative influence” but one that explores the very Freudian family romance in greater detail.56

53 Freud, “Family Romances,” 239.
55 The short quotation in this sentence is from Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence*, 64.
56 The term “negative influence” is taken from Meyer, *Style and Music*, 143, n. 19. Meyer says, “It should ... be recognized that not all instances of influence result in similarities of features. For instance, when a composer explicitly avoids being like some powerful predecessor, *negative influence* occurs ... .” While what is stated in this quotation is not problematic, Meyer himself does not explore this aspect of musical influence in this book. This kind of attitude was almost standard among music studies until Bloomian studies of music was attempted in the early 1990; Meyer’s book, *Style and Music*, was also published earlier; it was published in 1989.
The revisionism found in the early ELP period can then be interpreted as a family romance between the present Emerson as a “child” and the past Emerson as his “father.” Originally Emerson wished to continue The Nice style but for some practical reasons had to be free from his older style and felt the need to replace it with another. But finally, through the six revisionary steps, he did not necessarily get rid of his father style but rather exalted it. Indeed, he still keeps the Emerson model, so the father is not totally replaced by another; some important elements are still there, regardless of the significant departure from his earlier style.

Then, the “rock-classical” intertextuality in “Knife Edge” can be interpreted in terms of this family romance. In a narrative scene, there are two pairs of “classical” and “rock” dramatis personae in a middleground, while the background features yet another pair of “classical” and “rock” personae. One of the middleground pairs is the same as the one described in Chapter Two, and they are playing out a dialectic drama together, leading to a high-level synthesis between them. The other of the middleground pairs is the personae that together long to be a dialectic pair like the first, and later start agonistically imagining the replacement of it with another, but finally exalting the status of the dialectic pair through transformation. The story of “Knife Edge” evolves around this younger, infantile pair, with the older, parental pair serving as reference and the background pair as a general tone of the story.

As long as such a revision itself is significant in the early ELP years, the audience of
the time is highly likely to hear ELP’s music in constant comparison with The Nice’s style and discover the revisionary relation to The Nice. To this extent, a story such as this is a possible narrative interpretation by the audience of the day. If this interpretation is correct, then this chapter should conclude with remarks that the simple “dialogic” model cannot highlight such an essential aspect of one of progressive rock’s representative pieces and that such a thing as revisionary intertextuality should be taken into account in order to further the study of intertextuality, not only in music but also in any areas. Just as things change, ideas are reassessed, and artists do not stand still, so intertextuality does not always remain the same: it is often revised.
CHAPTER 4

SUBTLE INTERTEXTUALITY:
TRANSFORMATION AND RECONTEXTUALIZATION IN KARN EVIL 9 (1973)

Keith Emerson’s style of intertextuality in the first half of the 1970s can be characterized as “subtle intertextuality,” and this can be opposed by “sharp intertextuality.” The words “subtle” and “sharp” are used here in a limited sense and must be understood as being devoid of any positive or negative value judgements. ¹ The word “subtle” is used here because it has such meanings as: (1) “not dense, rarefied”; (2) “not easily grasped, understood, or perceived”; and (3) “of thin consistency; hence, penetrating, pervasive or elusive by reason of tenuity.” ² And the word “sharp” is used here as an opposing term, since it has such meanings as: (1) “acute and pointed”; (2) “not shaded off”; and (3)

¹ For instance, I do not intend to use “subtle” for such evaluative adjectives as “crafty,” “nice,” “skillful,” “dexterous,” “clever,” “cunning,” “treacherous,” “wily,” etc. By “sharp,” I do not mean “discerning,” “sagacious,” “clever,” “merciless,” “intense,” “excellent,” “stylish,” “smart,” “well-equipped,” etc.

² These meanings are all quoted from the Oxford English Dictionary. The first and last meanings are quoted from the first definition of the OED entry and the second meaning is quoted from the fifth definition of it. The dictionary lists thirteen definitions of the word. See “subtle, a.” in the Oxford English Dictionary.
“clearly defined.”³ To roughly contrast these two sets of three meanings with one another, one could say that (1)’s are about convergency, (2)’s are about perceptibility, and (3)’s are about consistency. A lower degree of convergence, perceptibility, and/or consistency, for instance, makes something subtler; a higher degree of these qualities makes it sharper. That “something” can be a musical intertextuality; i.e. different degrees of convergency, perceptibility, and consistency of intertexts in music change the degree of sharpness/subtlety in intertextuality. Considered along these lines, the degree of convergence in musical intertextuality can be measured in terms of the type of intertexts involved. Robert Hatten distinguishes between “style” and “strategy” for intertextual material: “style” designates “the general principles and constraints” that governs a range of different pieces, while “strategy” is “the individual choices and exceptions occasioned by a work.”⁴ “Stylistic” intertextuality is usually general and thus lacks specificity and

³ These are also from the OED. The first meaning is from the third definition, and the second and third meanings are from the twelfth meaning. The dictionary lists twelve definitions of the word. See “sharp” in the OED.

⁴ Hatten, “Place of Intertextuality,” 70; and Musical Meaning in Beethoven, 29-30. Hatten’s terminology is very generalized, but I use it here because the very generality may help understand one measure of a subtle intertextuality in relation to the other two measures that follow in the text. But in the long run, the more detailed terminology that has been offered by Meyer, for example, must be considered in order to further develop the theoretical framework of sharp/subtle intertextuality. Meyer distinguishes between the following four terms: “dialect” which is a specific set of rules a number of geographically or periodically related composers employ in common; “idiom,” which is a specific set of constraints a composer repeatedly selects from the larger repertory of the dialect; “intraopus style,” which is a set of constraints that are replicated within a single work; and “intraopus structure,” which is a set of nonrecurrent elements in a work and which Meyer derives from Narmour’s term “idiolect.” See Meyer, Style and Music, 23-30; and Narmour, Beyond Schenkerism, chapter 11. Hatten’s “style” corresponds to the first two aspects of Meyer’s terminology and Hatten’s “strategy” corresponds to Meyer’s “intraopus style” and
pinpointedness, thus making the intertextual reference less convergent, “not dense,” and more “rarefied”—to speak metaphorically—, while “strategic” intertexts are specific and pinpointed, thus making the reference more convergent and “acute.” Second, the degree of perceptibility in musical intertextuality can be measured in terms of the way intertexts are incorporated. If an intertext (strategy or style) is incorporated with a significant amount of transformation, it may work as what literary theorist Michael Riffaterre calls an “implicit” intertext, which is hidden and “not easily grasped, understood, or perceived.” In contrast, if an intertext is incorporated with little or no transformation, it may work as what he calls an “explicit intertext,” which is “not shaded off” and highly perceivable.\(^5\)

Third, the degree of consistency in musical intertextuality can be measured in terms of the treatment of the incorporated intertexts within the new piece. Some incorporated materials keep playing the same intertextual role within a piece, while others keep changing their intertextual role because of what Dora Hanninen calls “recontextualization.” “Recontextualization” is a repetition of musical material in different contexts within a piece, which gives rise to a different perception of the same material.\(^6\) If an intertext is

\(^{5}\) For the terms explicit and implicit intertexts, see Riffaterre, *Semiotics of Poetry*, 133-134. An explicit intertext makes what literary theorist Heinrich Plett calls “intertextual identity,” which means that the quoted text within a new context is identical with the original text, while an implicit intertext makes what Plett calls “intertextual deviation,” which means that the quoted text deviates from the original text. The deviation is made through transformations such as “addition, subtraction, substitution, permutation, and repetition.” See his “Intertextualities,” 9; and *Textwissenschaft und Textanalyse*, 143-149.

\(^{6}\) Hanninen, “Theory of Recontextualization,” 61 and 71. As she says, “[t]he experience of recontextualization is necessarily subjective. Yet like so much in music, it can be
recontextualized significantly, the intertextual reference may change its referential meanings accordingly and be “of thin consistency; hence, penetrating, pervasive or elusive.” If, on the other hand, an intertext receives little or no recontextualization within the piece, the intertextual association may be “clearly defined” because of the consistent and stable referentiality of the intertext. These three measures—the type of intertexts, the way of incorporation, and the internal treatment of intertexts—together or individually determine various degrees of convergency, perceptibility, and consistency and hence various degrees of subtlety and sharpness in musical intertextuality.⁷

Remarkably intersubjective.” See the same article, 71. The perception of musical repetition, or musical rehearing, has long been an important topic of discussion in musicology; any analytical work on motivic unity in music, such as the one by Nicholas Ruwet, assumes that rehearing of the same motives at different sections and levels helps the listener perceive the piece as a unified whole. But to the best of my knowledge, Leonard B. Meyer’s discussion on musical rehearing seems to be the first to recognize different perceptions on every repetition of events in music explicitly. Edward T. Cone’s study on rehearsings of music in comparison with rereadings of story also explicitly recognizes different understandings of the same events at every rehearing. But these previous studies are admittedly too general, and a more detailed study on the changing perception of repetition according to the context is necessary to fully explore the significance of phenomenal transformation of musical repetition and rehearing. Hanninen’s work might open up a further detailed discussion on phenomenal transformation of repeated materials. See Ruwet, “Methods of Analysis in Musicology”; Meyer, “On Rehearing Music”; and Cone, “Three Ways of Reading a Detective Story.” For a general discussion on the use of repetition in popular music, see Middleton, Studying Popular Music, 183-189 and 267-292.

The degree of sharpness/subtleness can also be considered the degree of what Riffaterre calls “ungrammaticality,” which is a cue for intertextual understanding of a text; a greater degree of ungrammaticality creates a sharp intertextuality, whereas a lesser degree of ungrammaticality creates a subtle intertextuality. Michael Klein uses this concept for analyses of musical intertextuality, but he does not consider the differing degrees of ungrammaticality in music; he treats all the ungrammaticality as something that triggers the listener’s “leap of interpretation.” I agree with the idea of leap of interpretation itself, but my stance is that there are differing degrees of such an interpretive leap and that treating all
In Emerson’s music, each of these three measures has been at work in a subtler intertextuality since The Nice period, but the degree of subtlety seemed to increase toward the first half of the 1970’s, culminating in “Karn Evil 9” (1973). Seen from the viewpoint of Emerson’s stylistic development, subtle intertextuality is important because it can be considered a logical outcome of this era; revisionary intertextuality was already a step toward subtler intertextuality in that Emerson transformed “classical” materials and triggered implicit intertexts in revising his practice of dialectic intertextuality. Subtle intertextuality is important also from the viewpoints of narrativity, since one may find a further softening of possible antagonistic “rock-classical” relations in the story; this would therefore give another solution to the “problems” inherent in dialectic intertextuality. Above all, subtle intertextuality is important because it constitutes the style that prevails among many pieces in the golden era of ELP—pieces that represent ELP’s style for many listeners. A generalized idea of “dialogism” would not help us understand this style; one has to consider the three properties outlined above in detail to determine various degrees of subtlety and sharpness in intertextuality.

This chapter attempts to support the above claim by exploring some important ways Emerson creates subtle intertextuality. First, Emerson’s approaches to intertextuality up to 1973 will be examined in terms of the sharpness/subtlety distinction. Second, “Karn

the ungrammaticalities in the same manner is in itself a logical leap. That is why I employ terms “sharp” and “subtle” to distinguish the degree of ungrammaticality clearly. See Riffaterre, *Semiotics of Poetry*, passim.; and Klein, *Intertextuality in Western Art Music*, 96-106.
“Evil 9” will be analyzed carefully as a culmination of Emerson’s developmental movement toward subtle intertextuality. Finally, a possible set of narrative interpretations of subtle intertextuality will be explored.

**Subtle Intertextuality in Context**

The intertextuality in earlier pieces is generally less subtle, mainly because even when a low degree of one of the three properties—convergency, perceptibility, and consistency—is evident in a piece, the degree of the other property or properties usually remains high. To demonstrate this earlier practice from this point of view, this section examines three examples: the first one shows a low degree of convergency, the second a low degree of perceptibility, and the third a low degree of consistency. In none of these examples, however, do all the three properties work together to create subtle intertextuality.

The first example is The Nice’s “The Thoughts of Emerlist Davjack” from their debut album of the same title in 1967. Here a low degree of convergency is found, but the degree of perceptibility and consistency is high. As discussed briefly in Chapter Two at Example 2.6, two sections in this piece can be described as “classical.” In these sections, certain “stylistic,” not “strategic,” elements of Baroque music are incorporated. Example 4.1 shows excerpts from these sections: a is the beginning of the verse and b is the beginning of the interlude. In a, there is an explicit reference to Baroque instrumental
style through the use of an eighth-note *Bariolage* and a half-note bass line, with both parts played by organ and harpsichord. In *b*, the sequential melody is played with a chorale-style chordal accompaniment on a Hammond organ imitating a church organ. These intertexts refer generally to Baroque “styles” and not to specific “strategies,” and as a consequence the “classical” reference is less specific, less acute, and less convergent.

**Example 4.1: The Nice, “The Thoughts of Emerlist Davjack” (1967, in *The Thoughts of Emerlist Davjack*)**

a. verse beginning

b. interlude

---

8 “Bariolage” is a nineteenth-century term to describe certain ways for a string instrument to mix one open string with stopped notes for special effect. The technique itself has been exported to other instruments, especially keyboard instruments. A well-known keyboard example is Bach’s BWV 565, which is partially shown in **Example 4.7**; see the lower part. The Nice’s verse, admittedly, is not exactly the same as this Bariolage technique, though here it can be heard as a variant of Bariolage. For a discussion on this technique in relation to Bach’s BWV 565, see Williams, “BWV 565.”
Despite the subtlety of these stylistic references, the degree of perceptibility and consistency remains high, contributing to a sense of sharper intertextuality. Indeed, these stylistic references are rather unmistakable and explicit, since Baroque features such as sequence and Bariolage are incorporated with no significant transformation. And the referentiality of these materials is quite consistent and not subject to change as the music unfolds; consequently, these materials never receive any recontextualization during the piece. Thus, while subtlety is indeed present in terms of convergence in this piece, it cannot be found in the other terms.  

A second example is the opening measures of The Nice’s “Happy Freuds,” a song from The Nice’s second album, *Ars Longa Vita Brevis* (1968). A low degree of perceptibility is expressed in this piece, along with a low degree of convergence, and this contributes to a sense of subtle intertextuality; the degree of consistency remains high, however, and this contributes to a sense of sharp intertextuality. Example 4.2a shows the opening measures of this piece.  

---

9 Practically speaking, “stylistic” reference is an easier way to incorporate “classical” intertexts than “strategic” reference, because of the copyright clearances. Emerson was later involved in lawsuits on copyright issues because he did not clear the copyright of Bartók’s Allegro Barbaro for ELP’s “The Barbarian” (1970, in *Emerson, Lake and Palmer*). Partly for this reason, he increasingly relied on stylistic reference later. See Macan, *Rocking the Classics*, 57-58, for the lawsuits on the copyright of Bartók’s piece.

10 The transcription in Example 4.2a assumes the key of the piece as G major, but actual recording as released in the CD sounds somewhere between G and G-flat.
Example 4.2: The Nice, “Happy Freuds” (1968, in *Ars Longa Vita Brevis*); and Bach, Partita 3 (BWV 827), Gigue

a. The Nice, “Happy Freuds,” 0:00-

![Music notation](image1)

b. Bach, Partita 3 (BWV 827), Gigue, m. 7-

![Music notation](image2)

These two passages are similar to each other, but not the same. The Nice excerpt indeed incorporates not a specific “strategy,” but rather refers to the “style” of Baroque music. Thus there is a low convergence and less acuteness in referentiality. Also, there is low perceptibility in this case, because the “style” is incorporated with some transformation. One may certainly find a number of similarities between the passages of The Nice and Bach. For example, each passage can be seen to present a composite melody, with two individual lines.

11 Though it may seem strange if someone borrows something from such an odd point of a piece, this example remains a possible source and no one can easily disprove this possibility. Even if some historical documents suggest something else as a more likely source, one cannot reject the possibility unless one figures out Emerson’s real “intention,” which is ultimately not possible, as Monroe Beardsley argues so convincingly in his famous article, “Intentional Fallacy.”
interlocking one another. In The Nice melody, the D6’s form an upper line separate from the lower line made of the other notes of the melody, and the two lines merge together towards the end of this excerpt. In the Bach passage, the D5’s and the last C5 constitute a separate upper line, while the other notes form a lower line. One may also note that the lower line in each example oscillates by step. Despite these similarities, the Baroque style is much transformed in The Nice passage. In fact, a composite melody or an oscillating line in Baroque music usually appears as part of a longer melody that shows a strong directionality.  

The Bach passage actually appears in the middle of a longer Fortspinnung passage, which moves downward sequentially. The D’s in this Bach passage are only a part of a longer downward motion F#-E-D-C (mm. 5-8, not shown here), and the lower line in the Bach passage that ends with the E4-D4-E4 motif is only a part of a longer descending line starting with a B4-A4-B4 motif, followed by a G4-F#4-G motif and an F4-E4-F4 motif. The Nice excerpt, by contrast, shows no such melodic directionality and simply stays on D in the top line and on G on the bottom. Thus transformed, the Baroque style in The Nice passage can work only as an implicit intertext that is less perceptible and “not easily grasped.”

In “Happy Freuds,” a high degree of consistency in the intertextual association of this material is maintained, because this material is not

---

12 Eighteenth-century counterpoint textbooks typically teach that melodic directionality is an important feature of eighteenth-century music. See, for example, Gauldin, Practical Approach to Eighteenth Century Counterpoint, 27; and Kennan, Counterpoint, 4-6.

13 That something is “not easily grasped” or perceived is not the same as that it is not grasped or perceived at all. Between the unmistakable perception of something and the non-perception of it, there are different degrees of perception of it. See also the discussion on implicit intertext in the last section of this chapter.
significantly recontextualized within the piece. It occurs twice, once as an introduction and the second time as a reintroduction. It is always followed by unmistakably “rock”-style texture, making the “rock-classical” contrast evident. So the “classical” association of this material is made consistently evident, despite low convergence and low perceptibility. “Happy Freuds” thus still retains a sharp quality of intertextuality.

The third example is ELP’s “Tarkus” from their second album of the same title (1971). This piece features a low degree of consistency in intertextual association, along with a low convergence, but the piece keeps a high degree of perceptibility. First, a low degree of convergence in reference is expressed by means of “stylistic” references to early twentieth-century atonal music. As Example 4.3a shows, the main riff of this piece is invariably constructed using the 027 trichord. And since both parts are always a perfect fifth apart, the two parts together manifest the 0257 tetrachord constantly. Such an invariable, regular, and somewhat elementary use of certain pitch-class sets is often found in early twentieth-century atonal pieces, especially those composed with some educational

14 Though in an organ solo there is some kind of quotation from Bach.

15 On Tarkus, Emerson indeed says, “I had ... always wanted to write atonally, although I wasn’t sure what that was, and that album allowed me the freedom to explore some things I had never really done before: percussive keyboard sounds, strong rhythm, atonality.” “Atonality” is thus only one of many influences. Macan and Forrester both mention the influence of Alberto Ginastera on ELP’s Tarkus, an influence that may affect the percussive and rhythmic aspect of the Tarkus riff. Also, Emerson once mentioned the influence of Frank Zappa on the writing of Tarkus, though it is not certain which aspect of Tarkus Zappa might have influenced. The above quotation appears in Forrester et al., Emerson, Lake & Palmer, 184. On the influence of Ginastera and Zappa, see Macan, Rocking the Classics, 87 and 91; and Forrester et al., Emerson, Lake & Palmer, 63 and 184.
Example 4.3: ELP, “Tarkus” (1971, *Tarkus*), the main riff; and Bartók, *Mikrokosmos*, No. 101, m. 12-


purpose in mind, such as Bartok’s *Mikrokosmos* (1939). Example 4.3b shows No. 101 of his *Mikrokosmos*, entitled “Diminished Fifth.” In this excerpt, instances of the 025 trichord are invariably used at various levels of transposition. And since the interval

---

16 Macan also points out the influence of Bartok in the ostinato pattern, though he also mentions Stravinsky as another possible source of influence. See Macan, *Rocking the Classics*, 91.
between the upper and lower voices is always a diminished fifth, the overall superset that embraces both voices is always 013679, a subset of the octatonic collection. As such, these pitch manipulations incorporated in “Tarkus” refer to a “style,” and not to a “strategy.”

Second, a low degree of consistency in intertextual association is also expressed in “Tarkus.” In fact, the 027 trichord as “classical” intertext receives significant recontextualization within the piece. It is significant all the more because the “classical” association of this collection is firmly established before it is recontextualized. Indeed, the trichord is most explicitly used in what can be called “classical” movements of the piece. As shown in Example 4.4a, the piece has seven movements, alternating between the odd-numbered instrumental movements and the even-numbered vocal movements. And given the complex harmonic and rhythmic construction in the instrumental movements and the more or less blues-oriented nature of the vocal movements, it is possible to view the instrumental-vocal alternation as a “classical-rock” alternation. The 027 collection is especially used in these “classical” instrumental movements. In “Manticore” (shown in Example 4.4b), for example, the opening measures are totally made of presentations of the

---

17 Analyses of this Bartok piece appear, for example, in Suchoff, Guide to Bartók’s Mikrokosmos; Straus, Introduction to Post-Tonal Theory, 120-122; and Lester, Analytic Approaches to Twentieth-Century Music, 115-116.

18 Macan discusses this alternation as “the first organizing principle” of Tarkus, the second being “contrasts in tempo” and the third being “harmonic practice.” See his Rocking the Classics, 87 and 91-95.
Example 4.4: ELP, “Tarkus” (1971, in *Tarkus*): Transformations of the Main Riff

**a. “Tarkus”: Movements**

1. Eruption........................instrumental ......“classical”
2. The Stones of Years........vocal ..................“rock”
3. Iconoclast........................instrumental ......“classical”
4. Mass.................................vocal ...............“rock”
5. Manticore........................instrumental ......“classical”
6. The Battlefield.................vocal ..................“rock”
7. Aquatarkus .....................instrumental ......“classical”


![Manticore Opening](image)


![The Battlefield](image)


027 trichord and a long-range 0257 tetrachord, as well as vertical versions of the 0257 collection in the first measures. These collections are used to create something widely
divergent from any typical “rock” style, and thus, they generate a “classical” association in this movement as a whole. But the “classical” association of 027 trichord is also eroded when it is used also for the “rock” movements. For example, “The Battlefield,” which is shown as Example 4.4c, has a markedly bluesy chord progression, as seen in the root motion of E-B-A-E. \(^{19}\) But Emerson seems to reinterpret this tonal motion enharmonically as an instance of the 027 trichord; he indeed plays 027 collections insistently as accompaniment to the song, as the boxes show in the example. \(^{20}\) The use of 027 trichord as an accompaniment to a bluesy song may give rise to some questions regarding the derivation of the chord, and particularly whether the 027 collection is derived from the “classical” or “rock” style. The association of the 027 trichord with “classical” style thus becomes somewhat suspect. The juxtaposition of “classical” and “rock” materials is no longer as “clearly defined” as it otherwise might be because of the “thin consistency” of the “classical” association of the trichord that results from the recontextualization of the 027 collection that occurs in the piece.

---

\(^{19}\) E-B-A-E is certainly E: I-V-IV-I, which is only a part of the typical twelve-bar blues form (I-I-I-IV-VI-I-V-IV-I-I). But in the context where intertextuality plays significant roles, the progression I-V-IV-I alone can work as a reference to blues because it is the most important part of the blues chord progression. Note also that minor pentatonic scale (C-Eb-F-G-Bb), which is often used in blues, features three interlocking 027 chords (F-G-C; Bb-C-F; and Eb-F-Bb). Also note that the guitar tuning is based on fourths which creates 027 chords. For a concise and useful account of the twelve-bar form as an organizational pattern, see Covach, “Form in Rock Music,” 66-69. On general discussions on blues styles, see Cohn, *Rock from the Beginning*; Middleton, *Pop Music and the Blues*; and Hatch and Millward, *From Blues to Rock*.

\(^{20}\) Example 4.4c is transcribed from the piano reduction in the published score, but the chords used largely reflect the actual recording.
In “Tarkus,” the degree of perceptibility of intertexts remains high, because the way the compositional “style” of early twentieth-century music is incorporated is quite explicit, with no change, and thus it cannot be considered an implicit intertext. Indeed, according to Emerson, when he showed his idea of the “Tarkus” riff to his band members, Lake said, “I can’t play that kind of music. If that’s what you want to play, then I think you should look for someone else to play with.” Lake was finally convinced to play the riff by the band’s manager, but he was sensitive enough to notice the explicitness of “classical” intertext. The intertextuality of “Tarkus” is therefore subtle in terms of convergency and consistency, but still sharp in terms of perceptibility.

While these three properties—convergency, perceptibility, and consistency—do not work together to produce subtle intertextuality in these examples, they do eventually coordinate to create subtle intertextuality in Emerson’s music, and this tendency culminates in “Karn Evil 9.”

**Subtle Intertextuality in “Karn Evil 9”**

“Karn Evil 9” (1973, in *Brain Salad Surgery*) features subtle intertextuality: all three decisive properties seem to be at work in this piece and they operate in a very elaborate

---

21 Quoted in Macan, *Rocking the Classics*, 87.
manner. This piece can thus be seen as a culmination of Emerson’s development toward subtle intertextuality. This section is devoted to a detailed analysis of subtle intertextuality as it occurs in “Karn Evil 9.” Each of the three key properties described above will be investigated in greater detail one by one, and at the end of this section, the issue of the recognizability of subtle intertextuality will be considered.

Turning to the first decisive property, a low degree of convergence in intertextual reference can be found in this piece; “stylistic” rather than “strategic” intertexts are incorporated throughout the work. Two examples of “stylistic” reference are especially worthy of note. One is the way the different movements of the piece are unified. “Karn Evil 9” has three movements—each called “Impression”—with the “1st Impression” further divided in two parts, as shown in Example 4.5a. Emerson creates a motivic unity

Example 4.5: ELP, “Karn Evil 9” (1973, in Brain Salad Surgery): The Largest-Scale Level and Main Themes of the Three Movements

a. The Overall Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>“1st Impression: Part I”</td>
<td>8'36&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>“1st Impression: Part II”</td>
<td>4'46&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>“2nd Impression”</td>
<td>7'07&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>“3rd Impression”</td>
<td>9'05&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. “1st Impression,” Main Theme

c. “2nd Impression,” Main Theme
d. “3rd Impression,” Main Theme


throughout the movements; or more precisely, he unifies the movements by contour, a practice that refers to “classical” multi-movement style. As the excerpt of the main theme of the “1st impression” and a contour analysis of it in Example 4.5b show, the theme embodies three important contours: the cseg <524130>; csegs <0121> and <210>s; and a

22 Similarity in contour between different movements of a piece has long been a common method of analyzing a unity throughout the movements. For example, see Hugo Leichtentritt’s motivic analysis of Beethoven’s op. 130 in his Musical Form; 339-346.

23 “Cseg” is the common abbreviation of “contour segment,” which has been studied since 1987, especially by Elizabeth West Marvin and Paul Laprades, and used widely in analyses of atonal music in particular. It is a way of describing melodic contour by discounting specific pitch content and counting only the relative “height” of the pitches. In this theoretical system, the lowest note of a melody is numbered “0,” the second lowest “1,” and so on. Thus, if a given four-note melody consists of C4-D4-B3-E4, the contour of this melody is described as cseg <1203> because B3 is the lowest, C4 the second lowest, D4 the third lowest, and E4 the highest. Cseg is especially useful for uncovering similarities in shape between two different melodies. If, for example, another given melody consists of F#3-A3-E2-G4, the contour of this melody is also described as cseg <1203> and it is considered similar to the first because of the shared contour. Like twelve-tone operations,
gap-fill scheme initiated by an ascending octave transfer. The main theme of the “2nd Impressions,” shown in Example 4.5c, also contains the cseg <524130>, some csegs <210>, and a gap-fill schema initiated by a descending octave transfer. And as shown in Example 4.5d, the main theme of the “3rd Impressions” also contains the cseg <524130>, the csegs <0121> and <210>s, and a gap-fill schema initiated by an ascending octave transfer.

The other particularly notable example of “stylistic” reference in “Karn Evil 9” is the cseg <524130> itself; this cseg is arguably derived from “classical” music styles and not from “rock” styles. To substantiate this derivation, an essence of this particular cseg, Emerson’s cognition of it, and Emerson’s use of it must be considered here. The essence of this cseg, which is shown in the upper staff of Example 4.6a, can be construed as two 

csegs may be subject to inversion, retrograde, and retrograde-inversion. There are different versions of the cseg theory, but this dissertation uses the system as developed by Marvin and Laprades because their version has been most widely recognized thus far. For more on cseg and its various theories, see Marvin and Laprades, “Relating Musical Contours”; Morris, Composition with Twelve Pitches; Morris, “New Directions”; Quinn, “Fuzzy Extensions”; Friedmann, “Methodology for a Discussion of Contour”; Polansky and Bassein, “Possible and Impossible Melodies”; Tenney, META + HODOS; Cogan, New Images of Musical Sound and Sonic Design. For ethnomusicological studies on contour that have been developed as early as the 1960s and 1970s, see Kolinski, “Structure of Melodic Movement”; Adams, “Melodic Contour Typology”; and Seeger, “On the Moods of a Music-Logic.”

24 Gap-fill scheme is Meyer’s term. A gap is normally created by a relatively large leap, descending or ascending, followed by step motion in the opposite direction. A gap is also created by what he calls an “octave transfer,” which creates an octave interval by a series of skips. A fill can be made also by skips as long as those skips are small skips and generally move to fill the gap in the opposite direction. See Meyer, Emotion and Meaning in Music, 130-135; Explaining Music, 145-157; and Style and Music, 252-256.
interlocking <210>s, as shown in the lower staff. But it is not that any two interlocking <210>s could make <524130>; both b and c of Examples 4.6 are made of two <210>s interlocking as shown in the lower staff, but they are not <524130> (shown in the upper staff). An important feature of <524130> is that the two <210> are registrally distinct from each other; they should not overlap registrally. As a consequence, this contour is rarely found in rock pieces because of the inevitably wide range; indeed, the overall range must be at least a sixth in a diatonic context.\footnote{Some notable exceptions include performances by such guitarists as Steve Cropper and Jimi Hendrix as well as such bass players as James Jamerson and Larry Graham; these performers all feature special techniques related to some sort of quick skips and sequences. Cropper’s famous “sliding sixths” as they are found in the opening measures of Sam and Dave’s “Soul Man” clearly features melodic sequence of sixth leaps and thus <031425>, the retrograde of <524130>. I discuss these measures and their influence on Hendrix’s “Long Hot Summer Night” briefly in my forthcoming paper, “Synthesizing the syntheses.”}

Example 4.6: Cseg <524130>

The question of how Emerson might have thought about the cseg <524130> can be considered by investigating how he plays a piece of music that contains this cseg. This
contour often occurs most explicitly in a melodic sequence. For example, Bach’s famous Toccata and Fugue in D minor, BWV 565 at mm. 35-39, shown in Example 4.7a, features this very cseg at the beginning of a melodic sequence, though this melodic sequence extends longer and therefore the cseg is generated. Emerson, however, played the short cseg only and not when he covered this very Bach excerpt for The Nice’s “Rondo” in 1967 (in The Thoughts of

Example 4.7: Bach, Toccata and Fugue, d minor, BWV 565; and The Nice, “Rondo” (1967, The Thoughts of Emerlist Davjack)

a. Bach, Toccata and Fugue, d minor, BWV 565, mm. 35-39, with a contour analysis

---

26 This is not to say that a melodic sequence always produces the cseg . To use Adam Ricci’s classification theory of melodic sequence, which is the basis for his classification theory of harmonic sequence, cseg may arise only when i=6 or i=5, “i” being the sum of diatonic intervals within and between the unit of repetition, though the reverse is not true; i=6 and i=5 do not always produce the cseg . This raises a difficult issue of the relation between melodic sequence and contour sequence that awaits further theoretical exploration. For Ricci’s theory on melodic sequence, see his “Classification Scheme.”

27 For a discussion on this well-known Bach piece, see Williams, “BWV 565.”
b. The Nice, “Rondo,” 4:45-, with a contour analysis

Emerlist Davjack), as shown in Example 4.7b. By repeating the third measure immediately instead of playing Bach’s fourth measure, Emerson clearly extracts the cseg 〈524130〉 for “Rondo”—evidence that Emerson took special note of this particular cseg.

The cseg under discussion here would not be a particularly “classical” reference if Emerson did not use it as a “classical” intertext, but it seems obvious that Emerson uses it as a “stylistic” reference to “classical” music. As Example 4.8a shows, The Nice’s “Five Bridges Suite” (1970, in *Five Bridges*) begins with a melody in which the cseg 〈524130〉 is partially embedded as 〈24130〉. True, this contour here is not strongly perceptible, and therefore should be called implicit intertext rather than explicit intertext, not only because it is presented intermittently and incompletely but because it is also made of relatively
unimportant notes that do not play particularly prominent harmonic, melodic, or rhythmic roles within the excerpt. Nevertheless, the fact that some notes in such a “classical” movement form this particular contour is important, considering that the contour is rarely formed—even out of unimportant notes—in much rock music, as mentioned above. This piece is indeed one of the most ambitious orchestral pieces written by Emerson in The Nice period, and this first movement is the most “classical” section and is entirely performed by orchestra and piano, with no rock instruments. Example 4.8b shows another use of a part of the cseg <524130> as a “classical” intertext. Again, the notes that form the contour here do not play any significant harmonic, melodic, or rhythmic roles in the excerpt and thus the contour is implicit, rather than explicit intertext, but a crucial thing is that such a contour is formed at all because this contour rarely occurs in rock music as mentioned.

---

28 If one picks up intratextually important notes, one might find out a more prominent and explicit, rather than implicit, “classical” contour, but still the implicit cseg <24130> is specifically mentioned here because it recurs in many of Emerson’s “classical” pieces. It should also be restated that implicit intertext is not something that is not perceived at all but instead something that is not easily grasped but anyway heard. Also, it would be interesting to closely examine, in a separate study, whether this particular cseg is a necessary or sufficient condition for the passage to refer to “classical” music. I acknowledge Prof. Allen Anderson for suggesting this last direction.

29 Those who are reminded of Schenkerian graph by this example might wonder why the analysis in Ex. 4.8a picks up G as the first note of the contour segment despite the F major harmony, but contour analysis should be clearly distinguished from Schenkerian analysis. While Schenker’s *Urlinie* requires a constantly descending line that traces scale degrees of the key only, contour designates any shape of a melody that can ascend, descend, ascend and then descend, or descend and then ascend and so on, without having to trace the scale degree of the key. Therefore, to analyze a contour in a piece is to attempt to find out any significant shape of melody regardless of its harmonic or tonal orientation. In this case the contour <524130> and its variants are considered significant indeed because they are found to recur over and over again in Emerson’s “classical” pieces and not because they play any harmonic roles in his pieces.

a. “Five Bridges Suite,” 1st Bridge, 0:00-

and third being “rock” and the second and fourth being “classical.” This excerpt is drawn from the beginning of the fourth movement.30

All of this suggests that the cseg <524130> embedded in the main theme of “Karn Evil 9” is indeed a reference to a “classical” “style.” Since this is not a reference to a specific piece or “strategy,” one can see a low degree of intertextual convergence.

Turning to the second decisive property, we may note that a low degree of perceptibility of the “classical” cseg <524130> is achieved in “Karn Evil 9” by means of an implicit presentation of it. As mentioned above, the cseg <524130> is most explicit when it is used in a melodic sequence as in the excerpt from Bach’s Toccata and Fugue. But Emerson tends not to incorporate it in that explicit manner; he embeds it, or hides it behind, a longer melody with many intervening notes, so that the cseg does not appear in an obvious manner on the surface of the music. The contour, having been significantly transformed, works only as an implicit “classical” intertext. And this is what is found in all the main themes of the three movements of “Karn Evil 9,” which were shown in Example 4.5 above. As long as each movement evolves from its main theme and the theme presents an implicit “classical” intertext in this manner, the whole piece can be seen

30 The reason why the second and fourth movements of “Memoirs” can be considered “classical” is because the second movement begins with direct borrowing from Chopin’s Etude Op. 10, No. 1 in C major which sneaks into their ballad song, and the fourth movement is the band’s second attempt at creating something similar to Ravel’s Bolero (the first attempt was made in ELP’s “Abbadon’s Bolero” in 1971 on their album Trilogy), with the same theme repeating itself over and over again while the texture is increasingly thicker towards the end.
to feature subtle intertextual juxtaposition.\textsuperscript{31}

Considering the third decisive property, a low degree of consistency in intertextual association is also achieved in “Karn Evil 9,” and this occurs in an elaborate manner. It is achieved by means of recontextualization. According to Dora Hanninen, recontextualization is “a (listener’s perception of) phenomenal transformation of repetition.”\textsuperscript{32} A repetition of some specific material in a new context usually gives rise to a different perception of this same material.\textsuperscript{33} By extension, a repetition of some particular intertext in a fresh context can give rise to a different perception of the intertext, so that the associational meanings of it are subject to change and become of “thin consistency.” In “Karn Evil 9,” Emerson recontextualizes the cseg $<524130>$ in a number of elaborate ways. Unlike the 027 trichord of “Tarkus,” which was first contextualized firmly within a “classical” context before being recontextualized in a “rock” context, Emerson contextualizes the cseg $<524130>$ in an ambiguous context from the beginning, before recontextualizing it in another, different kind of ambiguous context. To see such a process of recontextualization, the initial context before recontextualization must first be

\textsuperscript{31} The other contours mentioned earlier, such as the cseg $<210>$s and a gap-fill scheme, can also be considered “stylistic” references to “classical” music. Indeed, these contours appear in those pieces that are supposed to incorporate “classical” intertexts, such as “Promenade” from Musorgsky’s (and ELP’s) \textit{Pictures at an Exhibition}, and the main riff of ELP’s \textit{Tarkus}, which is discussed above in \textbf{Example 4.3a}. But these contours appear explicitly in “Karn Evil 9”; they sound foregrounded in the music.

\textsuperscript{32} Hanninen, “Theory of Recontextualization,” 61.

\textsuperscript{33} See footnote 6 above on the present state of studies on recontextualization and musical rehearing.
examined. Example 4.9 shows the main theme of the “1st Impression” on the top of the example, followed by some analytical sketches of it; the cseg itself is not shown in this example, it is shown in Example 4.5b above:34

This two-measure theme, in which the cseg <524130> is embedded, is ambiguous in terms of intertextuality. As the first analysis just below the theme shows, the rhythm can be considered part “classical” and part “rock.” The syncopated rhythm is emphasized by the drums, and especially by bass, during roughly the first half of the theme, which is a typical “rock” idiom. But the final three-beat portion is not quite typical for “rock” because the snare stroke of the penultimate beat (the third beat of the last measure) de-emphasizes the “weak” beat (i.e., the second and fourth beats), thus making it sound

34 The analytical sketches in the following examples may raise a question of musical segmentation in general. The guiding principles for segmentation in these analyses are the viewpoints of intertextual associations and stylistic incongruity or “ungrammaticality.” Existing studies on musical segmentation tend not to discuss this crucial aspect; they are generally concerned with purely internal, intratextual logic of segmentation. Even in Hanninen’s comprehensive study on the subject, only three criteria for segmentation are presented: sonic criteria, contextual criteria, and structural criteria. That is, intertextual criteria are entirely missing from her list. In the long run, however, the relation between such intratextual segmentation and intertextual segmentation must be carefully investigated to further explore the essence of musical composition and perception. For recent work on musical segmentation, see Lefkowitz and Taavola, “Segmentation in Music”; Hasty, “Segmentation and Process”; Hasty, “Phrase Formation”; Kennet, “Segmentation and Focus”; Tenney and Polansky, “Temporal Gestalt Perception”; and Hanninen, “Orientations, Criteria, Segments.”
Example 4.9: "Karn Evil 9," Main Theme of 1st Impression, Part I

“classical” in comparison with the syncopated “rock” rhythm of the first half.\textsuperscript{35} The harmony (see the next analyses of the same example) also has both “rock” and “classical” aspects. The leading-tone cadence at the end may certainly work as a sign of a more “classical” style.\textsuperscript{36} The prevailing modal mixture might also be a sign of certain Romantic compositions, but such mixture was also no longer unusual in “rock” styles of the day.\textsuperscript{37} The chord progression generated by the repetition (i.e., the progression from the final chord to the first chord) is g#: i - IV, which can also be interpreted as c#: v - I, thus creating (following Deborah Stein) a kind of I-IV-to-V-I transformation as found in

\textsuperscript{35} Of course I do not claim that syncopated rhythms are always “rock” or a de-emphasis of the third beat of a 4/4 measure always refers to “classical” music. My interpretation is always contextual and intertextual, as mentioned in the Introduction of this dissertation. In a context in which everything is played by “rock” instruments, the listener may try to relate as much material as she can to “rock” intertexts, whereas she may try to relate as much “ungrammatical” material as she can to “classical” intertexts in the context of prog rock. At this level, the listener would surely make an interpretive leap, as Michael Klein would argue, but it is more crucial to suggest in which direction—“rock” or “classical”—an interpretation would leap. A leap of interpretation cannot be a totally subjective, disorganized act; any interpretation has some tendency defined by many conditions including those related to the musical sound. And psychological principles such as Gestalt principles play crucial roles in the listener’s contextual interpretation of intertexts. On the importance of the Gestalt psychology in music analysis, see Meyer, \textit{Emotion and Meaning in Music}, chapter 1.

\textsuperscript{36} In an attempt to discriminate rock’s harmonic practice from “classical” music’s harmony in terms of rock’s “flattened seventh,” Allan Moore regards “the presence of the leading-note/tonic relationship as axiomatic to the definition of common-practice tonality, particularly in respect of the existence of cadential functions and modulations.” See his “The So-Called ‘Flattened Seventh’ in Rock,” 187.

\textsuperscript{37} Macan discusses prog rock’s modal mixture in relation to its preference to modal harmony in general, and ascribes some harmonic tendencies in prog rock to “twentieth-century English and Eastern European nationalist composers” such as Bartók, Vaughan Williams, Stravinsky, and Holst. See Macan, \textit{Rocking the Classics}, 51-55; and “The Spirit of Albion.” A more general discussion on modal rock is found in Capuzzo, “Neo-Riemannian Theory.”
nineteenth-century harmony. But the use of v (minor five) in c# may be associated with “rock” rather than “classical.” Contrapuntally, as analysis in the example shows, note-against-note counterpoint between the bass and soprano creates a nice “classical” counterpoint, but at the same time a similar motion to a perfect octave may rather evoke the common “rock” practice of parallel progressions. The bass line itself, which is responsible for the similar motion to the octave, may also be a sign of the “rock” style because of the disjunctness and directionlessness. It is in this ambiguous context that the “classical” cseg <524130> is first contextualized before being subsequently recontextualized.39

Since this theme itself is played in the first two verses and since the two verses are very different music, the “classical” cseg embedded in the theme also receives much recontextualization along the way, which in turn undermines the intertextual association of the cseg. Example 4.10 shows the first verse of the “1st Impression,” with some analytical sketches.

As the notes on the right-hand margin of this example show, the theme’s intertextual character at the first verse seems to be more “rock” in rhythm but more “classical” in harmony and counterpoint, thus the cseg works with more “rock” rhythm and more

39 Here the analyses of rhythm, harmony, and counterpoint are done separately but analyses
of the relations between them, for example harmonic rhythm would further highlight interesting aspects.
“classical” harmony at this point as well. As the first analytical sketch shows, the rhythm of the first two measures emphasizes a “rock” syncopation because the attack points of the organ and the drums stand out against those of the vocal and piano. The next two measures (i.e., the theme) feature both “rock” and “classical” rhythms, as discussed above. Then, the rhythm of this whole four-measure verse can be characterized as being mostly dominated by “rock” rhythm, with the “classical” rhythm serving only as a temporary deviation or accent in the prevailing “rock” context. The listener might struggle to associate everything in these four measures with some kind of “rock” rhythm, and to this extent, the final three beats would even be understood as a possible kind of “rock” rhythm.

This shifting meter may also be viewed as an influence of minimalist music. Macan sees the minimalist influence on the ostinato pattern of ELP’s “Infinite Space” (1971, in Tarkus). Considering the time period of this piece, the ostinato cannot be seen as an actual minimalist influence, though we, who already know minimalist music, can hear minimalist intertext in the piece and thus what Klein calls aleatoric intertextuality. Actual minimalist influences would rather be found in later Emerson pieces. For example, ELPowell’s “The Score” (1986, in Emerson, Lake and Powell) features the introduction in which a synthesizer is used only for a repetitive and percussive effect, functioning like a hi-hat cymbal, right after the entry of drums. Most recently, a number of Emerson’s pieces from the soundtrack of the film Godzilla: Final Wars (2005) are constructed almost entirely of percussive and repetitive synthesizer sounds with only a few melodies or harmonies. However, these must also be considered in relation to electronic dance music or its earlier manifestations in different forms; the percussive and repetitive patterns are not solely the result of minimalism but also of such popular genres. For Macan’s discussion on the influence of minimalism on prog rock, see his, Rocking the Classics, 138-140. On the electronic dance music and its various influences, Mark Butler’s forthcoming book, Unlocking the Groove, which is sure to contain much useful discussion.

In fact, one pattern found in many rock songs is a four-measure unit of repetition in which the first three measures are sung to a regular and simple pattern and the fourth measure features an instrumental “hook.” Examples of this pattern abound in much hard
The harmony of the first two measures, in contrast, is very unlike any “rock” style, partly because of the repeated F#-G# dyad on organ and partly because of the harmonic uncertainty created especially by a chromatic motion in the piano in the second measure. The repeated dyad in the keyboards might indeed be a reference to the music of early twentieth-century “classical” music by composers such as Bartók. The piano line of the second measure, e#2 - f#2 - d2 - a1 - c#2 - g#1 ..., can be thought of as a typically Emersonian “classical” reference, because this line can be seen as ^bb7 - ^b7 - ^b5 - ^b2 - ^4 - ^1 in g#; this can then be interpreted as an embellished version of the second half of the “Tarkus” theme, fb2-cb2-gb1-f1, which can be interpreted as a chromatic motion ^7 - ^b5 - ^b2 - ^1 in f (see Example 4.3a). Such a “classically” oriented first two measures would surely go with the “classical” aspect of the harmony of the theme, rather than its rock: e.g., Deep Purple’s “Highway Star” (1972, in Mahine Head) at the first verse; Led Zeppelin’s “Rock ‘n Roll” (1971, in IV) in the first verse; and Black Sabbath’s “Paranoid” (1970, in Paranoid), also in the first verse. Therefore, it is indeed possible to associate the final measure of the theme of “Karn Evil 9” with these hard rock pieces. My masters thesis, “Hierarchic Analysis of Rockbeat,” discusses these hard-rock pieces in greater detail.

42 When Bartók uses this kind of percussive dyad in his pieces, he tends to resort to more chromatic dyads such as 01 and 06, as can be found throughout the second movement of his Suite for Piano Solo, Op. 14, for example. I mention Bartók in particular because the Hungarian composer is clearly present in Emerson’s thinking and repertoire: he mentions Bartók’s name a number of times in interviews and covered Bartók’s Allegro Barbaro, transforming it into ELP’s “Barbarian.” I am not arguing, however, that this should be a Bartók reference; I am only suggesting the possibility. One can at least say that this dyad is quite remote from any “rock” style harmony to the extent that one can justifiably associate it with some “classical” style.

43 Emerson said that “Karn Evil 9” is “a logical extension of Tarkus (1971).” It is likely that he tried to make some connection between these pieces in terms of the chromatic motion in the main themes. For the quotation, see Stump, Music’s All That Matters, 170.
“rock” aspect, because thereby the entire four-measure unit can be viewed coherently as a “classical” intertext. Thus, the theme’s harmony tends to be seen as more “classical” than “rock.”

Similarly, the theme’s counterpoint can be considered more “classical” than “rock” in this first verse. The first two measures are certainly not written contrapuntally, because the voice and organ simply offer a G#-F# pedal point against which a single melody unfolds on piano. But in the next two measures, Emerson makes a small but important contrapuntal adjustment to the theme; he plays G#1 on his piano, as opposed to Lake’s G#2, so that the note-against-note counterpoint between the lowest and highest lines becomes more “correct” in “classical” terms. This piano line itself is an addition to the theme. Thus, this contrapuntal context provides the theme with a certain “classical” character in the first verse.

By contrast, the second verse treats the theme very differently. As noted in the right-hand margin of Example 4.11, the theme’s stylistic character at the second verse seems to be more “classical” in rhythm but more “rock” in harmony and “rock and/or classical” in counterpoint. The cseg <524130> here in the second verse works with “classical” rhythm and “rock” harmony, unlike the theme at the first verse. The homophonic texture in the keyboards and bass, which consists of a repeated unit of two eighth-notes and a quarter note, can be thought of as being derived from the “classical” rhythm of Bach’s Brandenburg Concerto No. 3, 1st movement, which starts similarly with a
Example 4.11: ELP, “Karn Evil 9” Verse 2, 1:37-

repeated unit of two sixteenth-notes and an eighth note, and which Emerson covered in 1968 as “3rd Movement: Acceptance/Brandenburger” of their “Ars Longa Vita Brevis” (1968, in *Ars Longa Vita Brevis*). The drums indeed support this “classical” tendency by de-emphasizing the backbeats in both these measures. These “classical” aspects of the rhythm in the first two measures work together with the “classical” aspect of the following main theme to emphasize the “classical” character of the whole four-measure unit. To this extent, the rhythm of the theme tends to be perceived as particularly “classical.”

The harmony of the first two measures, by contrast, tends to emphasize a certain “rock” quality. The chord progression, i – bVII\(^{M7}\) – bVI\(^{9}\text{add6}\) – V\(^{b9}\text{,11}\), is an embellished version of common “rock” progressions such as i – bVII – bVI – V. Though the extended tertian sonorities created by such notes as major seventh, ninth, eleventh, and added sixth, might be in some ways derived from “jazz” and thus represent “jazz” intertext, the root motion played by the bass emphasizes the i – bVII – bVI – V progression and can be ascribed to a typical “rock” style. This would emphasize the “rock” quality of the

---

44 The Bach rhythm mentioned here is analyzed as “normal iambs” in the theory of rhythm by Grosvenor W. Cooper and Leonard B. Meyer, and this ELP rhythm would also be analyzed similarly as normal iambs according to their theory. “Iamb” is a two-element rhythmic group, with the first element “weaker” than the second. Cooper and Meyer analyze the first two shorter notes of the Bach excerpt as together constituting the weaker element of an iamb, and the following longer note as the stronger element. For the definition of “iamb,” their analysis of the Bach example, and their reasoning of such a composite analysis, see Cooper and Meyer, *Rhythmic Structure of Music*, 6, 22 and 48.

45 For rock music’s harmonic patterns, see Moore, “Patterns of Harmony.” In his list of patterns of rock harmony, i-bVII-bVI-V appears on page 84 of his article and is among those progressions which Moore cites as appearing in a larger number of pieces than some others he considers.
following theme rather than its “classical” quality. 

The first two measures serve to add contrapuntal ambiguity to the theme. On the one hand, the outermost voices move in contrary motion as in much “classical” counterpoint, creating an intervalllic progression of 8 - 10 - 6 – 8 between the outermost voices, which is “correct” in “classical” textbook counterpoint. On the other hand, there is an obvious “rock” parallelism in Emerson’s organ part, as he simply plays minor triads and major triads in root position and produces a number of parallel fifths—a feature common in “rock” counterpoint.46 The “classical” contrapuntal quality of the first two measures may support that quality in the theme that follows, and the “rock” parallelism may support that quality in the following theme. Thus the ambiguity inherent in the theme is simply emphasized by the counterpoint of the first two measures. 

Thus, the same main theme can be seen to change its intertextual character according to the context, and the intertextual association of the cseg <524130> which is embedded in this theme is subject to change accordingly. To summarize, the theme in the first verse sounds more “rock” in rhythm and more “classical” in harmony and counterpoint, whereas in the second verse the theme sounds more “classical” in rhythm and more “rock” in 

46 Parallelism is also common in Bartok, Debussy, Ravel, etc whose compositions Emerson and other prog rock musicians often reworked, but perhaps that should not suggest “classical” quality in the parallelism. The considerable degree of predominance of parallelism in much rock music would rather suggest that prog rock musicians liked Bartok and others because the parallelism in these “classical” composers sounds familiar to rock musicians.
harmony. The cseg is originally contextualized in an ambiguous circumstance in the theme, but since the theme itself is recontextualized and is subject to musical transformations, the cseg also changes its intertextual associations. Consequently, the intertextual association of the “classical” cseg <524130> is of “thin consistency” and subject to change “by reason of tenuity.”

“Karn Evil 9” shows that all three factors of subtle/sharp intertextuality may combine to create subtle intertextuality. In this sense, this piece can be seen as a culmination of Emerson’s tendency towards subtle intertextuality.

Before proceeding to next section, it is worth noting that subtle intertextuality is certainly less obvious, though still recognizable. For Emerson, subtle intertextuality may provide a musical environment for “secret” compositional experimentation. Indeed, Emerson seems to return to the “forbidden” dialectic intertextuality in “Karn Evil 9,” thus exerting his poetic wish to recreate dialectic intertextuality according to Bloom’s sixth revisionary ratio, *apophrades.* As Example 4.12 shows, dialectic intertextuality can be

---

47 A similar kind of recontextualization occurs throughout “Karn Evil 9”; for example, in the “3rd Impression” the vocal verse that contains the cseg <524130> is played instrumentally at 2:57- and 3:26-.

48 Emerson’s wish to return to a dialectic intertextuality can be found not only in “Karn Evil 9,” but is also realized in “I Believe in Father Christmas” (1975), in which a rather sharper dialectic intertextuality finally emerges. Emerson employs an explicit “strategic” intertext from Prokofiev’s Lieutenant Kije Suite played on keyboard in the first verse (0:53-), on guitar in the second verse (1:46-), and on guitar (2:40-) and piano (2:59-) in the.
Example 4.12: ELP, “Karn Evil 9”: A Subtle Dialectic Intertextuality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Exposition”</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>“classical”</th>
<th>“1st Impression” “Part I”</th>
<th>0:00-4:51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td>“rock”</td>
<td></td>
<td>“1st Impression” “Part I”</td>
<td>4:51-8:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“1st Impression” “Part II”</td>
<td>0:00-4:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>“2nd Impression”</td>
<td>0:00-7:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Recapitulation” A”</td>
<td>“classical+rock”</td>
<td>“3rd Impression”</td>
<td>0:00-9:05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

found at the “right” point in the piece, along with the Emerson model that features a sonata-like form as well as an A-A'-B-A" form, with A' beginning in the middle of the “1st Impression: Part I.” The A section is a “classical” thesis, the A’ section a “rock” antithesis, and the A" section a “classical+rock” synthesis. Indeed, these three A sections are the only sections that contain verses, and a contrast between A and A’ sections is clear because the A’ section does not contain the cseg <524130> at all and instead features typical “rock” rhythms and slower and clear harmonic progressions. The coordination at the A" section is obtained by synthesizing the “classical” cseg <524130> of the A section and the typical “rock” rhythm of the A’ section. Following the discussion above of the third verse.

49 My A-A’ division in Example 4.11 does not correspond to the physical track division on record or the CD because the music of 4:51-8:36 of “1st Impression: Part I” is obviously the same as that of “1st Impression: Part II.” Joe Benson says this curious banding is “[b]ecause of time limitations,” but the real reason is not precisely known. See Benson, Uncle Joe’s Record Guide, 22.

50 The “classical” nature of the “3rd Impression” is described by Emerson as “Elgar-ish.”
three decisive properties, the overall intertextuality is subtle rather than sharp; and because of this intertextual subtlety, this dialectic intertextuality is not overt and seems carefully hidden in the music.

As hidden as it may seem, it does not follow that subtle intertextuality is unrecognizable; it is in fact recognizable, though in a subtle manner. Indeed, Emerson’s secret return to dialectic intertextuality was perhaps eventually noticed by his bandmates, which might be a likely artistic reason why ELP nearly stopped recording new pieces during the next four years. And when they came back with a new double album in 1977, there are only a couple of tracks recorded through collaboration; all the other tracks were recorded independently by each member of the group. This means that they virtually quit their musical relationship as early as 1973. Thus, the subtle intertextuality in “Karn Evil 9” seems not to have gone unnoticed by Lake and Palmer. There would also have been many audience members who may have noticed more than a hint of dialectic intertextuality hidden in the subtle intertextuality. Subtle intertextuality is therefore a recognizable but less obvious type of intertextuality.

The “rock” aspect of the same movement is described by Forrester as “the definitive technorock.” See the liner notes of the CD release of ELP’s Brain Slad Surgery; and Forrester, “Musical Analysis,” 202.

51 Recall the reasons previously discussed for why Emerson had to revise dialectic
Subtle Intertextuality in Interpretation

As discussed above, subtle intertextuality can be obtained by three means: (1) “stylistic” rather than “strategic” intertexts; (2) implicit intertexts by means of transformation; and (3) phenomenally transformed intertexts by means of recontextualization. A possible narrative interpretation can be developed according to some of the features derived from these three points.

First, to incorporate a “style” and not “strategy” is to depict a dramatic persona not as a figure with proper name but as a general agent. Hatten indeed argues that “stylistic” intertextuality can be construed as “an ‘anonymous’ intertextuality.” 52 A quick comparison of a narrative possibility of The Nice’s “Country Pie/ Brandenburg Concerto No. 3” (1970, in Five Bridges) with that of ELP’s “Karn Evil 9” highlights the narrative significance of this distinction. In the former case, dramatis personae in a narrative world are necessarily two specific persons with proper names such as Bob Dylan and J. S. Bach. This encourages an interpretation of the intertextual drama as conveying some very specific topics such as Dylan’s social protest on the one hand and Bach’s devotional service on the other. By contrast, in “Karn Evil 9” the listener loses any cues to interpreting the intertextual drama as having some specific sense of conversation. The dramatis personae

intertextuality at the beginning of the ELP era in Chapter Three. See also my “Can You Keep Your Balance?”

52 Hatten, “Place of Intertextuality,” 70.
are only “rock” and “classical” agents, working in anonymity. Thus the meaning is not densely embodied in the drama; the reference is not convergent but “rarefied,” and not at all “acute and pointed.”

Second, to transform intertexts and present them behind the surface of the music is to hide dramatis personae behind the stage of the drama. The audience would find the personae nowhere explicitly on stage; they discover them only implicitly. “But,” Riffaterre writes regarding implicit intertextuality:

... even when the intertext has been obliterated, the text’s hold on the reader is not affected. The fact that he is unable to decipher the hypogram of reference immediately does affect the content of his reactions, but not his perception of the grid of ungrammatical or nonsense phrases. They function as buoys marking the positions of a sunken meaning.\footnote{Riffaterre, Semiotics of Poetry, 136.}

Thus the dramatis personae do play roles, but perhaps in the backstage or in some other manner that prevents the audience from detecting the personae explicitly. The audience perhaps perceives only their voices but not their figures. The audience may well detect approximately where the voices come from backstage, but they can never be certain exactly where they are, or exactly who they are.

Third, to recontextualize intertexts and phenomenally transform them is to transfigure the dramatis personae during the course of the drama’s unfolding. As
Hanninen’s formulation of recontextualization as “phenomenal transformation” clarifies, the transformation is only “phenomenal,” not essential. *Dramatis personae* themselves do not change, but perhaps their attributes, stage settings or some circumstance change in such a way as to make the audience start wondering who the *personae* are.

To summarize, a possible drama depicted in “Karn Evil 9” can be interpreted as being played by anonymous “rock” and “classical” agents who appear somewhere implicitly on or off stage and transfigure a number of times during the drama. To understand this entire process fully, the audience is perhaps required to have a high-level competency in order to follow the story and find the anonymous, implicit, and changing *dramatis personae*. For this reason, it is very difficult to conceive of possible conversations between the “rock” and “classical” agents.

An important effect is that such a high degree of subtlety in the musical narrative would direct the audience’s attention to the drama itself, rather than encourage them to decide the “reliability” of the musical narrative too quickly. In other words, such a subtlety would contribute to preventing the listener from judging the “reliability” of the musical story simplistically, because the subtlety keeps the audience from pinpointing what, where, and how of *personae* (intertexts) within the drama (music) on which they could base their aesthetic judgment. The audience may simply find themselves at a loss for words that characterize the experience. In the case of “Country Pie/Brandenburg Concerto No. 3,” the audience can readily and quickly begin debating the “reliability” of the story,
because the intertexts/personae are obvious: Dylan and Bach. They might consider the relation between these two specific musicians to discern the “reliability” of such an unrealistic coupling of very different musical personages. In the case of “Karn Evil 9,” the audience cannot even begin debating the “reliability” of the narrative because there is simply no easy cue that helps them discern the intertexts/personae. They cannot know where to start, what to discuss, how to debate. They may find no other way than to listen to the music of “Karn Evil 9” more carefully than they would with “Country Pie/Brandenburg Concerto No.3” if they wish to start debating. But they may soon be forced to give up finding intertexts in the music because these intertexts are in a sense hidden and thus difficult to find.

If Emerson’s new approach to intertextuality is part of the reason that ELP’s popularity hit a high point in 1973, and perhaps, as a corollary, why the criticism against the band’s music seems to have decreased at about the same time, then an exploration of subtle intertextuality in Emerson’s music may indeed be crucial to an understanding of his music during this period. Considering also that other golden-era prog-rock pieces by other groups also feature some degree of subtle intertextuality, it is of utmost importance to further investigate the range of different manifestations of subtle intertextuality in order to better understand the historical development of progressive rock as a whole. As has been argued throughout this dissertation, clear-cut “double-voicedness” is not the only form of intertextuality. More subtle kinds of intertextuality played a crucial—and perhaps more delicate—role in the history of the “rock-classical” musical mixture.
CHAPTER 5

MULTI-PLY INTERTEXTUALITY:
REFERENCE AND ALLUSION IN “PIANO CONCERTO NO. 1” (1977)

Keith Emerson seems to have directed his experimental attention gradually to semantic aspects of music during the ELP years and to have established what I call “multi-ply intertextuality” in his “Piano Concerto No.1” (1977, in Works, vol. 1), probably the first piano concerto composed by a rock musician. “Multi-ply intertextuality” can be understood in contrast with what I call “single-ply intertextuality.” By “single-ply intertextuality,” I mean a form of intertextuality in which several intertexts (“style” or “strategy”) form a flat hierarchy, as Example 5.1a illustrates graphically. Bahktin’s

---

1 The reason I use “-ply” instead of “-layered” is because the levels implied here are not to be confused with music-analytical, or Schenkerian structural levels. The structure to be discussed in this chapter is strictly of a semantic kind and not of a syntactic kind, as will become clearer in the course of this chapter.

2 The term “flat hierarchy” is perhaps first used by a social scientist of “system theory,” Herbert Simon. It designates a group of elements that are not arranged or distributed in a layered manner. If a book is comprised of chapters from one through four and if each of the chapters is not subdivided into smaller sections, then that book’s structure is regarded as a flat hierarchy. But if there are subsections in each chapter, that book is structured as a normal hierarchy. See Simon, “Architecture of Complexity.”
Example 5.1: Single-Ply Intertextuality and Multi-Ply Intertextuality

a. Single-Ply Intertextuality

b. Multi-Ply Intertextuality

“double-voiced discourse” may correspond to this model. ³ By a “multi-ply

³ In Dialogic Imagination, at page 273, Bakhtin says, “heteroglossia, as organized in these low genres ... was parodic, and aimed sharply and polemically against the official languages of its given time,” (emphases added) thus presuming two interacting intertexts—“low genres” and “official languages”—as autonomous “units” which together constitute the “doubleness” but which are not “double” in themselves. It is important to add that Bakhtin does not necessarily think that these intertexts are unitary languages, since he writes “[l]anguage ... is never unitary.” (ibid. p. 288) And yet, when Bakhtin discusses the doubleness of discourse, he tends to treat each element of the “double” as a unitary whole, which is presumably the reason so many scholars have been referring to his idea of “the double-voicedness” as constituting of two units each of which is not itself
intertextuality,” by contrast, I mean a form of intertextuality that grows hierarchically through bifurcation of (an) intertext(s) into several (sub-)intertexts to make a kind of tree diagram, as Example 5.1b shows visually. The initial intertextuality as the basis of a multi-ply intertextuality can be called first-level intertextuality, and the intertextuality that arises directly from one of the intertexts of the first-level intertextuality can be called second-level intertextuality. Of course, deeper-level intertextualities such as third-level, fourth-level, etc. intertextuality are also possible. Kristeva’s notion of intertextuality may roughly correspond to a multi-ply intertextuality.⁴

It is possible to wonder if such a distinction could be ascribed entirely to differences in viewpoint between distinct observers, and challenge whether this distinction can be established as a hard fact; Bakhtinian views would indeed explain everything in terms of single-ply intertextuality, whereas Kristevan views would prefer multi-ply intertextuality. While it is true that these models reflect an interpretive difference, it is also crucial to see that certain musical characteristics, and especially a certain context, may strongly invite one interpretation over the other. That is, if one focuses on the supposed response of the intended audience of a specific historical period, it can be observed that certain kinds of

⁴ Kristeva admits absolutely no autonomous “units” as intertexts of “poetic language”; she argues, “poetic language functions as a tabular model, where each ‘unit’ (this word can no longer be used without quotation marks, since every unit is double) acts as a multi-determined peak.” See Kristeva, “Word, Dialogue and Novel,” 40; Semeiotiké, 89. Emphases are original. The parenthesized annotation is also original. Compare this quotation with Bakhtin’s remarks in the previous footnote.
intertextuality *tend* to be interpreted by the audience in one way and not the other.\(^5\)

Two examples might be helpful at this point and offer an opportunity to clarify these terms somewhat before moving to further theoretical elaboration. One first example is Procol Harum’s “A Whiter Shade of Pale” (1967, in *A Whiter Shade Of Pale*). As shown in Example 5.2a, it is surely a multi-ply intertextuality in principle, because the piece is not only intertextual between “classical” and “rock” intertexts as we have seen previously, but also because the “classical” intertext consists of two different pieces, J. S. Bach’s “Air on a G String” (from the Orchestral Suite, No. 3 in D major, BWV 1068, c1729) and his cantata “Wachet Auf, Ruft Uns die Stimme” (BWV 140, c1725), which may together constitute a

---

\(^5\) This position might sound like that of such “historicists” as Richard Crocker, Leeman Perkins, David Schuluenberg, and Richard Taruskin, who argue for the study of ideas in music of the past as understood by those who are contemporaneous with the music. At the other extreme, there are of course such “presentists as Carolyn Abbate, Rose Rosengard Subotnik, Lawrence Kramer, and Allen Forte, who argue for studying older music through using today’s latest analytical/hermeneutic tools. I take my position to be grounded in the middle, somewhere between these two extremes, since the perspective using such newly developed terms as “intertextuality” is admittedly presentist, whereas the exclusive focus on the understanding by the contemporaneous audience seems historicist. Even though it may certainly be interesting to note that the word “intertextuality” was born in the late 1960s, which is exactly the same period as the emergence of progressive rock, I am currently studying intertextuality not because it was prog rock’s contemporary term but rather because of a usefulness that has been demonstrated by many later scholars. For attempts to sort out these and other different positions in music studies, see, for example, Christensen, “Music Theory and Its Histories”; Schubert, “Authentic Analysis”; Haimo, “Atonality, Analysis, and the Intentional Fallacy”; Lockwood, “On Current Trends in Musicology”; and Agawu, “Analyzing Music under the New Musicological Regime.”

a. Procol Harum, “A Whiter Shade of Pale”

b. BST, “40,000 Headmen”
second-level intertextuality. However, the 1967 rock audience, for whom the piece was primarily written and recorded, is very likely to generalize both these Bach pieces only as a single “classical” intertext in their semantic interpretation. At least nothing prevents the audience from disregarding the second-level intertextuality and regarding the overall referential structure as single-ply intertextuality.

On the other hand, “40,000 Headmen” (1970, in Blood, Sweat & Tears 3) by Blood, Sweat & Tears (BST), offers a different and, in many ways, more complicated example. As Example 5.2b shows, this piece also features multi-ply intertextuality: an East-West intertextuality from the borrowed Prokofiev’s “Romance” (from his “Lieutenant Kije”

---

6 The “rock” intertext of this piece, according to Holm-Hudson, is made of Dylanesque lyrics and a double-keyboard instrumentation with a piano and an organ which is also derivative of Dylan’s recent music. This is stylistic rather than strategic intertext as it is discussed in chapter 4, and one might wonder why stylistic intertext such as this is placed on the same level as strategic intertexts such as Bach’s pieces in Ex .5.2a. While I admit that the diagrams in the examples throughout this chapter tend to be general and need further sophistication in the future, I also argue that our (or, at least my) aesthetic experience of music is not that cleanly organized; in my honest hearing, and as many Gestalt psychologists would also argue, something more familiar comes first and something less familiar comes next, no matter whether it is stylistic or strategic. For Holm Hudson’s commentary on the Dylan intertext, see his “Introduction,” 6-7.

7 The two Bach intertexts would be indeed regarded as just one “classical” intertext all the more because these are also considered derived from some “non-classical” sources. One such source is Percy Sledge’s “When A Man Loves A Woman” (1966, in When A Man Loves A Woman and Other Hits). I owe Prof. John Covach for letting me know about this connection. This connection is also noted in Gillet, Sound of the City, 2nd ed. 394. Another “non-classical” source is, surprisingly or not, Bob Dylan. According to Mike Bloomfield who is the guitarist who played with Dylan in the 1960s, “the cycle of chord changes that he [Bob Dylan] introduced ... became so widely imitated and used—those were the chord changes that later became ‘When a Man Loves a Woman’ and ‘Whiter Shade of Pale’.” Quoted in May, “AWSoP and its composers.” These connections with “non-classical” sources would further distract the audience’s attention from the contrast
Suite, 1934) may be found at the third level; Traffic’s “Forty Thousand Headmen” (1968, in Traffic) which is also borrowed may create an intertextuality with funk and the 1960s hardrock styles at the second level and a rock-ethnic intertextuality at the third level; and so on. Although some of these intertextualities, especially those at the third level, may be less crucial in the long run, this BST piece tends to resist a generalized interpretation, mainly but not exclusively because of the reference to Traffic and funk. When this BST piece was released in 1970, Traffic’s music was still a fresh style distinct from many other “rock” bands’ music, and funk was also a newly emerging style that sounded distinct from any existing “rock” styles. Faced with the “novelty” of these styles, the 1970 rock audience perhaps would have still been perceiving the differences, more than the similarities, between these new styles on the one hand, and existing “rock” styles on the other. It might have been difficult for the audience to subsume these new styles under the heading of “rock” quickly; the audience could have resisted generalizing them into a single “rock” intertext in their interpretation. The BST piece, therefore, tends to show multi-ply rather than single-ply intertextuality.

The difference between single-ply and multi-ply intertextualities is therefore the

---

8 The Prokofiev piece was a Russian composition from 1934, which is far removed from the 1970 audience of the West; though the physical location in which Prokofiev wrote Lieutenant Kije Suite was outside Russia, he composed it on a Russian commission. It may be interesting to note that the East-West intertextuality in this Prokofiev piece appears to be detected by some later rock musicians. For example, in his song “Russians” (1985, in Dream Of The Blue Turtles), Sting uses the Prokofiev piece and sings about the cold war between Soviet and America. For Prokofiev’s East-West sensibility, see discussions in

213
“novelty” of a certain deeper-level intertext; if one deeper-level intertext is “novel” for a specific audience, the overall referential structure tends to be interpreted as a multi-ply intertextuality because the novel intertext tends not to be erased easily in the listener’s mind, even if it is a second- or third-level intertext. If the listener finds no “novelty” in the first level, then no intertextuality would result. For an intertextuality to exist at all, there should at least be a novel combination of intertexts at the first level.

The notion of “novelty” should be understood in a strictly relative sense as one stage in the cognitive sequence of the mind’s acquisition of new knowledge. Robert Hatten’s elaboration on semiotologist Charles Sanders Peirce’s well-known trichotomy—“firstness,” “secondness,” and “thirdness”—is helpful in this context. According to Hatten, if X is followed by Q instead of Y in the context where X is normally followed by Y, one perceives Q just as a pure “novelty” (and “surprise”) at the “firstness” stage of cognition; at the “secondness” stage, Q is understood relatively as “not Y”; and at the “thirdness” stage Q is systematically integrated into the existing knowledge as a strategic negation of Y. Especially in the secondness stage, “novel” material such as Q tends to be contrasted with a less novel and therefore expected material such as Y, creating an expected-nonexpected opposition/intertextuality. Time, however, will change the interpretation of pure “novelty” to a relative “novelty,” and finally to a marked value; pure or relative novelty will never last forever. And in this

9 If the listener finds no “novelty” in the first level, then no intertextuality would result. For an intertextuality to exist at all, there should at least be a novel combination of intertexts at the first level.

10 Hatten, Musical Meaning in Beethoven, 261. Peirce uses this trichotomy recursively at many different levels of his studies. An introductory discussion on the trichotomy is found in Peirce, Collected papers, I. 300-353.

11 Hatten, Musical Meaning in Beethoven, 263-266.

12 This formulation should be understood only as Hatten’s reading/application of Peirce’s
sense, the notion of “novelty” is strictly context-dependent in that one could not even talk about three stages without knowing the context in which X is normally followed by Y. The difference between single-ply and multi-ply intertextualities is the difference in the way a musician who knows the context relates him/herself to it.

Considered in this way, most of the intertextuality in Emerson’s music up to 1977 can be more or less interpreted as single-ply intertextuality because of his specific choice of intertexts. His “Piano Concerto No. 1” (1977, in ELP, *Works, vol. 1*), however, seems to be an attempt to evade an interpretation in terms of single-ply intertextuality; in this piece he seems to choose certain apparently “novel” intertexts that cannot easily be generalized into first-level intertexts. Also from the perspective of narrativity, multi-ply intertextuality can be seen as a natural result in Emerson’s stylistic development, because the proliferation of intertexts obscures the identity of *persona* in the musical drama even further than subtle intertextuality does.

To substantiate this claim, the rest of this chapter first explores the construction of “novelty” in the use of intertexts and shows how Emerson tended to use single-ply intertextuality before 1977. Next, multi-ply intertextuality in his “Piano Concerto No. 1”

---

theory and not necessarily as representative of many semiologists’ understanding of Peirce. For example, Patrice Guinard skillfully analyzes Peirce’s trichotomy in great detail and concludes, “There is no implication of temporal succession in this terminology: a ‘first thing’ (a being of Firstness) is not something which comes *before* ... They are simultaneously present to the mind ... .” Nevertheless, I interpret the theory as something related to temporal dimension as Hatten does. For Guinard’s analysis, see his “Critical Analysis of Peirce’s Semiotics.”
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is examined in detail. At the end of this chapter, a possible narrative interpretation of multi-ply intertextuality in terms of Peircean narrative is explored.

**Multi-Ply Intertextuality in Context**

The “novelty” of “rock” and “classical” intertexts is strongly determined by the audience’s conceptions of what can be considered “rock” and “classical” music of the time. The late 1960s and 1970s prog-rock audience tended to hold very specific conceptions of “rock” and “classical” music. Interestingly enough, “rock” music in their mind did not include prog rock itself; prog rock was for them more advanced kind of music than just “rock,” and therefore ideologically, a sharp distinction was made between prog rock and “rock.” Paul Stump reports an ideological situation surrounding the late 1960s and early 1970s rock audience: “‘Guitarist/writer seeks receptive musicians determined to strive beyond existing stagnant music forms’ – small ads of this kind multiplied virally in the crepuscular murk of the back end of the *Melody Maker* ....”  

Stump also cites the prog-rock group Egg “stating baldly on the back of their first album that theirs was serious music which was ‘not for dancing to’.” Prog rock musicians of the time thus appears to draw a clear line between their own music and kinds of music that were “for dancing” and

---

14 Stump, *Music’s All That Matters*, 78.
which were rejected as “existing stagnant music forms.” Bill Martin formulates the idea of “rock” as “blues orthodoxy”:

[A] demarcation opens up between rock music that will remain more closely tied to the blues form and to the electric guitar, and rock music that explores other possibilities ... [M]y term for the insistence that only the former is “real” or “authentic” rock music is “blues orthodoxy” ... Looked at this way, we might also consider that progressive rock straddles various lines as well, with one foot in the kind of rock music that rejects blues orthodoxy, and the other foot perhaps out of rock music altogether: From the perspective of blues orthodoxy, this kind of music really isn’t rock music at all.  

Despite the fact that prog rock is also rock, prog-rock musicians tended to distinguish blues-based rock from more experimental kind of music, and often, if not always, tried to reject the former. Indeed, as Allan Moore clarifies, the “search for origins in the blues” was “the key element in the ideological (as opposed to music-stylistic) identification of ‘rock’ as a separate music from ‘pop’.” They ideologically—and erroneously—believed that blues practices by black musicians were “authentic,” “natural,” “pure,” “spontaneous,” and “genuine.” And it is such an ideologically blues-oriented “rock” that progressive

---

15 Martin, Listening to the Future, 51-52. Critics such as Lester Bangs, Robert Christgau and others, writing in the magazines such as Rolling Stone and Creem and obviously from the perspectives of “blues orthodoxy,” declared that progressive rock was no kind of rock. See Macan’s discussion on these critics in Macan, Rocking the Classics, 167-178.

16 Moore, Rock: The Primary Text, 74.

17 Such an ideology of blues as authentic etc. is obviously racist, but still, as Moore argues, “this erroneous belief clearly affected the music.” See Moore, Rock: The Primary Text, 75. This “blues ideology” is naively discussed even in some academic writings on blues music. See, for example, Keil, Urban Blues; Small, Music of the Common Tongue; Frith, Sound Effects; and Wicke, Rock Music.
rock musicians in turn tried to separate themselves from. Thus they tended to generalize all kinds of blues-oriented music as “blues orthodoxy.” Any musical material that could be related to blues, such as I-V-IV-I progressions, twelve-bar form, straightforward regular rhythms, poppy-sounding vocal music, and so forth, were all considered constituents of “rock.” In a list of such supposedly blues-oriented “rock” groups from whom progressive rock was considered separate, Macan even includes such new and diverse groups and musicians as: The Beatles, Bob Dylan, the Rolling Stones, the Who, the Yardbirds, Cream, Jimi Hendrix, Procol Harum, the Doors, and Jefferson Airplane. In the circle of progressive rock musicians and audience members, music that features blues characteristics and that is played by bands and musicians such as these was all generally of the same kind; and it was all something that had to be transcended.

Prog-rock musicians’ conception of “classical” music was also of a very particular cast. They did not always distinguish between different styles of “classical” music; they had a very general and vague idea of “classical” music. As John Covach makes clear:

[S]uch diverse art-music characteristics as baroque-era counterpoint, romantic-era virtuosity, and modernist rhythmic syncopation and sectional juxtaposition, for instance, seem to coexist comfortably and without any sense of historical incongruity within much progressive-rock music. One gets the sense that for these rock musicians, as well as for the audience for whom they compose, record, and perform their music, all of these borrowings are of the

---


19 Macan, *Rocking the Classics*, 167-168. This list may be controversial; for example, Moore discusses “progressive” aspects in the use of blues in the music of Cream. Cream’s use of blues is also discussed extensively by Dave Headlam. See Moore, *Rock: The Primary Text*, 76-80; and Headlam, “Blues Transformation.” John Covach also doubts Macan’s list.
same kind: “classical.”

This “classical” music was, as Covach also says, “‘classical music’ mostly as it is understood in the modern concert culture that promotes Western art music—a culture that can sometimes foster an image of the art-music tradition that is quite different from the ways in which that tradition is understood by musicologists and theorists.” To understand more concretely the repertoire that was borrowed in much prog rock music, the list in Example 5.3 would be helpful. It is created as a kind of “chart” of “classical” composers whose music is often used in rock music. The composers’ names are arranged in the order of the number of entries to Duxbury’s three-volume directory. Though the number of entries to Duxbury’s volumes does not necessarily reflect the prog-rock audience’s image of “classical” music quite accurately, it certainly reflects some factual part of the phenomenon. One may notice many composers whom we encounter in twentieth-century “classical” concerts in Western culture, though this list does

---

22 Duxbury, Rockin’ the Classics and Classicizin’ the Rock; its Supplement; and its Second Supplelement.
23 Indeed, counting the number of entries to Duxbury’s volumes is not sufficient at all. It is necessary at least to consider the impact of each “classical” borrowing in order to examine the real image of “classical” music held among the prog-rock musicians and audience of the time. For example, in the “chart” in Example 5.3, Vaughan Williams appears only at #82, despite the fact that his musical idiom is considered significantly influential on progressive rock in general, probably mostly because of his influence on such “super groups” as Yes and ELP. See Macan, “Spirit of Albion.”
Example 5.3: “Hot 100” of Classical Composers in Rock Music (based on Duxbury)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th># of entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Bach, J.S.</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Beethoven</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mozart, W. A.</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Tchaikovsky, Peter Ilich</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Grieg, Edvard</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Chopin, Frederic</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Handel, George Frideric</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Vivaldi, Antonio</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Stravinsky, Igor</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Gershwin, George</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Rimsky-Korsakov, Nicolas</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Paganini, Nicolo</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Weill, Kurt</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Holst, Gustav Theodore</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Rachmaninoff, Sergei</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Ravel, Maurice</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Wagner, Richard</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Prokofiev, Sergei</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Rossini, Gioacchino Antonio</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Debussy, Claude</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Liszt, Franz</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Schubert, Franz</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Musorgsky, Modest</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Brahms, Johannes</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Bizet, Georges</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Verdi, Giuseppe</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Puccini, Giacomo</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Dvorak, Antonin</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Glass, Philip</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Pachelbel, Johann</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Strauss, Johann, Jr.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Strauss, Richard</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Bartók, Bela</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Saint-Saens, Camille</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Satie, Erik</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Albimoni, Tomaso</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Mendelssohn, Felix</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Gounod, Charles François</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Elgar, Sir Edward</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Purcell, Henry</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Copland, Aaron</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Khatchaturian, Aram</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Haydn, Franz Joseph</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Orff, Carl</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Borodin, Alexander</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Offenbach, Jacques</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Ginastera, Alberto</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Mahler, Gustav</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Berlioz, Hector</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Schumann, Robert</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th># of entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Sibelius, Jean</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Albeniz, Isaac MF</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Branca, Glenn</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Falla, Manuel de,</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Faure, Gabriel</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Smetana, Bedrich</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Suppé, Franz von</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Villa-Lobos, Heitor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Bernstein, Leonard</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Bach, C.P.E.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Cage, John</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Ives, Charles</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Varese, Edgard</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Delibes, Clement Philibert</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Shostakovich, Dmitri</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Barber, Samuel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Boulez, Pierre</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Gilbert, Sir William S.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Leoncavallo, Ruggiero</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Monteverdi, Claudio</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Scarlatti, Domenico</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Bingen, Hildegard von</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Bocherini, Luigi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Bruckner, Anton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Delius, Frederik</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Donizetti, Gaetano</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Dowland, John</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Dukas, Paul</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Glazunov, Alexander</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Sarasate, Pablo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Scriabin, Alexander</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Vaughan Williams, Ralph</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Adams, John</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Boellmann, Leon</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Corelli, Arcangelo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Gluck, Christoph Willibald</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Górecki, Henryk</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Gulda, Friedrich</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Hoffmann, Wolf</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Janacek, Leos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Mascagni, Pietro</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Massenet, Jules</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Morley, Thomas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Palestrina, Giovanni Pierluigi da</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Pärt, Arvo</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Respighi, Ottorino</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>Stockhausen, Karlheinz</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Strauss, Johann, Sr.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>Sullivan, Sir Arthur</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>Telemann, Georg Philipp</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
not neatly correspond to the list of composers whom one would study in a university music department.

According to Macan, prog rock musicians borrowed from these “classical” composers such general stylistic features as: the programmatic multimovement suite and the symphonic poem; “systematic juxtapositions of what can best be termed masculine and feminine sections”; “building up tension until a shattering climax is reached, abruptly tapering off, and then starting the whole process anew”; “improvisatory quality”; economical use of musical ideas; virtuosity; unusual meters; polyrhythms; fugues; modal harmony; bitonality; whole-tone harmony; variety of timbres; etc. As long as these characteristics were present, musical material was considered “classical.” (more on this later in this chapter)

In a situation where these specific ideologies prevail, the choice of intertext greatly affects the resulting form of intertextuality. If several intertexts are chosen from within the blues-based rock repertoire, then all of them would be generalized into a single “rock” intertext, and no contrast at the second level would be particularly sustained, thus making the referential structure a single-ply intertextuality. If, in contrast, one intertext is taken from the blues-oriented style and another is taken from non-blues rock, then the distinction between “rock” and a different kind of rock would so stand out such that the intertextuality between these kinds of rock would be recognized at the second level of referential structure,
thus creating a multi-ply intertextuality. Similarly, if several intertexts are chosen all from
the “chart-topping” “classical” composers, then all of them would be taken to be the same
“classical” music, thus creating single-ply intertextuality. If, by contrast, one intertext is
taken from a chart-topping “classical” composer and another from Western art music that is
outside of the chart, then the contrast between these intertexts would stand out such that the
intertextuality between them would be sustained in the referential structure, thus making for
a multi-ply intertextuality.

Considered this way, most of Emerson’s pieces with The Nice and earlier in his ELP
period than “Piano Concerto No. 1” (1977, in ELP, Works, vol. 1) can be interpreted as
instances of single-ply intertextuality. In the early years, there were some pieces that
could be interpreted as being multi-ply, but even those pieces can be interpreted
alternatively as instances of single-ply intertextuality. Only in the time leading up to 1977
does a tendency towards a multi-ply intertextuality become apparent.

During the years of The Nice and early ELP, multi-ply intertextuality is certainly
suggested, even if it is not made evident. Three examples will illustrate this point. The
first example is The Nice’s “Country Pie/Brandenburg Concerto No. 6” (1970, in Five
Bridges). As Example 5.4 shows, this piece is a mixture of “rock” and “classical”intertexts at the first level. The piece contains borrowings from Bob Dylan’s “Country
Pie” (1969, in Nashville Skyline), the southern British rock style of the 1950s and 1960s,

---

24 Macan, Rocking the Classics, 30-56.
and J. S. Bach’s “Brandenburg Concerto No. 6, iii” (c1718) at the second level. Third-level intertextualities can be observed in the Dylan song; there is an intertextuality of the acoustic folk-rock style of the pre-1965 Dylan and the electrified rock style which

Example 5.4: The Nice, “Country Pie/ Brandenburg Concerto No. 6” (1969, in Five Bridges)

25 From the 1950s to 1960s there was something called the rhythm and blues revival especially in southern parts of England such as Brighton where Emerson grew up, and a certain genre was formed by those musicians and groups who were influenced by American blues and wanted to play it with loud electric guitar sound. Emerson and Jackson were members of one of such “Rhythm and Blues” groups called The VIP’s. Other notable groups include the Yardbirds and the Troggs, who contributed greatly to the creation of hard rock in the late 1960s and early 1970s. So the term rhythm and blues denotes something very different from its American counterpart which is often related to the Motown sound. A fully separate study about rhythm and blues is necessary to further discuss this issue.
Dylan incorporated in 1965. More third-level intertextuality may be found in the Bach piece, which can be seen as a mixture of Italian concerto style and Italian trio sonata style. Certainly the Dylan song was still new enough to remind the listener of its intertextuality, but finally both of these third-level intertextualities are likely to be generalized away and erased in the listener’s understanding of the referential structure of the piece. As mentioned above, Dylan was already in Macan’s list of “rock” musicians from whom progressive rock must be separate. No matter what kind of intertextuality Dylan may incorporate, Dylan is simply no more than “rock” in the prog-rock audience’s ideology, and therefore the acoustic-electric intertextuality that may have been important for Dylan fans was perhaps not as important for prog rock listeners. In the case of the Bach intertextuality, the audience of the time perhaps did not have the necessary stylistic competency to detect such styles within the Bach piece; such a stylistic competency would be held only among some who have a very refined knowledge of early music. The 50s-60s British rock style, as represented perhaps by Jackson’s vocal and the overall “rock” rhythm, can be merged with the Dylan intertext into a “rock” intertext at the first level, because both Dylan and such 50s-60s British rock were indeed considered to share blues qualities. Therefore, the 1969 listeners for whom The Nice piece was written and performed might simply have erased the second- and third-level intertextualities in their

26 Dylan’s style change from acoustic folk rock to electrified rock that occurred in 1965 is a very well-known, controversial story and well documented; almost any book on Dylan’s biography mentions it. For example, see Shelton, No Direction Home, 301-304.
28 See Moore, Rock: The Primary Text, 73-74, for a blues influence on the 1950s and 1960s
A second example is The Nice’s “Rondo 69” (1969, in Nice), two kinds of interpretation of which are shown in Example 5.5. As discussed in Chapter Three with Example 3.2, this recording is a revision of the 1967 version of the same piece, with additional “classical” intertexts such as: Dukas’s “Sorcerer’s Apprentice” (1879); Holst’s “Mars, the Bringers of War” (1918); Bach’s Italian Concerto (BWV 971, c1735); Partita No. 3 (BWV 1006, 1725); and Brandenburg Concerto No. 3, (BWV 1048, c1711). Thus, the 1967 version can be considered an intertext, along with these additional intertexts, as shown in the second level of Example 5.5a. And since this 1967 version is already a mixture of jazz pianist Dave Brubeck’s 1959 piece, “Blue Rondo a la Turk” (in Time Out) with elements of the British rock style of the day as well as Bach’s Toccata and Fugue in D minor (c1708), one can observe the third-level intertextuality of these materials. Of course one can even see a fourth-level intertextuality in the Brubeck piece between Janissary music, jazz, and Mozartian rondo style. Certainly, such a fourth-level intertextuality may be too far removed chronologically from the intended audience of The Nice’s 1969 recording to expect them to be recognized. But recognition of the third- and second-level intertextualities may at least be possible, especially because of the reference to British rock, which was sometimes called rhythm and blues.

29 The issues on how today’s listener would hear these 1970s intertextuality constitute an entirely separate topic of further exploration. This dissertation generally limits itself to the intertextuality as it may have been understood by the audience of the time.
The Nice’s earlier piece; The Nice is one of the earliest and most important prog-rock groups that are supposedly separate from blues-oriented “rock.” The audience likely remembered the 1967 version and retained its Brubeck-rock-Bach intertextuality, as represented at the third level of this diagram. Though all the “classical” intertexts at the second level may be generalized into a “classical” intertext at the first level, The Nice’s 1967 piece and its

Example 5.5: The Nice, “Rondo 69” (1969, in Nice)

a. Interpretation #1
intertextuality may not easily be categorized into a “rock” intertext at the first level (hence the question mark following “rock” in the example). A possibility for this piece to be interpreted in terms of multi-ply intertextuality is certainly present.

On the other hand, another aspect of the 1969 revision is that it demands the listener to pretend to hear the revised version as if it is the original version. Even if the listener remembers the original 1967 version, she is aesthetically required to pretend to forget the 1967 version. As Example 5.5b shows, if the 1967 version are eliminated from the

---

30 This type of aesthetic response is well formulated throughout Kendall Walton’s *Mimesis as Make-Believe*. 
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diagram because of this pretense, all the original third- and second-level intertexts except the 1967 version form a single line across the second level of “interpretation #2.” Further, all these second-level intertexts can be grouped neatly into “jazz,” “rock,” and “classical” intertexts of the first level. According to this reading, the second-level intertextualities might easily vanish in the listener’s understanding of the referential structure. “Rondo 69” can thus be interpreted as single-ply intertextuality; nothing prevents such a hearing.

A third example is ELP’s “Nutrocker” (1971), shown in Example 5.6. This is a cover version of B. Bumble and the Stingers’s “Nut Rocker” (1962), combined with hard rock and blues styles, as the second level of Example 5.6a shows. The original B. Bumble piece is a reworking of Tchaikovsky’s famous “Marche” from his “Nutcracker” Suite (1892) with Honky Tonk and ‘50s-‘60s rock styles. Since the B. Bumble piece is distinct from the “blues ideology” because of its incorporation of “classical” material, this material may be understood as “novel” and the audience may hear multi-ply intertextuality as the diagram marked “interpretation #1” shows.

But since B. Bumble and the Stingers was already an old band and almost ten years had passed since they hit the charts in 1962, this 1972 ELP cover may also tend to be interpreted as single-ply intertextuality. As shown in Example 5.6b, the listener may

---

31 “Honky Tonk” is a style that originated in the southern barrooms of the United States in the late nineteenth century, where an often poorly maintained piano (owing to the humidity) would accompany dancers on the dance floor. This style would later figure in the origins of country music.
Example 5.6: ELP, “Nutrocker” (1971)

a. Interpretation #1

b. Interpretation #2
notice only the Tchaikovsky piece, honky tonk style, 50s-60s rock style, and blues, in the ELP version, categorizing them squarely into “classical” and “rock” intertexts; all the “rock” side intertexts are indeed more or less related to blues. Consequently, the listener may simply try to understand the piece as a juxtaposition of a “classical” intertext and a “rock” intertext, without particularly hearing the second-level intertextuality in this second interpretation. Every reference in the piece then tends to be subsumed under “rock” or “classical” intertext at the first level.

In most of the later ELP pieces, the semantic tree diagram can be very simple and single-ply, as shown in Example 5.7. In “The Only Way” (1971, in Tarkus), for example, two Bach pieces are borrowed directly and juxtaposed at the second level, but the audience may not be expected to have the stylistic competency detect the intertextuality between them. Thus both Bach pieces are most likely to be generalized into a single “classical” intertext at the first level. In other pieces such as “Abbadon’s Bolero” (1972, in Trilogy) and “Fugue” (1972, in Trilogy), specific pieces are referred to and located at the second level of the diagram, but they do not necessarily form any intertextuality at that level. Only in “Karn Evil 9, 2nd Impression” (1973, in Brain Salad Surgery) does Emerson appear to resort to a multi-ply intertextuality by referring to the horror-film style. While it is difficult to decide whether the horror-film style is “classical” music or a more popular style, it clear that it has nothing to do with “rock.”

In this way, most of Emerson’s pieces before 1977 tend to be single-ply. He appears to make a simple dichotomy between “rock” and “classical” styles that can be easily comprehended. Inherent here is a simple triangular structure; “progressive rock” is inherently defined as a mixture of “classical” and “rock” intertexts. This comprehensibility was perhaps one of the key features of ELP’s early pieces for most listeners.
Multi-Ply Intertextuality in “Piano Concerto No. 1” (1977)

In his “Piano Concerto No. 1” (1977, in *Works, vol. 1*) Emerson incorporates certain intertexts that could not be subsumed easily under the common headings of “rock” and “classical.” For he chooses “novel” kinds of material for deeper-level intertexts. **Example 5.8** diagrams the referential structure of the piece; the “classical” intertext is now “German” music with “non-German” materials; a question mark follows because “German” music did not constitute a prevailing conception of “classical” music. For “rock” intertext

**Example 5.8: Emerson, Piano Concerto No. 1: Diagram**

![Diagram of intertextual relationships in “Piano Concerto No. 1”]

“German”

“non-German”

“Classical”?

early ‘70s prog

“Rock”?

“Rock”

“Classical”

“Piano Concerto No. 1”

Third Level

Second Level

First Level
he chooses early progressive rock materials, and a question mark is put after “rock” because prog rock did not formerly constitute the prevailing conception of “rock.”

To begin our discussion of this piece, note that the word “classical” is followed by a question mark in this diagram because it refers to both “German” and “non-German” music, as just mentioned. To understand this, one may briefly review the “Hot 100” in Example 5.3 and notice the disproportionately large number of nineteenth- and twentieth-century “nationalist” or “non-German” composers (shown in regular font and not in boldface). “Austro-German” composers (shown in boldface) certainly find their ways into this list, starting from Bach, Beethoven, and Mozart, but they appear only occasionally and most of the list could be seen as occupied by “non-German” composers. Indeed as Macan elucidates, such early twentieth-century nationalist composers as Stravinsky and Bartók, as well as Vaughan Williams and Holst, exerted a significant influence on the English progressive rock movement, including The Nice and ELP. This influence is not confined to overt musical quotation, but also includes stylistic borrowings. As Macan writes:

This “nationalist” influence undoubtedly contributed to some of the most characteristic elements of English progressive rock: the juxtaposition of blocks of goal-oriented and static harmonic material, the seasoning of the modal harmonic syntax with more pungent sonorities (bitonal, whole-tone-derived quartal, polytriadic), the energetic rhythms and the frequent recourse to shifting and asymmetrical meters and polymeters and, perhaps, even the use of thematic transformation ... .

Thus, despite such “top three” “German” composers as Bach, Beethoven, and Mozart in the

---

“chart,” a tendency was certainly to use “non-German” materials (i.e. materials by “non-German” composers) in progressive rock music.

This tendency toward heavy use of nineteenth- and twentieth-century “nationalist” composers is even more evident in Emerson’s pieces. **Example 5.9** gives a list of Emerson’s pieces that use some “classical” materials in a notable manner. One may quickly notice those “non-German” composers such as Sibelius, Tchaikovsky, Bernstein, and Dvorak as “classical” sources (shown at the right column), but no composers from German-speaking areas except for Bach.

**Example 5.9: Select “Classical Rock” Recordings by Keith Emerson, 1968-77**

**with The Nice:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Album</th>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>“Classical” Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Ars Longa Vita Brevis</td>
<td>“Acceptance/Brandenburger”</td>
<td>Bach, Brandenburg Concerto No.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Five Bridges</td>
<td>“Intermezzo from the Karelia Suite”</td>
<td>Sibelius, “Karelia” Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Pathetique”</td>
<td>Tchaikovsky, Symphony No. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Country Pie/ Brandenburg Concerto no.6”</td>
<td>Bach, Brandenburg Concerto No. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Elegy</td>
<td>“America”</td>
<td>Bernstein, <em>West Side Story</em>, Dvorak, Symphony No.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**with Emerson, Lake and Palmer:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Album</th>
<th>Piece</th>
<th>“Classical” Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Emerson, Lake and Palmer</td>
<td>“The Barbarian”</td>
<td>Bartok, Allegro Barbaro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Knife-Edge”</td>
<td>Janacek, Sinfonietta; Bach, French Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Tarkus</td>
<td>“The Only Way”</td>
<td>Bach, Toccata in F; Bach, Prelude No. 6 in d minor from WTC Book I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Pictures at an Exhibition</td>
<td>“Pictures at an Exhibition”</td>
<td>Musorgsky, suite; in multi-movement format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Nutrocker”</td>
<td>Tchaikovsky, “Nutcracker”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Trilogy</td>
<td>“Hoedown”</td>
<td>Copland, Rodeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Abaddon's Bolero”</td>
<td>Ravel, Bolero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Brain Salad Surgery</td>
<td>“Toccata”</td>
<td>Ginastera, Piano Concerto No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Works Vol. 1</td>
<td>“Piano Concerto No. 1”</td>
<td>so many!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Two-Part Invention in D Minor”</td>
<td>Bach, Invention in d minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Fanfare for the Common Man”</td>
<td>Copland, “Fanfare for the Common Man”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It follows that the prog-rock audience, particularly fans of Emerson, would most normally expect as “classical” resources those materials from “non-German” compositions or Bach, and not from other composers. In other words, “classical” music in the mind of the prog audience most often means “non-German” compositions or Bach’s music, and not too much else. Given such a relatively narrow conception of “classical” music, a sudden recourse to “German” materials other than Bach in a piece of prog rock may well bewilder the audience. Those “German” materials would appear as “pure surprise” or “pure novelty” at the Peirce/Hatten’s “firstness” stage. At the “secondness” stage, these “novel” materials would be understood in opposition to familiar “non-German” materials. “German” materials are presented for the first time in Emerson’s music except for Bach pieces; the listener has to first experience the firstness and secondness stages. The “German” and “non-German” materials are still clearly juxtaposed with each other at the second level.

Indeed, the Emerson concerto features some overtly “German” materials. At the larger-scale structural levels, the piece shows a typical First Viennese School piano-concerto style. A general comparison of the Emerson concerto with such a typical “German” concerto as Mozarts’s Piano Concerto No.23 in A major K. 488 (1786) reveals the overall formal similarity between these pieces. As Example 5.10 shows, the second movement is slower and shorter than the outer movements, although Emerson favors more frequent changes of tempo and meter in the manner of some Romantic compositions.33

33 For perhaps the only earlier attempt at an analysis of this Concerto, see Pethel, “Keith
Example 5.10: Mozart, Piano Concerto No. 23 and Emerson, Piano Concerto No. 1: Movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Mozart</th>
<th>Emerson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Movement</td>
<td>Allegro 4/4 Concerto Form/ Sonata Form</td>
<td>1st Movement 325 mm.: mn=104, Meno mosso (mn=66-72), Poco più mosso (mn=44), gioioso, mn=104, Vivo, Più mosso (mn=72), Maestoso (mn=96), Maestoso, same tempo, a tempo, Cadenza Grandioso (mn=104) ma poco rubato sempre, Swing (mn=144), meno mosso sempre rall. Vivace (mn=160), Meno mosso (mn=104), molto rall., a tempo (mn=104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Movement</td>
<td>Andante 6/8 Song Form</td>
<td>2nd Movement 47 mm.: Andante con moto (mn.=c.72-76), Tempo giusto (mn=72-76), poco scherzando, Doppio movimento (mn=c.144-152), Tempo I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Movement</td>
<td>Presto 2/2 Sonata-Rondo Form</td>
<td>3rd Movement 245 mm.: m.n.=c.150, Cadenza senza misura, Lento subito (m.n.=88) ma sempre moderato, meno mosso, Più mosso, Tempo I, Grandioso (m.n.=c.128)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stylistic affinity between these two concertos is not limited to the largest-scale level. For example, comparing the first movements with one another more reveals that Emerson employs certain aspects of the sonata form of Mozart’s first movement, if very loosely. As Example 5.11 shows, Emerson’s first movement has no repetition of the exposition and no use of Classic tonic six-four chord before the final cadenza as in the Classic concerto.

**Example 5.11: Mozart, Piano Concerto No. 23 and Emerson, Piano Concerto No. 1: 1st Movements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mozart</th>
<th>Emerson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- 1st Theme (Th.) tutti A</td>
<td>1- 1st Th. tutti atonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18- Transition tutti A</td>
<td>35- Transition tutti modulatory G-Db</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31- 2nd Th. tutti E</td>
<td>44- 2nd Th. tutti Ab?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47- Closing tutti A</td>
<td>59- Closing tutti Ab aeolian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67- 1st Th. solo A</td>
<td>69- Modified 1st Th. solo Ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82- Transition tutti to solo A</td>
<td>77- Modified 1st Th. tutti to solo Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99- 2nd Th. solo E</td>
<td>81- Modified 1st Th. tutti to solo Eb-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115- Closing solo to tutti E</td>
<td>93- Modified 1st Th. tutti to solo F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137- Codetta tutti E</td>
<td>100- Modified 1st Th. tutti to solo Eb-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143- Modified 2nd Th. tutti to solo E</td>
<td>148- Modified 1st Th. solo Ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156- Modified 2nd Th. tutti to solo C</td>
<td>160- Modified 1st Th. tutti to solo Ab-Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164- Modified 2nd Th. solo w/ acc. D...,a</td>
<td>164- Modified 1st Th. solo w/ acc. F-Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171- Modified 2nd Th. solo w/ acc. D...,a</td>
<td>178- Modified 1st Th. tutti Eb-Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182- Modified 2nd Th. solo w/ acc. D...,a</td>
<td>188- Modified 1st Th. tutti F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189- Retransition solo a:vii/VI-V</td>
<td>189- Modified 1st Th. tutti to solo A: I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198- 1st Th. tutti to solo A: I -</td>
<td>140- 1st Th. tutti Ab-Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213- Transition tutti to solo A</td>
<td>150- Retransition solo - tutti - solo ?-A-Eb-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237- 2nd Th. solo w/ acc. A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245- Closing solo w/ acc. A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261- Modified 2nd Th. solo A</td>
<td>186- Modified 1st Th. tutti - solo w/acc. Ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284- Transition Material tutti to A:16</td>
<td>227- Modified 2nd Th. tutti ends on C:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298- Cadenza solo on E:4</td>
<td>242- Cadenza solo b-flat·Ab:5 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299- Ending (-314) tutti A: I</td>
<td>317 Ending (-325) tutti-solo-tutti Ab: I to Eb: V-I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
form, but a sonata-like form is roughly traced.  

Example 5.12 shows that the second movement of both concertos share an almost

Example 5.12: Comparison with Mozart’s Piano Concerto No.23 in A major, K 488 (1786): 2nd Movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mozart</th>
<th>Emerson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part I:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Part I:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- “Verse” 1 solo f♯</td>
<td>1- “Verse” 1 tutti C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12- “Verse” 2 tutti f♯</td>
<td>7- “Verse” 2 tutti C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20- “Verse” 3 solo w/ acc. f♯-A: V</td>
<td>10- Connecting Motif tutti C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part II:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Part II:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35- “Verse” 4 tutti - solo A</td>
<td>15- “Verse” 3 solo f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43- “Verse” 5 solo &amp; tutti A</td>
<td>20- “Verse” 4 solo c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51- tutti A - f♯</td>
<td>22- Connecting Motif solo-tutti-solo-tutti C: V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part III:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Part II:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53- “Verse” 1’ solo f♯</td>
<td>29- “Verse” 1’ solo w/ acc. C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68- “Verse” 2 tutti f♯</td>
<td>35- “Verse” 2’ solo w/ acc. C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76- “Verse” 3’ solo w/ acc. f♯</td>
<td>38- Connecting Motif solo w/ acc. C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coda:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-99 Ending solo w/ acc. f♯</td>
<td>44- Ending tutti to solo C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 During the composition of this Concerto in 1975 and 1976, Emerson collaborated with John Mayer, who taught him form and orchestration. Emerson says, “John showed me exactly what was meant by a sonata form, how for the music to truly be in that form there had to be certain relationships between the keys and the presentation of the musical material.” But the key relation between the first and second themes of this first movement does not seem to be that of a textbook sonata form. Emerson also says, “When I started I’d intended writing a set of variations, ... [a]nd it gradually got away from the original variation which I’d created, which gave me the clue that it would possibly be worked better into the concerto format.” Therefore he at least loosely cast his music in what he thought to be a concerto format. For the first quotation, see Pethel, “Keith Emerson,” 96. For the second, see Forrester et al., Emerson, Lake & Palmer, 104.
identical overall form; an inclusion of modulation to a closely-related key, iv, in Part II of the Emerson’s movement is also derivative of the Mozart concerto, even though the modulation from I to iv is not as close as that from i to III.

Example 5.13 suggests that aspects of rondo form in Mozart’s third movement are

Example 5.13: Mozart’s Piano Concerto No.23 in A major, K 488 (1786): 3rd Movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mozart</th>
<th>Emerson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refrain 1:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Refrain 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1- 1st Th.</td>
<td>1- 1st Th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16- 2nd Th.</td>
<td>21- Closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32- Transition - Codetta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62- Refrain-Closing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74- Transition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Couplet 1:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Couplet 1:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106- Couplet-1 Th.</td>
<td>35- Couplet-1 Th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129- Sequence</td>
<td>46- transition material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175- Couplet-1 Th. dev.</td>
<td>97- Cadenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187- Closing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refrain 2:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Refrain 2:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202- 1st Th.&amp; Frag.</td>
<td>39- 1st Th.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230- Couplet-2 Th.</td>
<td>46- transition material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262-</td>
<td>97- Cadenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refrain 3:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Refrain 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312- Refrain-Closing</td>
<td>120- 1st Th.’’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Couplet 3:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Couplet 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330- Couplet-1 Th. frag.</td>
<td>126- Couplet-1 Th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refrain 4:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Refrain 4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441- 1st Th.</td>
<td>130- 1st Th.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456- 2nd Th.</td>
<td>137- 1st Th.’ Modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466- Transition - Codetta</td>
<td>145- Retransition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480- Couplet-1 Th. dev.</td>
<td>177- Ending Th. (-245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508- Ending (-524)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
also seen in Emerson’s third movement, in that the themes periodically recur one after another in the same sequence as in a rondo form. Thus, despite many differences in the details, large-scale levels in Emerson’s concerto can be analyzed in a way similar to Mozartean concerto.

The music of the Second Viennese School is also referenced in Emerson’s concerto. As shown in Example 5.14a, the very first theme of Emerson’s 1st movement is made from

Example 5.14: Emerson, Piano Concerto No. 1: 1st Theme

a. The 1st Theme (mm. 1-): Schoenberg?

b. Serial Counterpoint (mm. 1-33): Bach?

a twelve-tone series; the row is transformed to I-0, R-0, and RI-0, which overlap each other in a manner reminiscent of Webern’s practice, though Emerson himself said he read Schoenberg’s *Style and Idea* to prepare himself for this composition.\(^{35}\) In any case, the reference is clearly made to the Second Viennese School. This theme is juxtaposed with a Bach-like counterpoint, producing an “answer” at a perfect fourth above the “subject” (hence P-5, R-5, I-5, and RI-5 in the answers), as shown in Example 5.14b.\(^{36}\) Also interesting is the row’s diatonic sonority; P-0 is made of diatonic hexachords (Eb-F-G-Ab-Bb-C, and A-B-C♯-D-E-F♯) and, when presented together with P-5, forms a major scale; P-0 (C-Ab-Bb-F-Eb-G) + P-5 (F-Db-Eb-Bb-Ab-C) = major scale (Eb-F-G-Ab-Bb-C-Db).\(^{37}\)

These references to “German” styles are juxtaposed in the Concerto with other references to “non-German” music, such as that of Debussy, Musorgsky, Elgar, and Bartók, which are listed in Example 5.15.

---

\(^{35}\) Emerson says, John Mayer “showed me various books which helped throughout the writing and orchestrating of the concerto. Schoenberg’s *Style and Idea* and Walter Piston’s orchestration text were very helpful.” Quoted in Pethel, “Keith Emerson,” 96. As for Schoenberg, certain things written in “Composition with Twelve Tones (1)” in his book seem to have particular relevances to Emerson’s Concerto. Further considerations on which aspects of Schoenberg’s and Piston’s theories particularly influenced Emerson’s compositions would be enlightening. For the texts Emerson refers to, see Schoenberg, *Style and Idea*, and Piston, *Orchestration*.

\(^{36}\) Pethel also says, “His conscious choice in using the twelve-tone system reflects his interest in Schoenberg’s book, while the use of a contrapuntal texture recalls his early experiences with Bach.” See Pethel, “Keith Emerson,” 99. In Bach connection, Prof. Severine Neff also points out the similarity of this theme to Bach’s Well Tempered Clavier,
Example 5.15: Emerson, Piano Concerto, No. 1: Allusions to Non-German Pieces

1st movement, mm. 35-: Allusion to Debussy?

1st movement, mm. 59-: Allusion to Musorgsky?

1st movement, mm. 186-: Allusion to Elgar?

3rd movement, mm. 1-: Allusion to Bartok?


Although it is admittedly possible to name other composers as the sources of these excerpts, the composers identified here are the most likely sources because they are among the most often cited ones in Emerson’s interviews, and their music is most often borrowed

Book I, Prelude 13.

37 I owe this idea to Prof. Allen Anderson.
in Emerson’s classical reworkings, as well as those of other progressive rock musicians.\footnote{Emerson says, “There are certain styles throughout the concerto which are intentional.” But he does not specify those styles himself. Forrester et al. say, “The musical language of the three-movement work is as eclectic as one might expect of Keith Emerson, beginning with twentieth-century serialism, and subsequently passing through Baroque, Romantic and jazz styles. The influences of Copland, Ginastera, Bernstein and others can be discerned.” But Forrester et al. do not specify at which points in the piece he finds these influences. More “source-hunting” work would be necessary to further elucidate the eclecticism of this Concerto. See Forrester et al. Emerson, Lake & Palmer, 104 and 105.} Such stylistic references to “non-German” music, which were likely more familiar to the progressive rock audience of the time, contrast with the allusions to the Viennese-School styles, as mentioned above, which are less familiar to the same audience. So the “German-vs-non-German” contrast creates clear intertextuality between familiar-nonfamiliar intertextuality at the second level of the piece’s referential structure.

The “rock” intertext also bifurcates at higher levels of the semantic construction of “Piano Concerto No. 1,” because it refers to early progressive rock, which is itself well-known among prog-rock audience members as intertextual itself. As the summary diagram in Example 5.8 above shows, if early ’70s prog rock constitutes the second level of the diagram, then its “rock-classical” intertextuality is a third-level intertextuality. Since prog rock itself was not subsumed under the prog-rock audience’s conception of “rock” music, a question mark is put following the word “rock” at the first level. The aim of prog rock was originally to transcend beyond preexisting music; prog rock itself is a transcendent music within the Progressive ideology. But by referring to early prog rock, and not directly to ’50s and ’60s rock, the rock reference is not easy to comprehend.
Allusions to early progressive rock indeed permeate every level of the Concerto. Even the twelve-tone theme of the concerto, which was discussed earlier, can also be seen as an allusion to the theme from Emerson’s own 1971 piece “Eruption.” As arrows and brackets in Example 5.16 show, both themes can be viewed as deriving from the same circle-of-fifth sharp-side progression through similar manipulations such as first taking some note groups, reversing the order of those groups, and then making some minor adjustments. Indeed, the resulting melodies can also be seen as similar to one another.

Example 5.16: Derivation of the Theme of “Eruption” (1971, in Tarkus) and P-0 of Concerto (1977)
Both melodies arrive at a note a minor-second higher than the beginning note. The fourth note of each melody is a perfect fourth higher than the beginning note. The allusion may be relatively clear especially, if only because these themes are among the very few tonally ambiguous ones among all the Emerson compositions. And since this theme of the Concerto is the often-recurring main theme of the piece, which returns over in many different forms, the allusion to “Tarkus” permeates the entire movement. 39

Similarly, the second movement of the concerto alludes to The Nice’s 1970 monumental work, “Five Bridges Suite” (in Five Bridges). As Example 5.17 shows, a melody from one of the most impressive moments of “Five Bridges Suite” is openly alluded to in the very opening of the second movement of the Concerto. As the arrows and brackets show, both melodies trace the same scale degrees: ^1-^3-^2-^7-^1-^5-^3-^6-^7-^1, beginning and ending on the tonic note. Both melodies contain an octave descent immediately followed by a minor-seventh descent, which in turn is immediately followed by a minor-second ascent. Additionally, both melodies are played by the string section of the orchestra alone. Such an allusion to The Nice piece is made within the main theme of the second movement of the Concerto. Considering the central role of this main theme in the second movement, the importance of this allusion in this second movement is crucial. As discussed earlier in relation to Example 5.12 above,

39 Emerson has remarked, “It may not have anything to do with 20th-century music, but it has a lot to do with me,” thus suggesting that he incorporated a lot of his own material into this Concerto. Quoted in Forrester et al. Emerson, Lake & Palmer, 104.
Example 5.17: Affinity between “Five Bridges Suite” (1970, in Five Bridges) and the 2nd Movement of Concerto (1977)

“Five Bridges Suite,” 1st movement, 5:11-

“Piano Concerto No. 1” 2nd movement, m. 1-

References to early prog rock consist not only of such self-allusions. Interestingly, this Concerto also alludes to another progressive rock super group’s musical monument, Yes’s “Close to the Edge” of 1972. As shown in Example 5.18, both melodies trace the same scale degrees: \(^3\)-\(^1\)-\(^2\)-\(^1\)-\(^2\)-\(^3\)-\(^1\)-\(^2\). Both melodies are put in triple rhythm and
Example 5.18: Allusion to Yes, “Close to the Edge” (1972)

“Close to the Edge,” 14:12-

“Piano Concerto No. 1,” i, 4:29- (mm. 175-)

are supported by a root pedal. Both melodies are accompanied by a line that is a major or minor sixth below. This melody alluded to here is perhaps the most impressive moment of “Close to the Edge,” because it is this very material that breaks the ice of a long and quiet drumless “B” section of AABA form, and which brings the music forcefully to the recapitulation of “Close to the Edge” theme. The allusion to one of the best-known or early prog-rock pieces makes it clear that this reference is not directed to ‘50s and ‘60s blues-based rock, but rather to such early prog rock music that was believed to transcend

40 See Example 1.5, Chapter One, for a form diagram of the piece. This recapitulation at
Allusions to early prog rock are not limited to these local aspects. **Examples 5.19** compares the opening of “Tarkus” with that of the third movement of “Piano Concerto No. 1”; the unfolding of specific textures at the opening of the movement is virtually identical to that of “Tarkus.” Since such an unfolding of textures is not necessarily unique to “Eruption” but characteristic to much progressive rock of the early 1970s, it can be viewed as a reference to early prog rock in general.\(^4\) The texture unfolds through five steps. First comes a presentation of a riff, shown at number 1 in the example. Second is a chordal accompaniment to the riff (2). Third is a short recess of the riff (3). Fourth is the riff with different accompaniment (4). And the fifth is a transitional portion without the riff (5).

Allusion to early prog rock can be found also at a larger-scale level. As discussed extensively in Chapter 1, many of the early prog rock musicians (as well as psychedelic rock musicians) used background intertextuality, referring to a sonata form and an AABA form simultaneously. Interestingly, the third movement of the Concerto, whose overall form is analyzed earlier as a rondo form, can alternatively be analyzed as an Emerson model, as shown in **Example 5.20b.** Emerson indeed creates an exposition, improvisation

---

14:11- is a transformed, not literal, statement of the original theme at 2:58-.

\(^4\) Admittedly, further investigation and much analytical work are certainly in order to further clarify this issue.
Examples 5.19: “Eruption” and Piano Concerto No. 1, iii: Textural Unfolding

“Tarkus,” ‘Eruption’

1. Riff (mm. 6-9)

2. Chords on the Riff (mm. 10-13)

3. Recess of the Riff (mm. 18-21)

4. Riff w/ different Accompaniment (mm. 22-25)

5. Transitory (mm. 26-37)

“Piano Concerto No. 1,” 3rd movement

1. Riff (mm. 1-4)

2. Chords on the Riff (mm. 5-8)

3. Recess of the Riff (mm. 9)

4. Riff w/ different Accompaniment (mm. 17-20)

5. Transitory (mm. 22-34)


recapitulation, and coda. Such background intertextuality may be a reference to something like ELP’s “Pictures at an Exhibition,” as shown in Example 5.20a for the purposes of quick comparison.

Example 5.20: ELP, “Pictures at an Exhibition” (1971) and the Third Movement of “Piano Concerto No. 1, iii” (1977)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. ELP, “Pictures at an Exhibition”</th>
<th>b. ELP, Piano Concerto No. 1, iii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Promenade #1</td>
<td>1- 1st Theme solo w/ acc. Bb-oct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The Gnome</td>
<td>21- Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Promenade #2</td>
<td>35- 2nd Theme solo w/ acc. c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The Sage</td>
<td>39- 1st Theme’ solo w/ acc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvisation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Improvisation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The Old Castle</td>
<td>46- Transitory Materials tutti c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Blues Variations</td>
<td>97- Cadenza solo w/ acc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recapitulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Promenade #3</td>
<td>120- 1st Theme’ solo w/ acc. Bb-oct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 The Hut Of Baba Yaga</td>
<td>126- 2nd Theme solo c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The Curse Of Baba Yaga</td>
<td>130- 1st Theme’ solo w/ acc. Bb-oct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 The Hut Of Baba Yaga</td>
<td>137- 1st Theme’ Modified solo w/ acc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 The Great Gates Of Kiev</td>
<td>177-245 Ending Theme tutti-solo w/ acc. F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All these references to early prog rock must surely be understood as “novel” material by prog-rock audience, considering the very specific conception of “rock” in those days, and their original intertextuality finds its way into the Concerto as a whole. The listener, having to cope with the “novelty” of the intertext, would retain the opposition between “rock” and “classical” intertexts at the third level.

To summarize, the Concerto alludes to “German” music as an opposition to non-“German” music on the one hand, and early prog rock to incorporate its inherent intertextuality as a whole on the other hand. Both these features contribute to a tendency to resist interpreting the concerto as single-ply intertextuality, because of the “novelty” of these deeper-level intertexts. Indeed, Emerson repeatedly talks about this Concerto as “a new challenge”; he says, “After three years, I didn’t want to go back with the same set-up. I needed a change, a new challenge ... I chose to go one step further.” Though journalists have almost always interpreted these Emerson remarks as referring to his use of orchestra—and he indeed speaks in such terms—it must be remembered that his use of the orchestra in 1977 was not at all new in his career; he had undertaken several outstanding experiments with the orchestra already during The Nice years. His “new challenge” was

---

42 Because of the lack of direct reference to blues-oriented “rock” styles in this Concerto, the journalist Forrester says this concerto owes “nothing to rock or pop idioms.” See Forrester et al., *Emerson, Lake & Palmer*, 104.


44 As already mentioned a number of times in previous chapters, his “Ars Longa Vita Brevis,” “Five Bridges Suite,” “Pathétique Symphony, 3rd Movement,” are among the most famous such attempts during The Nice years. He had thus been well known for these attempts since the late 1960s.
perhaps not the use of the orchestra, but rather the use of “novel” intertexts such as German music and early progressive rock materials, and his “change” was perhaps that he moved from single-ply intertextuality to multi-ply intertextuality.

Multi-Ply Intertextuality in Interpretation

As mentioned a number of times in this chapter, multi-ply intertextuality results from the listener’s contextual perception of some sort of “novelty” at deeper levels, and such a perception of “novelty” occurs at the firstness and especially the secondness stages of the Peircean-Hattenesque trichotomy model of the cognitive process. As mentioned above in relation to Hatten’s application of Peirce’s theory, the secondness is the stage where the “novel” is understood in opposition to the “non-novel.” In other words, the “non-novel” is the expected (e.g., nineteenth- and twentieth-century nationalist music and blues-based “rock”) and the “novel” is the unexpected (e.g., German music and non-blues-based rock). Peirce regards such an opposition of the expected and the unexpected as “the element of struggle.”

A possible narrative interpretation of multi-ply intertextuality can therefore be attempted based on this Peircean idea of “struggle” at Secondness.

According to Peirce, the struggle between these forces opens up because reality

---

45 Peirce, 1.322-324.
“insists upon forcing its way to recognition as something other than the mind’s creation.”

The mind has to face a “pure binarity” forced with “bruteness” beyond any reason. And the mind experiences a “shock ... when anything particularly unexpected forces itself upon our recognition ... [It is] that sense of externality, of the presence of a non-ego ....” Shock is not the only response of the mind, however; Peirce also refers to “doubt”:

“Among the inner shapes which binarity assumes are those of the doubts that are forced upon our minds.”

To summarize his brief introductory discussion on Secondness, Peirce introduces a brief exemplary story:

The long whistle of the approaching locomotive, however disagreeable it may be, has set up in me a certain inertia, so that the sudden lowering of the note meets with a certain resistance. That must be the fact; because if there were no such resistance there could be no shock when the change of note occurs ... [R]esistance is effort [of] opposing change.

Now, if blues-based “rock” is the expected music and another kind of rock is the unexpected, they can be seen as struggling with each other at the second level of the diagram at Example 5.8 above, even though blues-based “rock” does not appear at this level of the diagram. This struggle opens up here because at this level the other kind of rock, early progressive rock, emerges unexpectedly on the stage of the drama, in a way similar to the appearance of the suddenly lowered note of the whistle in the above story.

---

46 Peirce, 1.325. Emphasis original.
47 Peirce, 2.84. Emphasis original.
48 Peirce, 1.332. Emphasis added.
49 Peirce, 2.84. Emphasis original.
In other words, the expected blues-oriented “rock” does not emerge at the expected point of the drama and instead the audience is brutally forced to see the unexpected early prog-rock persona. Since the early prog-rock persona emerges suddenly in place of the expected blues-oriented “rock” persona and claims the status of “rock” like a coup d’etat, the audience resists this change and experiences a shock or doubt.

On the other hand, if “non-German” music was the expected and “German” music was the unexpected, the struggle between them occurs also at the second level of the diagram. But this time struggle occurs not because the expected is replaced by the unexpected but because the unexpected appears together with the expected. In the above story by Peirce, a note was replaced with a lowered note, but if a lowered note suddenly appears in addition to the sustained higher note, this whistle story would bear some analogy with the “classical” intertexts of the Concerto at the second level. The originally singular “classical” persona is now doubled because both German persona and non-German persona emerge on stage together and both claim the status of the “classical” agent. The audience is forced to recognize the doubleness of “classical” persona. They would resist this change and experience another shock or doubt here.

Any further interpretation of a possible narrative of this Concerto would have to be based on a further detailed observation of this kind focused on the “novelty” of intertexts. Those who miss the significance of the “novelty” of intertexts would miss the whole point

---

50 Peirce, 1.336.
of the musical narrative in multi-ply intertextuality. For example, Blair Pethel, despite his awareness of the “novelty” of some intertexts employed in the Concerto, condemns the piece, complaining that “[t]he music of the concerto is fairly superficial; there is little real drama in it, and the writing often reveals itself to be weak.”

Perhaps for Pethel, the “novelty” of intertexts itself does not make the story significant. But as this chapter has argued, it is the “novelty” itself that brings deep significance to the music’s semantic dimension.

In fact, many other writers seem to respond to this novelty of intertexts in the Concerto negatively or positively. Those who truly resist the change (and would never be happy to recognize the change) may perhaps interpret such a drama as “unreliable” and infer the existence of a sarcastic implied author behind the narrating subject of the story. Such listeners would include, on the one hand, those whom Macan calls “rock purists” who espouse the “blues ideology” mentioned above, and on the other hand, those whom I would call “early-prog purists,” who espouse only the nineteenth- and twentieth-century nationalist compositions as “classical” intertext of prog rock. For either of these groups of listeners, the referential construction of Emerson’s Concerto may not be permissible or acceptable. Such people therefore may tend to keep resisting and rejecting the story narrated in this piece, and interpret and value it accordingly. For example, Stump’s interpretation of this Concerto as an instance of “clodhoppingly stereotypical tradition” in progressive rock is perhaps a typical over-resistance to the change of the type of intertexts;

his hyperbolism represented by the word “clodhoppingly” clearly indicates a kind of reaction-formation and betrays his presumably “prog-purist” orientation. By contrast, those who would not resist the music to such an extent would include a more liberal kind of audience and some deeply devoted fans of Emerson-related groups. For example, Forrester describes the Concerto as “the first formally ‘classical piece’ written by him [=Emerson].” As the author of ELP’s biography, he is likely a devotee of Emerson’s music and able to open his ears to the struggle that the “novel” personae introduce to the drama. Yet another type of response would be simply to wonder how to interpret the piece in the first place. For example, Brett Allen-Bayes, in a review of the concert of this Concerto performed in March 2004 by the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra with conductor Kristjan Jarvi and pianist Michael Keiran Harvey, asks this question: “Is this a great concerto?” Allen-Bayes was unable to answer his own question, perhaps because doubt was forced upon his binarity-perceiving mind, as Peirce characterizes it.

Some may still wonder how significant shock and doubt are in the context of the listener’s musical experience. For those uninitiated, it may be helpful to note that this Peircean narrative can be considered as something like an earlier version of Leonard B.

52 See Stump, Music’s All That Matters, 216.
53 Forrester et al. Emerson, Lake & Palmer, 104.
54 Though it is not clear whether he hears the reference to early prog rock in the Concerto. For Meyer’s formulation on musical meaning, see his Emotion and Meaning in Music, ch. 1.
Meyer’s Gestalt-psychological theory of musical meaning.\textsuperscript{56} This is important because Peirce’s shock or doubt might even be considered parallel to Meyer’s conception of “embodied musical meaning.” Meyer’s classic formula posits that musical meaning arises when the mind’s expectation about musical progression is inhibited for any reason, creating a tension. To compare Peirce’s formulation roughly to Meyer’s, “inertia” is expectation, “change” is inhibition, “resistance” is tension, and “shock” or “doubt” is meaning. What has been discussed with reference to Peirce’s narrative here could be viewed as a semantic parallel to Meyer’s syntactical/embodied meaning.

To conclude, I have argued not only that multi-ply intertextuality became Emerson’s style of intertextuality during the late 1970s, but I have also explored new ways of looking at the referential structure of intertextuality employing the contextual distinction between single-ply intertextuality and multi-ply intertextuality. Though anything can be multi-ply intertextuality in principle, certain contexts usually help determine the general tendency of a certain intertextuality to be interpreted as either single-ply or multi-ply. Investigating such differing tendencies indeed reveals certain crucial aspects of such an historically important piece as Emerson’s “Piano Concerto No. 1” and even some critical responses to it. Generalizing any intertextuality as either a Bakhtinian single-ply intertextuality or a Kristevan multi-ply intertextuality would entirely miss the importance of context-dependent meaning of music.

\textsuperscript{56} This theoretical affinity may be drawn despite the lack of Peirce’s writings in the bibliographies of most of Meyer’s published works.
CHAPTER 6

FRAMED INTERTEXTUALITY:
FRAMING AND COMPETITION IN “INFERNO” (1980)

Keith Emerson’s musical intertextuality in his late period (c1980-) features what can be called “framed intertextuality.” Framed intertextuality is a kind of intertextuality embedded within an “internal frame” of a work, in contrast with what can be called “framing intertextuality” which is the kind of intertextuality outside the internal frame.\(^1\) An internal frame is to be distinguished from an “external frame” of an artwork. An external frame separates the world of work from the outside world. In painting, the external frame of a picture separates it from the wall of the museum in which the picture is displayed, for example.\(^2\) In music, an external frame would refer to the silence

---

\(^1\) One could also distinguish one more kind of intertextuality that could be termed an “overall intertextuality,” which arises out of an interaction between the two worlds separated by the internal frame. But in order to avoid confusion, this will not be explored further in this dissertation; such a further exploration could be done more effectively when the concepts of framed and framing intertextualities are more fully discussed and understood among writers on intertextuality in the future.

\(^2\) See Kant’s classic formulation on the picture frame in Book I, “Analytic of the Beautiful,” of “Analytic of Aesthetic Judgement,” in his Critique of Judgement. See also Jacque Derrida’s deconstruction of Kant’s formulation in Derrida, The Truth in Painting. And for Richard Littlefield’s application of Derridean deconstruction of Kant’s ideas to
surrounding a musical work that separates the work from the world outside, as Edward T. Cone and Richard Littlefield argue.³ An internal frame, in contrast, separates the world of work into two ontologically differentiated discourses, one outside the frame and the other inside of the frame, the latter being a world-within-world or a picture-within-picture in the case of painting.⁴ In a literary work, an internal frame can be made by such “markers” as quotation marks, for example, that separate an actor’s voice as an embedded discourse from the narrator’s voice as the primary, immediate discourse.⁵ In a musical work, an internal frame can be formed by inserting a long silence (e.g., fermata and rest) as Littlefield says; by extrapolating a prelude and a postlude as Cone discusses; or by interpolating extremely music, see Littlefield, “Silence of the Frames.”

³ Littlefield suggests four kinds of silence as external frames: the silence preceding the work, the silence following the work, the silence above the highest pitch of the piece, and the silence below the lowest pitch of the piece. See Figure 2 of his “Silence of the Frames.” As for Cone’s discussion, see his Musical Form and Musical Performance, 14-16.

⁴ This formulation is from Berger, “Diegesis and Mimesis,” 421 and 429. Similar point is made also by literary narratologist Mieke Bal, who argues that a “framed narrative” is the embedded narrative (actor’s text), which is dependent on the primary narrative (narrator’s text), in the manner of a subordinate clause to a main clause of a sentence. So the embedded text and the primary text “are not of equal status,” because of the former’s structural dependence on the latter. See Bal, Narratology, 142-143.

⁵ Quotation marks are not the only instances of an internal frame in a literary work, of course. As Heinrich Plett formulates, there are “explicit markers” (including quotation marks and footnotes) and “implicit markers” (that becomes effective “when a codal interference exists between the quotation and its context”) that indicate the occurrence of an embedded text. See Plett, “Intertextualities,” 11-12. Concerning the word “primary” in the text, literary narratologist Mieke Bal discusses the levels of narration in the following way: “We shall always term the narrator’s text ‘primary,’ without implying a value-judgment ... Eventually, the narrative text constitutes a whole, into which, from the narrator’s text, other texts may be embedded.” See Bal, Narratology, 142-143. With regard to the use of the word “immediate,” see Berger, “Diegesis and Mimesis,” 409-411.
contrasting material or some sort of quotation, as Berger suggests. These latter two types of internal frames tend to create some sort of A-B-A' form in music, with the A’s framing the B (that is, with the B framed by the A’s). The musical intertextuality as it occurs within such a framed, middle section of the piece is called framed intertextuality, while the musical intertextuality as it occurs in the framing, outer sections is called framing intertextuality.

Many of Emerson’s pieces can be seen as a competition between these two kinds of intertextuality, but in his stylistic development the emphasis seems to move gradually from framing intertextuality to framed intertextuality. In early years the emphasis was placed on the framing intertextuality, in which case the framed intertextuality is structurally dependent on the framing intertextuality, just as the contrasting middle section of the A-B-A' form tends to be structurally dependent on the outer, often thematic, and thus primary sections. This dependency relation can be described as Adornian or modernist part-whole organic relation, in which part functions only in relation to the whole and without the whole the part alone cannot be significant. Such a dependent status of the framed intertextuality parallels, though not equals, what literary theorist Mieke Bal calls

---

6 Littlefield, “Silence of the Frames,” paragraph 3.6; and Cone, Musical Form and Musical Performance, 22. Just a rest may not easily create an internal frame, though. A hierarchical distinction between the primary and the embedded texts plays crucial roles. For this reason, less hierarchically organized collection of intertextual pieces, such as Brahms’s Haydn Variations, might be described as featuring no framed intertextuality, unless the variations can be shown to form a hierarchy.
“explanatory” function of the framed text in literature.⁷ For example, the sentence “Your coffee is ready on the table that is next to your desk,” embeds the secondary text (italicized), which is embellishing and thus dependent on the primary text (unitalicized) because the embedded text is there only to explain the primary text (non italicized) and is significant only as part of the whole. Such an explanatory function of the framed intertextuality in music can be often, if not always, harmonically articulated by two means. One is the reappearance of the key of the A section of the A-B-A' form in the A' section—a reappearance which can make the framing intertextuality look primary and the framed intertextuality secondary; and the other is the connection of the key of the B section to that of the A' section—a connection which makes the whole B section work as a big embellishment to the A' section and which works like the relative pronoun “that” of the “coffee” sentence above. Because of these two harmonic means, the B section can sound dependent on the A and A' sections, and so the framed intertextuality is dependent on the framing intertextuality. For example, Emerson’s solo piece, “Medley” (c1958, in Emerson Plays Emerson), which is briefly diagramed in Example 2.2 in Chapter 2, features framing and framed intertextuality and the harmonic elements make the framed intertextuality dependent on the framing intertextuality. First, the key of the A section, G major, becomes the key of the A' section, thus making the framing intertextuality primary and the framed intertextuality secondary. Second, the harmonic connection from the key of the B section, E-flat major, to the key of the A' section, G major, is taken care of; an authentic cadence in E-flat major is followed by D major triad and then G major triad, with

⁷ Bal, Narratology, 144.
the D chord functioning both as Eb: #VII and G:V in a way similar to pivot chord.\textsuperscript{8} The two key areas are mediated by this D chord, just as the relative pronoun “that” mediates the primary and secondary texts of the “coffee” sentence above. And because of these harmonic means, the B section is clearly articulated as a big embellishment to the A section, thus performing Bal’s explanatory function and becoming part of the whole. An important effect of this type of relation is that novel or ambitious approaches in the framed section can paradoxically help the framing sections become dominant over the framed intertextuality. In other words, the more novel and ambitious the framed intertextuality, the more dependent the framed intertextuality on the framing intertextuality and the firmer and tighter the modernist organic connection between the framed and framing sections becomes.\textsuperscript{9} As long as the A section returns as the A' section and the B section is connected to the A' section, the A and A' sections are received always as primary and the B section is always secondary, no matter how ambitious and novel the B section may be.

\textsuperscript{8} As long as the #VII is not diatonic in Eb, the D chord is not really pivot chord, but still sounds functioning in both keys and thus working like pivot chord. This is partly because within rock styles as well as Emerson’s personal idioms, a major triad is often built upon any scale degree as a result of their habitual parallelism and thus #VII chord can be heard as functioning like a diatonic chord. Recently, Walter Everett convincingly extricates rock’s tonal systems as distinct from that of Western art music in his “Making Sense of Rock’s Tonal Systems.” He discusses one of the tonal systems in rock music as parallel major triads built on all the scale degrees of minor-pentatonic scale. Though he does not discuss #VII chord in particular, this line of thoughts can be extended to include #VII chord, though it would require a separate analytical study of another hundreds of rock and pop songs.

\textsuperscript{9} One might be reminded of Meyer’s famous theory of delayed gratification; the more delayed the realization of expectation, the stronger the gratification; and the more inhibited the expectation, the more satisfying the delayed gratification. See Meyer, \textit{Emotion and Meaning in Music}.  
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Emerson’s later pieces, on the other hand, tend to emphasize framed intertextuality, by challenging such a modernist type of dependency relationship and rather trying to establish Jamesonian or postmodernist type of juxtaposed relationships. The relation is no longer that of part and whole; the framed and framing sections are just separated and juxtaposed, because the framed section is more independent. In such a form as A-B-C or A-A’-A", the middle section is certainly framed by the outer sections but the form can be felt as a series of three equally independent sections. This relation parallels, though not equals, Bal’s formulation of “resembling” function as the other important function of

---

10 One may find a parallel relation between such a move toward independent status of framed intertextuality and that of the sonata-form development from the late eighteenth century. The sonata-form development is also a middle section, framed by the exposition and the recapitulation. The middle section was initially not the focus of the form, but Beethoven, for example, extended the length of development significantly and even created a new, independent theme in his “Eroica” symphony. The tendency toward the reversal of structural relation is certainly one of the patterns of stylistic development in many Western music traditions. Emerson’s elaboration on framed intertextuality can be seen as one of such developments.

11 This is a response to the following suggestion offered by Berger: “[I]t is impossible to decide with complete certainty whether what we have outside and within the internal frame are two different worlds or a single one. All that we can say is that the more interpolations of this sort differ from the discourse they interrupt, the stronger the suggestion of the diegetic mode [i.e., two separate work-worlds].” Such a suggestion is then to be understood in relation to a yet larger issue of musical unity/disunity discussed in n. 9 of Introduction. Further it should be considered more extensively in relation to the issues of segmentation, grouping, and closure. For the Berger quotation, see his “Diegesis and Mimesis,” 429. See also Daverio, “Schumann’s ‘Im Legendenton’” and Berger, “Toward a History of Hearing” for studies of musical interpolation. For a relatively recent and comprehensive discussion on segmentation, see Hanninen, “Orientations, Criteria, Segments.” As for grouping, see Cooper and Meyer, Rhythmic Structure of Music. And on closure, see Explaining Music, 81; and McCreless, “Hermeneutic Sentence.” See also Smith, Poetic Closure, 34; and Kermode, Sense of an Ending, for classic studies of closure in the literature.
framed text in literature. For example, the sentence “The world is supported by four elephants that are standing on the back of a giant turtle,” features the embedded text (italicized here) that resembles the primary text (non italicized) in meaning and grammar, and does not successfully explain exactly where the four elephants are because the reader of this sentence is not supposed to know where the giant turtle is. The reader may rather be invited to compare the primary and embedded texts in this sentence. Such a resembling function is achieved in music if the framed section resembles the framing sections and if the framed section is not connected to the framing sections. For example, in the case of “Medley,” if there was not the mediating D chord, the connection would be felt abrupt and there would be some sense of separation and juxtaposition between the middle section and the outer sections. In this case the entire form of the piece would be felt like A-B-C

---

12 Bal, Narratology, 144. Although Bal singles out explanatory and resembling functions as the most notable functions of embedded text in literature, these are by no means the only functions possible for an embedded text, of course. Manfred Jahn, for example, proposes the following five functions: actional integration; exposition; distraction; obstruction/retardation; and analogy. See his “Narratology,” N2.7.

13 This point is not made by Bal, but rather drawn here from Kendall Walton’s discussion on an embedded text in art in general which constitutes a part of his famous theory of art as “make-believe.” Walton formulates aesthetic experience of art as game of “make-believe,” and describes the essence of the game as the audience’s “psychological participation” as opposed to physical participation. However, the audience experiences an embedded text differently. Walton says, “[w]e stand apart from the internal fictional world and observe it through its [internal] frame.” The audience’s participation in an embedded text is rather inhibited, and instead the audience would compare the embedded text with the primary text. Walton says, “we may be fascinated by the combination of fictional truths it generates ... we may admire the artist’s skill and ingenuity in devising ways of generating fictional truths; we may delight in the devices by which participation is inhibited.” See Walton, Mimesis as Make-Believe, 284 and 275, for these quotations.

14 Without the D chord, the progression would be from Eb to G, which is basically a direct modulation from Eb: I to G: I, but can also be interpreted as G: bVI-I which is more abrupt.
form, or A-A'-A" if the sections resemble each other. An important effect of this type is that novel or ambitious approaches in the framed section can straightforwardly help the framed section become independent. The more novel and ambitious the framed intertextuality, the more independent the framed section becomes and the more separate, juxtaposed, and postmodernist the sectional relations become. If the opening section does not return after the middle section and the middle section is not connected to the following section, the middle section tends to be independent, especially when it is articulated in a very novel and ambitious manner. One good example is Emerson’s 1980 score for Italian postmodern horror film *Inferno*.

To show this development of emphasis from framing intertextuality to framed intertextuality, this chapter first investigates Emerson’s use of framed intertextuality during the 1970s as being dependent on the framing intertextuality in the modernist context, and then demonstrates his framed intertextuality in his film score, *Inferno* (1980), as more independent in the postmodernist context. At the end of this chapter, a narrative interpretation of a framed intertextuality is presented in relation to the narrative of the film.

*Framed Intertextuality in Context*

progression than G: V-I.
Framed intertextuality in Emerson’s composition becomes increasingly independent during the 1970s, but it always seems to function as part of the whole in his pre-1980 pieces, since there are normally some clear elements that would make the framed intertextuality look subsidiary to the framing intertextuality and create modernistic and organic relation between the framing and framed parts. To show this, this section briefly discusses five pre-1980 pieces that feature dependent kind of framed intertextuality.

The first example, ELP’s “The Barbarian” (1970, in Emerson, Lake and Palmer) shows a very early framed intertextuality. The boxes in Example 6.1a are intended to represent the external and internal frames respectively; the B section of this piece (1:26-2:47) is internally framed because of the solo bass sound at the beginning and end of this section, as well as the conspicuous contrast in instrumentation between this framed section (played mainly with piano) and the framing sections (played mainly with the Hammond organ). This section can be seen as framed intertextuality because it is a piano performance of the Bartók piece with such “rock” instruments as electric bass and drums. This framed intertextuality certainly shows a certain extent of resemblance to the framing intertextuality as the original Bartok piece. The similarity can be found by comparing Example 6.1b with 6.1d, as well as their sources 6.1c with 6.1e (especially follow the melody lines of the examples carefully). But this framed intertextuality rather shows Bal’s “explanatory” function than “resembling” function. The framed intertextuality is dependent on the framing intertextuality, and the framed intertextuality is significant as part of the whole. This is so firstly because the key of the A section, f# minor, reappears at the

a. ELP, “The Barbarian,” Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Exposition”?</td>
<td>0:00- intro</td>
<td>0:14- a</td>
<td>1:26- a’</td>
<td>3:51- a” (-4:26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:42- b</td>
<td>0:55- c</td>
<td>1:42- c’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:18- drone</td>
<td>2:01- d</td>
<td>2:38- Codetta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Recapitulation”?</td>
<td>2:47- reintro</td>
<td>2:57- a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:22- b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. ELP, “The Barbarian,” 1:26-
c. Bartók, “Allegro Barbaro,” m. 101- (the source of Example 6.1b)

d. ELP, “The Barbarian,” 0:14-

e. Bartók, “Allegro Barbaro,” m. 5-

f. ELP, “The Barbarian,” 2:45-
A' section, and secondly because the key of the B section, F major, is connected to that of the A' section in some way. As Example 6.1f shows, the final three-note descent of the B section, B#-Bnatural-A, is F: 5-#4-3, and this is reinterpreted as f#: 4-4-(b)3 and followed by the bass reintro at the beginning of the A’ section, the ascent F#-A-B-B#, which is f#: 1-(b)3-4-4. Also note that the final note of the descent is A, which is diatonic in both f# minor and F major keys, working like the relative pronoun “that” in the “coffee” sentence above. Such a connection establishes the middle section as a big embellishment to the A’ section, thus performing something of Bal’s “explanatory” function and creating part-whole relation. The B section in this piece is not even elaborate.

In Example 6.1b, which is an excerpt from this B section, ELP picks up from the second half of m. 101 of the Bartók excerpt, which is shown as Example 6.1c, thus changing the rhythmic configuration to some extent. But the piano part (the top two staves) plays almost exactly the same music as in Bartók’s original; the only difference is the reduction of the two long notes to eighth notes. Drums add a certain impatient rhythmic quality, but do not change the music significantly. The framed intertextuality in the B section can thus be characterized as an “undoing” of intertextual transformation; “classical” aspect is simply kept intact here with very little transformation. On the other hand, Example 6.1d, which is an excerpt from the beginning measures of the framing section of the ELP piece, shows a greater extent of elaboration of its source which is shown as Example 6.1e.

---

15 This approach was part of the band’s stock-in-trade of the time. The same procedure is indeed employed, for example, in the quotation from Bach’s French Suite I, Allemande, d minor, mm. 1-12, at 3:20- of “Knife Edge”; and the quotation from Bach’s Prelude 6, d minor, WTC I, mm.1-6 at 2:25- of “The Only Way”;
The original Bartók excerpt places strong emphasis on the pitch class F# without necessarily suggesting it as the key of the piece; the two accented chords—a C# diminished triad and a C# diminished triad with a major seventh—cannot squarely be interpreted in the key of F#. But the ELP version displays the group’s serious efforts to make the Bartók piece “rock”; the band interprets the Bartók piece forcefully in F# minor by playing an F#-minor pentatonic scale explicitly on the bass and by treating the two originally accented and “problematic” C# chords simply as unaccented chords, as if they were only embellishments.\(^{16}\) The incessant alternation of root-position triad and first-inversion chords in the original is entirely jettisoned in the ELP version, probably because the rhythm does not fit well into eight-beat.\(^{17}\) And the open voicing of the Bartók excerpt is changed to close chord formation, which is more typical in “rock” music in general. Rhythm is also radically changed; not only the change from 2/4 to 4/4 time but also some syncopation is incorporated within the overall eight-beat scheme. In these ways, ELP strongly transforms the Bartók piece to a “rock” version in the framing sections. Thus the middle section does not even look elaborate or novel compared with the framing sections. The framing intertextuality is thus dominant and the framed intertextuality is simply very dependent on the framing intertextuality in many respects.

---

\(^{16}\) These chords fall on the third beat of the measure, which is a weak beat in the context of eight-beat rhythm in rock music.

\(^{17}\) Since Bartók’s harp note is interpreted as a quarter note in the ELP version, the former’s eighth notes would become sixteenth notes in the latter. This would create a sixteenth beat, instead of eight beat.
Starting sometime around 1972, Emerson begins elaborating on his use of framed intertextuality, though it can still be seen as being dependent on the framing intertextuality. The 2\textsuperscript{nd} movement of the three-movement piece “The Endless Enigma” (1972, in Trilogy) is such an example. As Example 6.2a shows, this movement, which actually begins at 6:04 of “Part One” and ends at the end of “The Fugue,” is an interpolation for piano, occurring between Part One and Part Two of the piece.\footnote{This interpretation of the beginning of “The Fugue” as 6:04 of “Part One” is based on the published score of the piece. This does not correspond to the track division of CD releases from Rhino (see footnote 23).} And the framed section here certainly resembles the framing sections in terms of the tripartite formal structure; “Introduction,” “Prelude,” and “Fugue” mirrors the three-movement structure of the whole piece, thus evoking Bal’s “resembling” function and inviting a comparison between the framed and framing sections to some extent.\footnote{The published score of this piece, the preparation of which was supposedly supervised directly by Keith Emerson himself, makes these sectional titles clear. See Emerson, Lake and Palmer, Anthology.} Also this piano movement features a distinctive, novel kind of “classical-jazz” intertextuality through such things as “Prelude” and “Fugue,” which are derivative of Bach’s \textit{Well-Tempered Clavier} as well as Friedrich Gulda’s \textit{Prelude and Fugue}, featuring Lake’s electric bass, as shown in Example 6.2b, as well as Palmer’s percussion (not shown here).\footnote{Yes’s “‘Close to the Edge’ fugato” is an example of a fugue played by a rock band. See Covach, “Progressive Rock.” Emerson himself had also tried out a fugue already with The Nice, though not with bass, as the fourth movement of their “Five Bridges Suite” in 1970.} Compared with such an ambition in the framed intertextuality, the approach to framing intertextuality looks even obsolete.
Example 6.2: ELP, “Endless Enigma” (1972, in *Trilogy*)

a. Form Diagram

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titles on CD</th>
<th>CD-Timing</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Part One”</td>
<td>0:00-2:26</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>2'26&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:26-6:04</td>
<td>Part One</td>
<td>3'38&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:04-6:41</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The Fugue”</td>
<td>0:00-0:50</td>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>2'34&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:50-1:57</td>
<td>Fugue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Part Two”</td>
<td>0:00-2:03</td>
<td>Part Two</td>
<td>2:03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. “Fugue,” 0:50-

![Musical notation]
c. Part I, 2:34-

Example 6.2c shows the beginning of the first verse in Part One. This section features a Bach-chorale style organ accompaniment, a triadic vocal melody, and the deliberate lack of any “blue note,” all of which can be taken as stylistically “classical” reference, whereas Lake’s voice and lyrics clearly make a “rock” reference. But such a construction is not at
all an ambitious kind of “rock-classical” intertextuality in 1972; Emerson had already approached intertextuality in a much more advanced fashion in his previous pieces such as “Tarkus” in 1971, as discussed in Chapter 4 at Examples 4.3 and 4.4. Despite the ambitious orientation, the structurally dependent status of this movement is made clear partly by the return of the theme after the middle section and partly by tonal connection to the following movement. Materials of Part One shown in Example 6.2c explicitly returns at Part Two. Also, the key of the middle movement, C major, is connected to the key of the framing movements, Gb major. As shown in Example 6.2d, the ending chord of the 2nd movement, C major, is followed by C major added 9th chord which begins the 3rd movement, and this chord is led to the tonic of Gb major during the next eleven seconds through a series of third-related chords step by step in a way similar to pivot-chord modulation.21 Thus the framed intertextuality here clearly works as part of the whole, dependent on the framing intertextuality. The ambitious intertextual approach in the framed section rather intensifies the modernistic organic relation between the framed intertextuality and the framing intertextuality.

A third example is “Toccata,” from 1973 (in Brain Salad Surgery). The framed section of this piece features even more ambitious and very novel intertextual approaches, but it never transcends a structurally subordinate status firstly because of the reappearance of the theme after the middle section and secondly because of the harmonically clear

21 Again, this modulation is not pivot-chord modulation because none of these chords is diatonic in both keys. But still, as the example shows, the Bb chord and Db chord play some connecting roles by somehow functioning in both keys.
connection from the middle section to the reappeared section. The drum solo of this piece at 2:56-6:18 is framed by the themes as shown in Example 6.3a. The themes are a reworking of the fourth movement of Alberto Ginastera’s Piano Concerto No. 1, op. 28. And the drum solo features the Ginastera theme played by timpani and glockenspiel during 3:52-4:13, thus creating an intertextuality between Ginastera and “rock.” It is ambitious and novel partly because it is perhaps the first “organized” drum solo in the history of rock music (i.e., rock drum solos are normally free-form improvisation). It starts from an introduction, followed by timpani and glockenspiel playing the theme of the piece, and then by a series of “accompaniments” of piano (4:13-4:22), guitar (4:24-4:59), and moog synthesizers (5:04-6:17). It really is a pre-composed drum solo, and a live recording of this piece provides some interesting evidence of this. In their “California Jam” in 1974, which was released in Then & Now in 1998, the structure of “Toccata” is mostly played out, as the form diagram of this live recording in Example 6.3b suggests.\textsuperscript{22} Also important is that the internal structure of this framed intertextuality partially mirrors the whole piece, in that it starts with an introduction, is followed by the materials from Ginastera’s piece, leading to the presentation of different material. However, Emerson maintains a connection from this drum solo to the return of the theme at 6:18 by a dominant motion on

\textsuperscript{22} It is not certain whether the entire piece or only the drum solo was played in the actual concert; the recording of this piece indeed abruptly starts with the drum solo, suggesting that the record producer might have deleted the preceding portions of the piece. But it is important that such a decision to extract the drum solo from the whole piece was made by someone in the group or their production team—a fact that suggests someone’s perception of this drum solo as an independent piece.
Example 6.3: ELP, “Toccata” (1973, in *Brain Salad Surgery*)

a. Form Diagram of the 1973 studio recording

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:28</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:47</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:56</td>
<td>Drum Solo: Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:52</td>
<td>with timpani &amp; glockenspiel on theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:13</td>
<td>with piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:24</td>
<td>with guitar &amp; Moog synthesizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:04</td>
<td>with Moog synthesizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:18</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:52</td>
<td>Coda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Form Diagram of the 1974 California Jam live recording as in *Then & Now*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:00</td>
<td>Drum Solo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:35</td>
<td>with timpani &amp; glockenspiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:19</td>
<td>with guitar &amp; Moog synthesizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:59</td>
<td>with Moog synthesizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:19</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:26</td>
<td>Drum Solo ending (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. “Toccata” (1973 in *Brain Salad Surgery*); the connection from the drum solo to the theme, 6:17-

```
Theme
```

“Piano Concerto No. 1, op. 28,” Music by Alberto Ginastera, as arranged by Emerson, Lake and Palmer as “Toccata.” Copyright 1961 by Boosey and Hawkes. All rights reserved. Used by Permission.
the bass, as Example 6.3c shows. The dominant note, E, is emphasized more than one whole minute from around 5:08 until the return of the opening theme at 6:18, which further emphasizes the structurally subsidiary status of the drum solo. Despite, or all the more for, its ambitious intertextual approaches and the seemingly resembling function, this framed intertextuality finally shows a structurally subordinate, “explanatory” function within the organic whole, in the way in which the embedded text of the “coffee” sentence above serves the primary text of it.

The middle movement of “Karn Evil 9” (1973, in Brain Salad Surgery) offers a fourth example, shown in Example 6.4. The middle section is framed by the outer, more “rock” movements, while featuring a theme derived from the contour of the first movement and generally employing a jazz-style piano, as discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4. The intertextual approach employed in the “2nd Impression” is very ambitious, in terms of the types of intertexts. One such intertext is a steel drum sound on the Hammond organ that alludes to Caribbean music, as shown in Example 6.4b. There is also what could be called a “horror-film section” within this movement, referring to the twentieth-century film

23 Emerson’s commentary on the Caribbean connection appears in the recorded interview, entitled “Making of Brain Salad Surgery,” released as the final track of the CD version of their album, Brain Salad Surgery, as well as in the booklet of Hammer It Out. In the latter, Emerson speaks of this movement: “I just allowed things to go. Experimenting with chord shapes and harmonics that jungled. Steel drums! I ran a movie in my head. You
Example 6.4: ELP, “Karn Evil 9, 2nd Impression” (1973, in *Brain Salad Surgery*)

a. Form Diagram (main events only)

1\textsuperscript{st} Impression

- Part One (8:36)
- Part Two (4:46)

2\textsuperscript{nd} Impression (7:07)
- 0:00- Theme
- 0:24- Theme
- 1:03- Rag-1
- 2:53- Interlude
- 5:50- Rag-2
- 6:48- Theme

3\textsuperscript{rd} Impression (9:24)

b. 1:08- “Caribbean” Section

---

can’t write or play stuff like this unless you are straight ahead!”  See his “Track 277
c. 3:15- “Horror Film” Section

![Musical notation image]


d. Karn Evil 9: The Connection from “2nd Impression” to “3rd Impression”

![Musical notation image]


genre, as shown in Example 6.4c.\(^2^4\) It is also noteworthy that, as the boxes in Example 6.4a indicates, this framed intertextuality roughly mirrors the entire opus twice; the whole

\(^2^4\) See Forrester, “Musical Analysis,” 201. Horror film music has rarely been studied thus far, but this distinct genre of music the elements of which Emerson often incorporates in this and other pieces is worth a careful examination. The source of the horror film sound may be traced back to Wagner and R. Strauss.
“2nd Impression” begins and ends with themes, interpolated by a middle section which in turn begins and ends with rags interpolated by an interlude. This also evokes Bal’s “resembling” function. However, the movement ends with a cadence in F#, which is the second most important pitch class, the first being G#/Ab. This is taken over as Gb at the very beginning of the “3rd Impression,” as Example 6.4d shows. This Gb is part of Eb-dorian melody that follows this example, and this melody is then transformed to an Eb-myxolydian version, which works as V of the key of the “3rd Impression,” Ab major. The “2nd Impression” is thus carefully connected to The 3rd Impression, and thus structurally dependent to the following framing part of the piece. The ambitious and novel nature of the framed intertextuality rather emphasizes its dependent status strongly; the framed intertextuality here can still be considered part of the whole in a modernist relationship, performing Bal’s “explanatory” function.

A final example is worth a brief mention. In 1977, ELP released a reworking of Aaron Copland’s “Fanfare for the Common Man” in the album Works, Volume 1. This piece is 9'45" long, and nearly half of the piece, 4'37", is devoted to the long middle section that is framed by themes of the Copland piece. This framed section is simply a very long improvisation over an unchanging bass riff derived from the thematic sections. As long as the improvisation is played on a riff related to the Copland sections, the framed section is

\[\text{Example 6.4d}\]

Lake’s vocal in the first several verses insistently oscillates between G#/Ab and F#; and Emerson also plays these two notes as a dyad on the Hammond organ in the first verse, as mentioned in chapter 4 at Example 4.10. Also g# and Ab are the keys of the outer movements respectively, and F# seems to be the key of the “2nd Impression.”
certainly intertextual, but it does not necessarily mirror the whole piece or show any particularly ambitious dimension. The framed intertextuality is also connected melodically and harmonically to the recapitulation of the theme so that the framed intertextuality can function as structurally subordinate music to the framing section. Nevertheless, the extremely long framed section is an indication of Emerson’s development toward an elaborate framed intertextuality that could compete with framing intertextuality. Indeed, this kind of composition, in which themes are followed by a very long improvisation that is then followed by a recapitulation of the theme, was rather typical with The Nice and the “first wave” prog rock groups, as Macan says, and not necessarily with ELP and other “second wave” groups. Emerson himself had been away from that style of composition for a number of years at this point in his career, so an overt return to that old style would seem quite unnatural. His general tendency toward the use of framed intertextuality as his experimental site, however, goes a long way toward explaining this strange return to his old style. Indeed, this move is brought to an extreme stage after ELP disbanded and, in 1980, Emerson composed a film score for the first time in his career.

26 Examples of pieces with a very long improvisation section in The Nice period include live versions of “Hang On To A Dream,” “America,” “Intermezzo from the Karelia Suite,” and “Rondo.” In all these pieces, the improvisation usually far exceeds the length of the framing sections. But as Macan points out, such an extremely long solo was to be modified generally into a more organized, pre-composed form when prog rock changed from the “first wave” to “the second wave” around the beginning of the 1970s.
With the help of Godfrey Salmon’s orchestration, Emerson undertook the challenge of providing a soundtrack music for the Italian horror film, *Inferno* (1980), a movie directed by “The Master of Italian Horror,” Dario Argento.27 This music is scored for orchestra, piano, electric instruments such as guitar, bass, and synthesizers, and a choir, can be counted among Emerson’s most ambitious and large-scale compositional efforts, such as The Nice’s “Ars Longa Vita Brevis” (1968, in *Ars Longa Vita Brevis*) and “Five Bridges Suite” (1970, in *Five Bridges*), orchestral performances of ELP’s “Abbadon’s Bolero” (1978, in ELP, *Works Live*) and Emerson’s “Piano Concerto No. 1” (1977, in *Works, vol. 1*).28 In fact, one could even see the distinctively Emersonian model in this score, as column “E-model” shows in Example 6.5, which is a list of musical pieces in the film.

Capital letters in “Type” column indicate the type of music used in the piece, and

---

27 For a general information about Argento, see Johns, *Profondo Argento*. Also a concise history of the horror film surrounding this period is found in Newman, *Nightmare Movies*.

28 Emerson even says that the reason he decided to score a film was mainly because he wanted to experiment with an orchestra—something that would be too expensive for him to do if he did it independently. He knew the film company would pay for the orchestra and therefore he would not be burdened with that expense. But of course it would be quick to think of only money issues as his motivation for scoring a film. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, he has been interested in horror film sound for a while partly because of the chromaticism and partly because he was into collecting photos from horror movies. Also his pieces were generally accompanied by some sort of program, even in the case of such “absolute music” as Piano Concerto No. 1; he always provides programmatic title, the words to be sung, or the programmatic notes in interviews, so making music for another
Example 6.5: A List of Musical Pieces in *Inferno*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-model</th>
<th>Timing (h:mm:ss)</th>
<th>Piece Type</th>
<th>Scene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Exposition” ?</td>
<td>0:00:00 - 0:02:56</td>
<td>“Inferno (Main Titles Theme)”</td>
<td>A New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:03:30 - 0:03:52</td>
<td>“Outtake #5” *</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:07:50 - 0:11:58</td>
<td>“Rose’s Descent into the Cellar”</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:13:35 - 0:16:00</td>
<td>“Outtake #4” *</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation ?</td>
<td>0:16:41 - 0:20:00</td>
<td>“Va pensiero #1” **</td>
<td>B Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:20:50 - 0:23:05</td>
<td>“Taxi Ride”</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:24:37 - 0:25:34</td>
<td>“The Library”</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:27:38 - 0:28:55</td>
<td>“Sarah in the library vaults”</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:29:43 - 0:30:54</td>
<td>“Bookbinder’s Delight”</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:33:00 - 0:37:16</td>
<td>“Va pensiero #2” **</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:38:22 - 0:38:51</td>
<td>“Outtake #3” *</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Recapitulation” ?</td>
<td>0:40:37 - 0:43:58</td>
<td>“Rose Leaves the Apartment”</td>
<td>A New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:44:45 - 0:46:49</td>
<td>“Rose Gets It”</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:54:16 - 0:54:28</td>
<td>“Additional Outtake #1” ***</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0:55:50 - 0:58:00</td>
<td>“Outtake #2” *</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00:40 - 1:01:45</td>
<td>“Elisa’s Story”</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:04:22 - 1:07:35</td>
<td>“A Cat Attic Attack”</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:08:59 - 1:09:14</td>
<td>“Additional Outtake #2” ***</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:17:59 - 1:21:33</td>
<td>“Kazanian’s Tarantella”</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:24:50 - 1:25:46</td>
<td>“Additional Outtake #3” ***</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:26:42 - 1:27:58</td>
<td>“Mark’s Discovery”</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:39:50 - 1:42:02</td>
<td>“Rose Gets It”</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:42:03 - 1:44:49</td>
<td>“Inferno Finale”</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:44:26 - 1:46:13</td>
<td>“Mater Tenebrarum” (end credits)</td>
<td>A/B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These pieces are from “Inferno (Outtakes Suite)” released as track 16 of the soundtrack CD of this movie, *Inferno* (Cinevox Record: CD-MDF 306, 1997). Since each “movement” of this “Suite” is given no title, I call, for the purposes of this dissertation, the 1st piece (0:00-3:08) “Outtake #1”; the 2nd (3:10-5:22) “Outtake #2”; the 3rd (5:23-7:00) “Outtake #3”; the 4th (7:01-9:41) “Outtake #4”; and the fifth (9:42-10:14) “Outtake #5.”

** A recording of “Va pensiero” occurs intact at 0:16:41 but with some modification at 0:33:00, as will become clear later in this chapter. Therefore I distinguish these two occurrences by numbering the first occurrence #1 and the second #2.

*** These pieces are not included in the aforementioned soundtrack CD, but they clearly seem to be of Emerson’s composition and performance. I call them “Additional Outtake #1,” “Additional Outtake #2,” and “Additional Outtake #3,” for the purposes of this dissertation.

A recording of “Va pensiero” occurs intact at 0:16:41 but with some modification at 0:33:00, as will become clear later in this chapter. Therefore I distinguish these two occurrences by numbering the first occurrence #1 and the second #2.

*** These pieces are not included in the aforementioned soundtrack CD, but they clearly seem to be of Emerson’s composition and performance. I call them “Additional Outtake #1,” “Additional Outtake #2,” and “Additional Outtake #3,” for the purposes of this dissertation.

---

medium is yet another attempt to write programmatic music. See Sasagawa, Keith 282
they suggest that each of these pieces can be categorized into one of three types: (A) those derived directly or indirectly from “Inferno: Main Titles Theme”; (B) those directly or indirectly derived from “Va pensiero” (0:16:41-0:20:00); and (C) those that are neither A nor B. Even though the “improvisation” section is not entirely improvisation, this section contains one piece, “Taxi Ride,” which includes an improvisable “rag” interlude. And the coda has the character of summing up of previous materials, “Mater Tenebrarum” can especially be interpreted as a mixture of both A and B.

This film score features an ambitious framed intertextuality in the B pieces, which occur within the Rome scene of the film. The ambitiousness can be heard partly in the length of the framed section (i.e., the total length of the B-pieces), which is approximately 13'44". This is longer than any other previously composed framed intertextuality in Emerson’s repertoire and forms about a thirds of the entire score, which amounts to about 41 minutes overall.

Intertextual approaches employed in each of the B-pieces are also ambitious and novel. All the B-pieces are derived from “Va pensiero,” a famous chorus from Giuseppe Emerson Interviews.
Example 6.6: Inferno (1980): Framed Intertextuality

a. “Va pensiero” from Giuseppe Verdi, *Nabucco* (c1841)

b. “Taxi Ride” (intertexts: ELP, Funk, etc.)

c. “The Library” (intext: Bach)
d. “Sarah In The Library Vaults” (intertext: late Romantic)

e. “Bookbinder’s Delight” (intertext: early 20th century)

f. “Outtake #3” (intertext: mid-20th century): Open-ended

"Va pensiero"

m. 12:

"Outtake #3" "Black-key cluster" joined by "white keys" played with a palm moving on the keyboard quickly
Verdi’s opera *Nabucco* (c1841).\(^{29}\) As **Example 6.6** shows with musical excerpts, arrows, and brackets, the melody of the Verdi piece, “Va pensiero” (a), is varied in “Taxi Ride” (b); the Verdi melody in F# major is transformed into an f-minor version with some rhythmic modification. The f-minor version is accompanied by allusions to ELP and funk. The ELP allusions are made by piano and drums (see annotated boxes). Piano plays perfect-fourth ascents in parallel perfect fifths, clearly referring to the main theme of “Tarkus,” which was shown in **Example 4.3a** in Chapter Four, though this time the range is much higher than “Tarkus” and the figure does not contain a harmonic modulation. Drums play a technically-demanding high-speed pattern on tom-toms and snare drum while keeping regular time on hi-hat and bass drum, even in an odd meter like 5/4, reminding listeners of Carl Palmer’s virtuosity and skill. The allusion to funk music is clear in the presence of the slapped electric bass guitar, an approach to playing developed specifically by such funk bassists as Larry Graham of Sly and the Family Stone, Stanley Clarke of Chick Corea’s Return to Forever, or even Marcus Miller, and was well established by the time *Inferno* was released in 1980.\(^{30}\) Emerson had never used a funk texture before, and his

\(^{29}\) This Verdi piece is sometimes called Italy’s unofficial “second anthem,” because at every ceremonial event in Italy this piece is performed. Emerson’s or Argento’s choice of this piece may be an homage to the country where the film was partly shot. But Emerson’s treatment of the anthem does not necessarily seem to respect the Verdi piece, which might argue against the “homage” idea. And yet, the way a well-known piece of music is treated compositionally does not necessarily reveal much about a musician’s political attitudes. Emerson seems to be the kind of person who is too interested in music to take much interest in politics, judging from existing interviews.

\(^{30}\) The recordings of these bassists were already hits by then; see, for example, Sly and the Family Stone’s *Stand!* which features Graham was released in 1969; Clarke’s album with Chick Corea’s Return to Forever, *Romantic Warrior*, was released in 1976; and Miller’s
use of this funk intertext is an important reason that this piece can be seen to project an ambiguous intertextual approach.  

This f-minor version of “Va pensiero” is taken over in the next piece, “The Library” (c) with a four-part harmonization in Bach-chorale style. The Verdi melody (the circled notes in the example) is no longer kept in the soprano part; it is distributed among different voices. Thus the original Verdi melody becomes a little harder to recognize clearly. This approach of employing a distributed cantus firmus melody is an entirely new one in Emerson’s repertoire, and he is clearly experimenting with the new technique in this piece.

In the next piece, “Sarah In The Library Vaults” (d), the f-minor melody with a four-part harmonization as a whole is taken over from “The Library,” but transformed in a very chromatic manner, thus alluding to a late Romantic style. The Verdi melody mostly comes back to the soprano voice in this piece, but it is now even harder to recognize because of the prevailing chromaticism, which de-contextualizes the originally tonal melody. This is also an entirely new intertextual approach in Emerson’s music.

Such chromatic decontextualization is further reinforced in the next piece, composition for Lonnie Liston Smith’s “Space Princess” was recorded in 1978.

31 Though groups such as Blood, Sweat and Tears did allude to funk as mentioned in Chapter Five, funk remained a relatively minor intertext in the context of progressive rock. A reference to ELP itself is discussed in Chapter Five as a “novel” intertext in Emerson’s “Piano Concerto No. 1” in 1977, but it is not certain whether that “novelty” is still effective in 1980. An extensive and detailed historical study on what kinds of “rock” intertexts have been used in much progressive rock is in order.
“Bookbinder’s Delight” (e), where the melody’s tonal orientation is further undermined. The melody from “Va pensiero” itself begins to be collapsed, and the accompaniment provides a further non-tonal context. The audibility of the melody seems to be challenged here.

The next piece is a reprise of “Va pensiero,” but with a series of silences intervening in the piece, owing to filmic/diegetic needs. It is after this fragmented “Va pensiero” that “Outtake #3” (f) is played. This is an effect rather than a piece of music; it is the final piece that still incorporates the Verdi piece but disrupts it so that the listener may have trouble hearing the Verdi melody. The main section from 6:32 is played on synthesizer with a sustain pedal. It starts with a “black-key cluster” that includes the beginning notes of the original Verdi melody. The cluster moves down and up very quickly, played by the right-hand palm, which soon also holds down white keys. This is then “accompanied” by an octave “white-key cluster” in the left hand, as all this is subject to a strong and dynamic electronic flanging effect. As an extreme transformation of “Va pensiero,” this “Outtake #3” might display one of the ambitious intertextual techniques.

But what is even more ambitious than the intertextual approach employed within each of these pieces is the approach employed throughout these B-pieces. These B-pieces may at first look like what is sometimes called “single-strain variations,” which is a set of

---

32 Within the filmic narrative, this reprise occurs when Sarah, a girlfriend of the protagonist Mark, experiences repeated blackouts. Because of the blackouts, the record player which is playing “Va pensiero” plays the piece intermittently.
variations based on a single theme, but actually these B-pieces instead constitute a chain of transformations. As the gray oblique line in Example 6.7 indicates, the Verdi melody is taken over by “Taxi Ride,” which is taken over by “The Library,” etc.; certain elements of the immediately preceding piece are carried over into the next piece. “Sarah,” for example, is not necessarily a variation of “Va pensiero #1,” because it is more directly related to the immediately preceding piece, “The Library.” One important effect of such a chain of transformations is that the transformation accumulates to such an extreme extent that by the end, the original “classical” Verdi melody becomes almost inaudible. Though

Example 6.7: Inferno (1980): Diagram of Framed Intertextuality

Emerson had employed various kinds of variation techniques in his music previously, he
seems not to have attempted such a consecutive chain of transformations before this work.
Emerson seems to make the framed intertextuality the focus of the whole film score.

In fact, the framed section as a whole is not connected to the following return of the
framing section in terms of key. Even though “Va pensiero” is firmly in F# major, it is
only the beginning; chromatic transformations finally bring the pieces into an effect with no
 tonality or cadence at all. “Outtake #3” is not harmonically connected to the following
piece at all which is “Rose Leaves the Apartment,” shown in Example 6.12b below. The
framed intertextuality ends prematurely, and the framing intertextuality suddenly returns.
There is nothing like the relative pronoun “that” of the “coffee” sentence above. The
framed intertextuality is not organically related to the framing intertextuality but simply
juxtaposed with it with no particularly significant relations.

The high degree of independence of framed intertextuality invite a comparison with
framing intertextuality. As Example 6.8 suggests with gray lines, framing intertextuality
is also made of transformations of the theme, though such a comparison reveals many
differences between framed and framing intertextualities. One big difference may be the
way the thematic transformations are presented. The framing intertextuality found in this
piece can be called “multi-strain variations.”

34 For this term, see Horsley, “The 16th-Century Variation”; and Nelson, The Technique of
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Example 6.8: Inferno (1980): A Diagram of Framing Intertextuality: Multiple-Strain Variations

The first strain starts with “Inferno (main titles theme),” connected to “Elisa’s Story” and

---

Variation, 11. What Donald F. Tovey calls “alternating variations on two themes” in his *Forms of Music*, 241-242 is a double-strain variation. Concerning variation forms in relation to Emerson’s compositions in general, a separate extensive study is necessary in order to fully understand his compositional practices, since so many of his pieces employ variations at different levels.
“Mark’s Discovery” and then arrives at “Inferno Finale.” The second strain begins with “Rose’s Descent,” followed by “Rose leaves,” and so on. The third strain starts with “Rose Gets It!” The New York pieces thus vacillate among these three strains, and do not deviate endlessly as in the Rome pieces.

Such multi-strain variation may however be considered reminiscent of Emerson’s older pieces such as “Tarkus” (1971, in Tarkus), where “classical” strain and “rock” strain alternates periodically, as discussed in relation to Example 4.4a in Chapter 4. Overall, the framing intertextuality here shows a less ambitious tendency. For example, the theme of variations here is composed in typical Emersonian style, employing no particularly new techniques. Example 6.9a shows the beginning of the theme. This piano theme is already intertextual, unlike the Verdi theme used in the framed intertextuality, but like that employed in many of Emerson’s compositions. Some “classical” intertexts can be found here. The left-hand arppegio figure might be considered derivative of that of Chopin’s famous “Revolution” etude (b), in that it contains a wide range, 1-5-1-2-b3-5 ... motion, with a sustain pedal, for example.35 The right-hand figure in the Emerson theme, on the other hand, might be derivative of Satie’s Gymnopedie, No. 1 (e), in that it is diatonic and rhythmically quite square.

---

35 One might argue that this might be a reference to some “rock” piano pieces, but such a
Example 6.9: Emerson, “Inferno (Main Titles Theme)”

a. opening measures

b. Chopin, Etude Op. 10, No. 12, “Revolution”, m. 9-

c. Satie, Gymnopedie, No. 1, m. 5-

wide range left-hand ostinato figure with the use of sustain pedal at this tempo is quite rare in any rock music. Most “rock” pianists play within a much narrower range on left hand.
There are also certain “rock” intertexts in this theme. The portion of the theme quoted in Example 6.10a can be seen as a “rock” intertext such as the one cited in Example 6.10b. The point here is that the texture of these pieces are similar to each other.

Example 6.10: Emerson, “Inferno (Main Titles Theme)” and King Crimson, “Lark’s Tongues in Aspic, Part Two” (1973, in *Lark’s Tongues in Aspic*)

a. “Inferno (Main Titles Theme)” 1:15-

b. “Lark’s Tongues in Aspic, Part Two”
in that a certain harmonic goal is reached not through a “development” of the initial materials but by repeating a single block of events, or a riff. In “Inferno,” the harmony moves from ii through V to i in C minor, and this progression is presented simply by repeating the same textural block over and over again with different pitch classes. There is no such thing as “liquidation,” “model and sequence,” or “fragmentation” that would create the kind of “development” found in so much Western art music. Such a textural succession by a repeating block is typical in much prog rock music, however. The King Crimson example is only one of many that could be cited; here the harmony moves from I to V, and all the group does is to play nearly the same pattern using different pitch classes.

Another “rock” intertext in the theme may be present in the form of “Inferno (Main Titles Theme),” which is clearly in AABA. A Chopin etude would create an AABAA form instead. AABA is a formal design very much associated with Tin Pan Alley pop, which led straight to “rock” music. Thus “Inferno” is not an entirely “classically”

---

36 “Liquidation” is defined as “gradually eliminating characteristic features, until only uncharacteristic ones remain, which no longer demand a continuation” in Schoenberg, *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*, 58. “Fragmentation” is defined as a “process of shortening the units” in Caplin, *Classical Form*, 41.

37 Such a succession of blocks is suggested as prog rock’s typical texture, in Macan, “Spirit of Albion.” It may be argued that the origin of such a block succession is traced back to the very origin of rock ‘n’ roll, where musicians converted irregular and characteristic elements into straightforward and regular rhythm, chords, and structure. I discuss some details of such important origin of rock ‘n’ roll in my Japanese article, “Structural Transformations.” One could also view the influence of minimalism on such prog-rock texture.

38 See, for example, Chopin’s etudes in op. 10 and 25. Most of these pieces are clearly in AABAA form.
oriented theme; important degrees of intertextuality are indeed apparent. And in this respect, the theme that is varied in the framing intertextuality is different from the theme that is varied in framed intertextuality. But ultimately, this theme is quite Emersonian and the composer does not seem to be experimenting much with new techniques here, as if he was announcing that the framing intertextuality should not be the focus of the whole score.

The way the theme is transformed in the framing intertextuality also seems to be less ambitious than that of the framed intertextuality, thus seeming to give up the primary status within the whole piece to the highly original sound of the framed intertextuality. The theme is first transformed in the first strain very slightly. This strain consists of those pieces that more or less literally repeat the theme; “Elisa’s Story,” “Mark’s Discovery,” and “Inferno Finale.” The beginning measures of each of the first two pieces are almost exactly the same as the theme, as Example 6.11 shows. The only difference in “Elisa’s Story” is the timbre of electric piano, while “Mark’s Discovery” differs in the use of added strings playing a sustained tonic triad. In the sense that such transformations can be created with the least effort, these transformations could be considered the least ambitious.

The transformations in the second strain are also not particularly ambitious and consist of some very slight chromatic alterations. Example 6.12 shows the beginning measures of some of the 2nd-strain pieces. Mm. 3-4 of “Rose Leaves the Apartment” and the beginning of “A Cat Attick Attack” sound almost identical; the only difference is whether a Db or D-natural occurs in the left hand as a passing note between C and Eb.
Example 6.11: 1st strain

a. Elisa’s Story, 0:00-

b. Mark’s Discovery, 0:00-

Such a very slight change might challenge the untrained ears of “rock” listeners. And such a procedure stands in contrast with that of the B-pieces, which instead feature more obvious transformations that challenge the listener’s ability to find the melody of the original Verdi piece. In this sense, there is perhaps some musical interest in such minor changes, but it would be difficult to regard this simpler type of transformation as something new for Emerson. Emerson appears here to use his long-time stock-in-trade techniques of compositions.

The way Emerson incorporates “rock” intertexts also seems to be less ambitious.
Example 6.12: 2nd strain

a. Rose’s Descent, 0:00-

b. Rose Leaves the Apartment, 0:00-

c. A Cat Attick Attack, 0:00-

Example 6.13 shows two examples of “rock” intertexts in this score. The first one sounds “rock” simply because of the repetitive texture, and he utilizes similar textures throughout the third movement of “Piano Concerto No. 1.” It is worth noting that the second example sounds like Jimi Hendrix’s “Purple Haze” (1967, in Are You Experienced?); allusion to

a. A Cat Attick Attack, 0:59-

b. Inferno Finale, 0:14-: Jimi Hendrix?

Hendrix’s music is one of Emerson’s favorite techniques going back to the beginning section of “The Barbarian” (1970, in Emerson, Lake and Palmer).

Emerson for the framing intertextuality just repeats what he did years before, whereas in the framed intertextuality he attempts what he had never attempted. The focus of the piece is clearly led to the framed and not farming intertextuality.

Most of the transformations in the framing intertextuality here are thus not very

---

39 Emerson remarks: “Our song ‘The Barbarian’ was kind of dedicated to Hendrix ... because that song started almost with the ‘Purple Haze’ chords.” Quoted in Black, *Jimi*
ambitious, and Emerson seems to rely heavily on his stock-in-trade intertextual techniques. “Kazanian’s Tarantella” is certainly an exception, however; it transforms the right-hand melody of “Inferno Theme” in a chromatic manner, as shown on the top staff of Example 6.14. This intertextual approach seems reminiscent of “Bookbinder’s Delight.” But still, this greater degree of transformation can be found only here in the framing intertextuality, and the music periodically comes back to the first or second strain, as the diagram above shows.

Example 6.14: “Kazanian’s Tarantella”

The ending of the framing intertextuality may also be derivative of his former practice of using an open-ending, as found in many of his earlier pieces that feature a tritone-related chord at the very end. As Example 6.15 shows, the c-minor cadence is here met with F# that seems to repudiate or negate the cadence.

_Hendrix_, 249.
As for the key relation between the framed intertextuality and the framing intertextuality, the framed intertextuality ends with the effect with tone cluster and flanging effects, which is not smoothly connected to the following piece, “Rose Leaves the Apartment,” shown as Example 6.12b.

Just as the reader of the “turtle” sentence above would start comparing the embedded and primary texts with each other because of their structurally weak mutual relation, so the listener of this film score might compare some characteristics of framed and framing intertextualities, because the framed intertextuality is now independent of the framing intertextuality and performs’ Bal’s “resembling function. Example 6.16 shows a table of comparisons: both framed and framing intertextualities are in variation-like forms, thus the framed intertextuality mirrors the framing intertextuality in terms of form. Also both feature an open-ended ending. The orientation of variation is single-strain in framed intertextuality, whereas it is multi-strain in framing intertextuality. Framed intertextuality
Example 6.16: Inferno (1980): Framing Intertextuality and Framed Intertextuality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Framing Intertextuality</th>
<th>Framed Intertextuality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>form:</td>
<td>transformations/variations</td>
<td>variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation:</td>
<td>multi-strain</td>
<td>single-strain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theme:</td>
<td>rock-classical</td>
<td>classical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deviation:</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>extreme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ending:</td>
<td>open-ended</td>
<td>open-ended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

features a “classical” theme, and it is transformed to an extreme extent, whereas the framing intertextuality features an already intertextual “rock-classical” theme, which is transformed in a more moderate manner. These direct comparisons suggest a more independent status than structurally subordinate status of the framed intertextuality.

Framed intertextuality in this score is juxtaposed with the framing intertextuality in a competing relation between two different kinds of intertextuality. The framed intertextuality does not establish any strong organic relation to the framing intertextuality; the framed intertextuality just exists there side by side with the framing intertextuality, vying only for a comparison with it.

_Framed Intertextuality in Interpretation_

As the above analyses have shown, Emerson had been presenting framed and
framing intertextualities over a period of several years, and especially in *Inferno*, he created a very independent kind of framed intertextuality that lacks a sense of structural dependence upon the framing intertextuality. Such a less modernist approach creates what Bal calls a *mise en abyme*, or infinite regress, a very postmodernist effect which could be found in the following example:40

It was a dark and stormy night. The band of robbers huddled together around the fire. When he had finished eating, the first bandit said, “Let me tell you a story. It was a dark and stormy night. The band of robbers huddled together around the fire. When he had finished eating, the first bandit said, ‘Let me tell you a story. It was a dark and stormy night. The band of . . .’”.41

Taking this as a model, we may consider that if rock-classical intertextuality in the framing part of the score is imagined as a dialogue between “rock” and “classical” agents or *dramatis personae*, one of them in this drama talks about another pair of “rock” and “classical” *personae* conversing with one another. This latter pair in turn is also imagined as talking about yet another pair of “rock” and “classical” *personae* having a dialogue between themselves, a dialogue in which yet another pair of “rock” and “classical” *personae* is the topic of discussion. Once such an infinite regress occurs, there is no end; and the listener cannot find a definite ending either. Infinite regress indeed seems to be

---

40 Bal, *Narratology*, 142-147. The effect of *mise en abyme*, or infinite regress, has been studied widely in literary narratology, but rarely in relation to music. For some exemplary studies on *mise en abyme* in the fiction, see Ron, “The Restricted Abyss”; Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, 93; and Spence, “Narrative Recursion.” For a study of infinite regress as a favorite feature of postmodernist texts, see McHale, *Postmodernist Fiction*, chapter 8.

41 Spence, “Narrative Recursion,” 188. Another famous example of infinite regress would be the following: “Eggs are laid by chickens who are hatched from eggs.”
the key to understanding a possible narrative interpretation for this kind of elaborate framed intertextuality in Emerson’s music. As long as there is also background intertextuality, by means of the Emerson model as mentioned above, one can imagine another pair in the background as discussed in Chapter 1—or somewhere in the backstage of the drama being played out by the piece as discussed in Chapter 4. All this can be considered part of a large “get-together” scene, to return to the opening analogy of this story.

With infinite regress, the framed intertextuality in *Inferno* intersects with the narrative in cinema. The movie is a kind of “postmodern horror,” a type of film that is distinct from “classic horror.” Isabel Cristina Pinedo, in distinguishing these two types of horror films, proposes five characteristics for postmodern horror films: (1) a violent disruption of the everyday world; (2) transgression and violation of boundaries; (3) questioning of the validity of rationality; (4) repudiation of narrative closure; and (5) production of a bounded experience of fear.\(^42\) Among these five characteristics, the fourth is of particular importance for our analysis of Emerson’s score. Indeed, the Rome scene of the movie is about the murder of Sarah, the girlfriend of the film’s protagonist, Mark; but the entire Rome scene ends with a situation that is questionable in a narrative sense. In this final Rome sequence, Mark arrives at Sarah’s apartment only to find her dead. But she falls down from behind a screen to the floor in front of it, breaking through the screen when Mark finds her, and this suggests to the viewer that she has been dislocated from the original location of her murder. More confusingly, she screams with her eyes open as she

\(^{42}\) Pinero, “Postmodern Elements of the Contemporary Horror Films,” 90-110.
falls down in front of Mark, even though she is supposedly already dead. It is not only that the rationality of a story is disrupted here, but also that this Rome scene does not achieve narrative closure because of it.

In fact, the film as a whole does not achieve much narrative closure either. In the final scene in New York, Mark barely escapes a haunted apartment that is being burned down. But while scrambling for a way out, he encounters a woman who transfigures into a monster called “Mother of Darkness.” Mark successfully escapes the building, but the woman willingly stays inside the burning building, going into rapture over the total flaming destruction. The viewer is left to wonder if the story ends at this point or not; the monster may or may not survive the fire or reappear in the future. Thus the film as a whole offers an open ending—an ending perhaps already suggested musically by the mirror-text of the Rome scene.

The kind of filmic narrative found in Inferno can be considered an early manifestation of such typical postmodern “nightmare” movies as Nightmare on Elm Street (1984), in which the protagonist has a terrible nightmare and wakes up only to find another nightmarish scene in the reality, completely blocking an escape to a more secure world. No matter how many times the character in the film wakes up from the nightmare, she will always encounter another nightmare. Inferno’s narrative can be seen as a basic form of such an infinite regress.
Emerson’s score, featuring mirror-text in framed intertextuality, supports this markedly postmodern-horror feature of repudiating narrative closure. Because of the effect of infinite regress brought in by the mirror text, narrative closure is firmly repudiated in the music. Emerson’s score for *Inferno*, which is a result of his intertextual development over more than a decade, matches the nature of the film quite neatly. And this may be one reason the film score was awarded an Italian film-music award.

This chapter has attempted to demonstrate several points. First, intertextuality can exist within some internal frame of a work. Intertextuality is often considered a phenomenon at work throughout a piece, but it can be framed into an embedded part of a work, creating an important relationship with the parts of the work outside the internal frame. Second, framed intertextuality can be variously elaborated to be something comparable to framing intertextuality, when the framing part is also intertextual. In such a case, the competition of two intertextualities may become the focus of attention. Third, framed intertextuality itself can constitute a mirror-text of the framing intertextuality by imitating some aspect of the latter. In such a case, an infinite regress is suggested in the piece; the whole work is considered as only a process within an infinite regress. Fourth, music for postmodern horror films such as *Inferno* might be further explored in terms of the intertextual and narrative construction of the music itself. When music is discussed in relation to film, the narrativity of the music is often discussed quickly. But as recent narratological studies in music have shown quite convincingly, music without any programmatic aspects can indeed generate narrativity of various kinds. The effect of film
music should be analyzed at the intersection between the filmic narrative and music’s own narrativity. And musical intertextuality contributes significantly to the construction of such a musical narrative. Finally, it is important not to assume that there is only one intertextuality per work in the manner of Bakhtinian analysis. As long as two kinds of intertextuality can be presented inside and outside of the internal frame, and as long as their relation and competition can play some significant role, it is important to attempt to recognize different kinds of intertextuality within a piece and explore their relations.

43 This position is entirely congruent with Nicholas Cook’s recent studies on musical
multi-media. See his *Analysing Musical Multimedia*; and “Theorizing Musical Meaning.”
CONCLUSION

“PROGRESSIVE” INTERTEXTUALITY

The previous chapters attempted to elucidate a variety of forms of intertextuality that progressive rock musician Keith Emerson developed over the course of his career. Each of the six forms discussed in the preceding six chapters has distinct characteristics and represents the style of his musical intertextuality during the period discussed. As the summary chart in Example 7.1 below suggests, background intertextuality, as opposed to foreground intertextuality, has been used to a significant degree throughout the duration of Emerson’s career. Dialectic intertextuality, characterized here as a kind of intertextual realization of Hegelian principles, was particularly used during The Nice period.

Example 7.1: Summary: Stylistic Development of Emerson’s Musical Intertextuality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(The Nice era)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Intertextuality</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(beginning ELP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialectic Intertextuality</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisionary Intertextuality</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle Intertextuality</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ply Intertextuality</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framed Intertextuality</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(late 1970s)</td>
<td>(1980s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revisionary intertextuality, defined as a revised version of Emerson’s previous intertextuality, was conspicuous at the beginning of ELP period. Subtle intertextuality, which was distinguished from sharp intertextuality, was featured in many of the golden-era ELP pieces. Multi-ply intertextuality, as opposed to single-ply intertextuality, characterizes Emerson’s 1977 monument, Piano Concerto No. 1. And finally, the development of framed intertextuality, which can be contrasted with framing intertextuality, is a key feature of his 1980 score for Inferno and the subsequent pieces. As a “crossover” musician, Emerson has made a constant “progress” toward new approaches of intertextuality; hence the title of this conclusion. These different forms of intertextuality are a natural and crucial result of his compositional activity. His musical styles can be distinguished from one another, as well as from other musicians’, especially in terms of these forms of intertextuality. And to varying extents, each of these styles that had a marked impact on the progressive rock movement, as well as many other “crossover” musicians more generally.

Each of the six forms of intertextuality discussed in the previous chapters has a broad applicability, as I have suggested throughout the dissertation. For example, background intertextuality is indeed found in many “rock” pieces of the 1960s and 1970s. Revisionary intertextuality can be found particularly when a musician who employs intertextuality changes her style for personal or artistic reasons. Subtle intertextuality can even be considered an essence of many golden-era prog-rock pieces that do not overtly resort to sharp intertextuality. In addition to the Blood, Sweat, and Tears piece already discussed
in Chapter Five, many avant-garde pieces by Frank Zappa, Vanilla Fudge, etc. can be considered in terms of multi-ply intertextuality because of the keen choice of “novel” intertexts they employ. Framed intertextuality is perhaps the essence of many musical quotations that interpolate the whole piece and frame itself, while also featuring intertextuality in itself. Even such an idiosyncratic form as dialectic intertextuality may find its parallel in various other musics. These forms of intertextuality are thus not restricted to the music of Keith Emerson and may be applicable to the understanding of music other than progressive rock, to music that could not be considered rock at all, or even to works of art other than music, such as poetry, literature, film, painting, architecture, sculpture, land-art, and others. In addition, these proposed concepts may intersect with related terms such as pastiche, parody, irony, collage, and so on, in interesting ways. It is hoped that further scholarly work on these and other forms of intertextuality will test the wider applicability of the theoretical formulations presented in this dissertation.

This is not to say, however, that all other works of art—in music or whatever else—are intertextual in the same sense as discussed in the preceding chapters. It is important to acknowledge that different kinds of intertextuality (included kinds not discussed here) find their way into works in different combinations. One form of intertextuality may explain one aspect of a work, but only that dimension. In many cases, one form of intertextuality interacts with other forms of intertextuality within the same work. It is the specific way these different intertextual forms are combined with one another within a work that creates the distinct intertextual characteristic of the work. A
single shared quality does not make two or more works identical to each other. Each of the six forms of intertextuality may well find its way into other works, but in different ways in each instance.

It is for this reason that I remarked in the Introduction that many more studies on a variety of intertextual procedures would be crucial to a better understanding of “rock-classical” intertextuality. As long as each piece features different combination of different kinds of intertextuality, it is extremely dangerous to discuss all intertextual practices in terms of a single model of intertextuality. Unfortunately, a model based of Bakhtinian “dialogic” has been universally used to describe any work employing intertextuality and, in the case of prog rock, one of the three stereotypical narratives (the “rockin’-the-classics” type, “classicizin’-the-rock” type, and reciprocal type, as mentioned in the Introduction) has been used fairly widely to explain many different intertextual practices as a consequence. Such monolithic treatment simply misses the central point of twentieth-century “crossover” experiments in the arts. It is the variety of intertextual practices that “crossover” artists have been experimenting with and that has attracted so many listeners; and to a certain extent, the term “crossover” can even be seen to characterize the entire history of the arts in the twentieth century. Various forms of intertextuality should not always be reduced to chaos in the audience’s responses.\footnote{Even in the case of such a seemingly chaotic intertextual form as John Oswald’s “plunderphonics” in which many samplings are mashed up, there must be some grammars comparable to what Mayer calls “intraopus style” and “intraopus structure” awaiting discovery. For interesting discussions on his practices, see Oswald, “Plunderphonics, or Audio Piracy”; Jones, Plunderphonics, ‘Pataphysics & Pop Mechanics, 131-142;}

\footnote{Even in the case of such a seemingly chaotic intertextual form as John Oswald’s “plunderphonics” in which many samplings are mashed up, there must be some grammars comparable to what Mayer calls “intraopus style” and “intraopus structure” awaiting discovery. For interesting discussions on his practices, see Oswald, “Plunderphonics, or Audio Piracy”; Jones, Plunderphonics, ‘Pataphysics & Pop Mechanics, 131-142;
are in the process of discovering more variety than has been discovered so far. One does not generalize things without knowing them; such an act would constitute a political act that is not based on scientific investigation but on the violent power of words. I believe it must be such an awareness of the morality of scholarly investigation that has motivated the studies of musical intertextuality by Korsyn, Straus, Covach, Burkholder, Metzer, and Klein, who sincerely aim at identifying a variety of intertextual practices, instead of rushing toward overgeneralization. Hopefully, many more names will be added to such a list of scholars in the future.²

“Doubleness” is certainly a powerful conceptual device, but our aesthetic and psychological experience of music is arguably much more complex and complicated than that word alone can explain, as the history of the study of musical aesthetics and psychology seem to indicate.³ Even if Kristeva’s intertextuality could be read as a gloss of Bakhtin’s theories, what made her the coiner of the term was her attempt to expand the Bakhtinian horizon of textual studies. Such an expansive tendency in Kristeva’s theory must be taken seriously without oversimplification. And we analysts of works of art must

² At the final minute before the submission of this dissertation, I learned that Serge Lacasse is editing a collection of papers, entitled *Incestuous Pop: Intertextuality in Recorded Popular Music*. This book is expected to be an important contribution to the study of a variety of intertextuality in popular music.

³ For an introductory account of the history of musical aesthetics, see Lippman, *History of Western Musical Aesthetics*. For a concise account of the history of psychology of music, see Gjerdingen, “The Psychology of Music.”
not overgeneralize the objects of our analysis in order to accord the analytical results with
the conceptual device too quickly and cleanly. Practical studies are indeed the very key to
transcending the limits of current intertextual studies and arriving at a better and richer
understanding of intertextuality. Whether a truly fruitful scholarly development of
intertextuality will be obtained in the future will depend on how seriously and sincerely we
can realize what Keith Emerson suggests in the following statement about musical
intertextuality:

... to play “progressively” you have to have a good understanding of all forms
of music. To become a great classical player takes a lifetime of dedication, to become a great jazz player takes a lifetime of dedication and personal conviction. To become a great blues player a load of abuse and conviction. To understand Indian music and raga forms takes all the above. ... Sadly life is too short for a progressive player to incorporate all these forms ...  

---

4 The quotation is from Ewing, “Keith Emerson.”
Discography

The following discography represents only some of Emerson’s standard recordings that I actually consulted with in preparation for this dissertation; many other recordings including a lot of bootleg CD’s have been excluded if they are not mentioned in this dissertation. For more complete discography, see Hanson, *Hang On To A Dream*, and Forrester et al, *Emerson, Lake and Palmer*, as well as countless fan pages on the internet.

The discography is divided into four categories: (1) The Nice recordings; (2) ELP’s, ELPowell’s, and 3’s recordings; (3) Emerson’s Solo recordings; and (4) Other’s recordings. Within each category, recordings are arranged in chronological order. The information presented is: the performer(s); the title (italicized); the year of first release; the label; the CD catalogue number; the year of CD release (parenthesized); and the track list with times.

---

THE NICE
---


1. Flower King Of Flies ................................................................. 3:18
2. The Thoughts Of Emerlist Davjack ........................................ 2:49
3. Bonnie K ........................................................................... 3:24
4. Rondo .................................................................................. 8:22
5. War And Peace .................................................................. 5:14
6. Tantalising Maggie ............................................................ 4:35
7. Dawn ................................................................................. 5:17
8. The Cry Of Eugene ............................................................ 4:36

1. Daddy Where Did I Come From ................................................................. 3:41
2. Little Arabella ......................................................................................... 4:15
3. Happy Freuds ......................................................................................... 3:26
4. Intermezzo From The Karelia Suite ....................................................... 8:53
5. Don Edito El Gruva ............................................................................... 0:14
6. Ars Vita Longa Brevis Prelude ................................................................. 1:48
7. Ars Vita Longa Brevis 1st Movement - Awakening ................................. 3:58
8. Ars Vita Longa Brevis 2nd Movement - Realisation ................................. 4:28
10. Ars Vita Longa Brevis 4th Movement - Denial ........................................ 3:21
11. Ars Vita Longa Brevis Coda - Extension to the Big Note ....................... 0:46


1. Azrael Revisited ...................................................................................... 5:56
2. Hang On To A Dream ............................................................................... 4:46
3. Diary Of An Empty Day ........................................................................... 4:00
4. For Example ............................................................................................. 8:54
5. Rondo 69 ................................................................................................. 7:55
6. She Belongs To Me ................................................................................. 11:53


1. The Five Bridges Suite ........................................................................... 18:13
   1) Fantasia 1st Bridge ............................................................................... 6:08
   2) 2nd Bridge; Choral ............................................................................... 3:59
   3) 3rd Bridge ........................................................................................... 3:30
   4) High Level Fugue 4th Bridge ............................................................... 1:02
   5) Finale 5th Bridge ................................................................................ 3:34
2. Intermezzo from Karelia Suite ................................................................. 9:01
3. Pathetique (Symphony No. 6, 3rd movement) ........................................ 9:27
4. Country Pie/ Brandenburg Concerto no.6 .............................................. 5:48
5. One Of Those People ............................................................................. 3:09
6. The Thoughts of Emerlist Davjack ......................................................... 4:12
7. Flower King Of Flies ............................................................................. 3:36
8. Bonnie K .................................................................................................. 3:19
9. Diary Of An Empty Day ......................................................................... 3:58
10. America .................................................................................................. 6:06

1. Hang On To A Dream ................................................................. 12:42
2. My Back Pages ................................................................. 9:10
3. 3rd Movement, Pathetique .................................................. 7:05
4. America ........................................................................... 10:17
5. Diamond-Hard Blue Apples Of The Moon ....................... 2:46
6. Dawn ................................................................................ 5:06
7. Tantalising Maggie ........................................................ 4:19
8. Cry Of Eugene ................................................................... 4:30
9. Daddy Where Did I Come From ........................................ 2:46
10. Azirial ............................................................................... 3:46


Disc One
1. America – Rondo ............................................................... 11:13
2. Little Arabella ............................................................... 4:57
3. She Belongs To Me .......................................................... 6:21
4. The Cry Of Eugene ........................................................... 5:02
5. Hang On To A Dream ......................................................... 10:30
6. Country Pie .................................................................. 5:57
7. Karelia Suite ................................................................. 7:58

Disc Two
1. Blade Of Grass ................................................................. 2:11
2. Cajun Alley .................................................................. 4:11
3. Tarkus ........................................................................... 21:00
4. Hoedown ....................................................................... 5:06
5. Fanfare For The Common Man ..................................... 7:55
6. Honky Tonk Train Blues ............................................... 6:05

Disc Three
1. Keith Emerson and The Nic – Interview with Chris Welch 2001 ............... 22:07

1. The Barbarian ......................................................................................................4:28
2. Take a Pebble.....................................................................................................12:27
3. Knife-Edge...........................................................................................................5:05
4. The Three Fates .................................................................................................7:43
   a. Clotho
   b. Lachesis
   c. Atropos
5. Tank .....................................................................................................................6:47
6. Lucky Man...........................................................................................................4:37


1. Tarkus ................................................................................................................20:35
   1) Eruption.............................................................................................2:43
   2) Stones of Years..................................................................................3:44
   3) Iconoclast ..........................................................................................1:15
   4) Mass ..................................................................................................3:11
   5) Manticore ..........................................................................................1:52
   6) Battlefield ..........................................................................................3:51
   7) Aquatarkus ........................................................................................3:59
2. Jeremy Bender .....................................................................................................1:46
3. Bitches Crystal.....................................................................................................3:55
4. The Only Way (Hymn)........................................................................................3:48
5. Infinite Space (Conclusion) .................................................................................3:18
6. A Time and a Place..............................................................................................2:57
7. Are You Ready Eddy?.........................................................................................2:10


1. Promenade ...........................................................................................................1:56
2. The Gnome ...........................................................................................................4:16
3. Promenade ...........................................................................................................1:23
4. The Sage .............................................................................................................4:40
5. The Old Castle ...................................................................................................2:31
6. Blues Variations .................................................................................................4:14
7. Promenade ...........................................................................................................1:28
8. The Hut of Baba Yaga .......................................................................................1:12
9. The Curse of Baba Yaga ....................................................................................4:09
10. The Hut of Baba Yaga .......................................................................................1:06
11. The Great Gates of Kiev .................................................................6:27
12. Nutrocker .....................................................................................4:33


1. The Endless Enigma, Pt. 1 .................................................................6:37
2. Fugue ..............................................................................................1:57
3. The Endless Enigma, Pt. 2 .................................................................2:00
4. From the Beginning .......................................................................4:14
5. The Sheriff ..................................................................................3:22
6. Hoedown ......................................................................................3:48
7. Trilogy ..........................................................................................8:54
8. Living Sin ..................................................................................3:11
9. Abaddon's Bolero .......................................................................8:13


1. Jerusalem ......................................................................................2:41
2. Toccata .........................................................................................7:16
3. Still...You Turn Me On .................................................................2:50
4. Benny the Bouncer .......................................................................2:15
5. Karn Evil 9: 1st Impression, Pt. 1 ..................................................8:39
6. Karn Evil 9: 1st Impression, Pt. 2 ..................................................4:43
7. Karn Evil 9: 2nd Impression .........................................................7:05
8. Karn Evil 9: 3rd Impression .........................................................9:24
9. Making of Brain Salad Surgery ....................................................13:40


1. Hoedown .......................................................................................4:28
2. Jerusalem .....................................................................................3:18
3. Toccata .........................................................................................7:23
4. Tarkus/Eruption/Stones of Years/Iconoclast ................................27:24
5. Take a Pebble/Still...You Turn Me On/Lucky ...............................11:08
6. Piano Improvisations: Fugue/Little Rock... .................................11:54
7. Take a Pebble [Conclusion] ..........................................................3:14
9. Karn Evil 9: 1st Impression/2nd Impression... ............................35:18

1. Piano Concerto No. 1, First Movement ........................................................... 9:18
2. Piano Concerto No. 1, 2nd Movement ............................................................ 2:09
3. Piano Concerto No. 1, Third Movement ......................................................... 6:50
4. Lend Your Love to Me Tonight ........................................................................ 4:00
5. C'est la Vie ....................................................................................................... 4:17
6. Hallowed Be Thy Name ................................................................................... 4:35
7. Nobody Loves You Like I Do ........................................................................... 3:56
8. Closer to Believing ......................................................................................... 5:34
9. The Enemy God Dances With the Black ......................................................... 3:16
10. L.A. Nights .................................................................................................... 5:42
11. New Orleans .................................................................................................. 2:45
12. Two-Part Invention in D Minor ...................................................................... 1:53
13. Food for Your Soul ....................................................................................... 3:58
14. Tank .............................................................................................................. 5:09
15. Fanfare for the Common Man ...................................................................... 9:38
16. Pirate .............................................................................................................. 13:20


1. Tiger in a Spotlight ......................................................................................... 4:34
2. When the Apple Blossoms Bloom in the........................................................ 3:55
3. Bullfrog .......................................................................................................... 3:52
4. Brain Salad Surgery ....................................................................................... 3:05
5. Barrelhouse Shake-Down .............................................................................. 3:47
6. Watching over You ........................................................................................ 3:55
7. So Far to Fall ................................................................................................. 4:56
8. Maple Leaf Rag ............................................................................................. 1:55
9. I Believe in Father Christmas ....................................................................... 3:16
10. Close But Not Touching ............................................................................... 3:19
11. Honky Tonk Train Blues ............................................................................. 3:09
12. Show Me the Way to Go Home ................................................................. 3:30

Emerson, Lake and Palmer, *Love Beach*, 1978, Rhino R2 72231 (1990s)

1. All I Want Is You ........................................................................................... 2:34
2. Love Beach ................................................................................................... 2:44
3. Taste of My Love .......................................................................................... 3:31
4. The Gambler ................................................................................................ 3:21
5. For You ........................................................................................................ 4:27
6. Canario (From Fantasia Para Un Gentilhombre) ........................................... 3:57
7. Memoirs of an Officer and a Gentleman
   1) Prologue/The Education of a Gentleman ............................................5:34
   2) Love at First Sight ...............................................................................5:36
   3) Letters From The Front .......................................................................5:18
   4) Honourable Company (A March) .......................................................3:46


   1. Introductory Fanfare ............................................................................................0:53
   2. Peter Gunn ...........................................................................................................3:38
   3. Tiger in a Spotlight ............................................................................................4:06
   4. C'est la Vie .........................................................................................................4:12
   5. The Enemy God [From The Scythian Suite 2nd Movement] .........................2:49
   6. Knife Edge .........................................................................................................5:14
   7. Piano Concerto No. 1, Third Movement .......................................................6:35
   8. Pictures at an Exhibition ..................................................................................16:16


   1. The Score .............................................................................................................9:08
   2. Learning to Fly ....................................................................................................4:02
   3. The Miracle .........................................................................................................6:50
   4. Tough And Go ....................................................................................................3:38
   5. Love Blind ..........................................................................................................3:11
   6. Step Aside ..........................................................................................................3:45
   7. Lay Down Your Guns .........................................................................................4:22
   8. Mars, the Bringer of War ..................................................................................7:54
   9. The Loco-Motion (bonus track) ........................................................................4:40
  10. Vacant Possession (bonus track) .....................................................................4:42

3, To The Power Of Three, 1988, Geffen UICY 9127 (1988)

   1. Talkin' Bout ...........................................................................................................4:03
   2. Lover To Lover ...................................................................................................4:12
   3. Chains ..................................................................................................................3:44
   4. Desde La Vida .....................................................................................................7:07
      1) La Vista
      2) Frontera
      3) Sangre De Toro
   5. Eight Miles High ...............................................................................................4:11
   6. Runaway ..............................................................................................................4:44

1. Black Moon .................................................................6:56
2. Paper Blood .................................................................4:26
3. Affairs of the Heart ....................................................3:46
4. Romeo and Juliet .......................................................3:40
5. Farewell to Arms .........................................................5:08
6. Changing States .........................................................6:01
7. Burning Bridges .........................................................4:41
8. Close to Home ...........................................................4:27
9. Better Days .................................................................5:33
10. Footprints in the Snow ..............................................3:50


1. Karn Evil 9 .................................................................1:45
2. Tarkus Medley: Eruption/Stones of Years.....................9:33
3. Knife Edge .................................................................5:27
4. Paper Blood .................................................................4:10
5. Romeo and Juliet .......................................................3:41
6. Creole Dance ..............................................................3:17
7. Still...You Turn Me On ...............................................3:18
8. Lucky Man .................................................................4:38
9. Black Moon .................................................................6:33
11. Finale: Fanfare for the Common Man/America ............14:41


Disc One

1. Touch And Go ..........................................................3:02
2. Hang On To A Dream ...................................................4:28
3. 21st Century Schizoid Man .........................................3:08
4. Fire .............................................................................3:26
5. Pictures At An Exhibition ........................................15:35
   1) Promenade .........................................................1:46
   2) The Gnome ..........................................................2:07
   3) Promenade ..........................................................1:44
4) The Sage ................................................. 3:10  
5) The Hut Of Baba Yaga ........................................ 1:16  
6) The Great Gates Of Kiev ...................................... 5:30  
6. I Believe In Father Christmas ............................. 3:28  
7. Introductory Fanfare / Peter Gunn .......................... 4:29  
8. Tiger In A Spotlight ........................................... 4:26  
9. Toccata ......................................................... 7:22  
10. Trilogy .......................................................... 8:54  
11. Tank .............................................................. 6:50  
12. Lucky Man .................................................... 4:38  

**Disc Two**  
1. Tarkus ...................................................... 20:42  
   1) Eruption .................................................. 2:43  
   2) Stones Of Years ......................................... 3:44  
   3) Iconoclast ............................................... 1:15  
   4) Mass ....................................................... 3:11  
   5) Manticore ............................................... 1:52  
   6) Battlefield ............................................... 3:51  
   7) Aquatarkus .............................................. 3:59  
2. From The Beginning ......................................... 4:16  
3. Take A Pebble (live version) .............................. 22:51  
   1) Take A Pebble ........................................... 4:58  
   2) Lucky Man ............................................... 3:02  
   3) Piano Improvisations ("Fugue" and "Little Rock Getaway") ........... 11:55  
   4) Take A Pebble (Conclusion) ......................... 2:53  
4. Knife Edge ................................................... 5:05  
5. Paper Blood .................................................. 4:29  
6. Hoedown (From Rodeo) .................................... 3:46  
7. Rondo .......................................................... 14:28  

**Disc Three**  
1. The Barbarian ................................................ 4:29  
2. Still... You Turn Me On ..................................... 2:56  
3. The Endless Enigma ......................................... 10:41  
   1) The Endless Enigma Part 1 ............................. 6:41  
   2) Fugue ..................................................... 1:56  
   3) The Endless Enigma Part 2 ............................. 2:00  
4. C'est La Vie .................................................. 4:19  
5. The Enemy God Dances With The Black Spirits (from "The Scythian Suite") .. 3:24  
6. Bo Diddley .................................................... 5:07  
7. Bitches Crystal .............................................. 3:58  
8. A Time And A Place ....................................... 3:00  
9. Living Sin .................................................... 3:15
10. Karn Evil 9 ...............................................................................................................29:41
   1) 1st Impression {Lake} ....................................................................................13:23
   2) 2nd Impression {Emerson} ..............................................................................7:07
   3) 3rd Impression {Emerson/Lake/Sinfield} .......................................................9:07
11. Honky Tonk Train Blues {Meade (Lux) Lewis} ..............................................3:10

Disc Four
1. Jerusalem ..................................................................................................................2:45
2. Fanfare For The Common Man ...........................................................................9:42
3. Black Moon .............................................................................................................6:59
4. Watching Over You ...............................................................................................3:55
5. Piano Concerto No. 1 (Third Movement: Toccata Con Fuoco) ...................6:50
6. For You ..................................................................................................................4:29
7. Prelude And Fugue ...............................................................................................3:17
8. Memoirs Of An Officer And A Gentleman .......................................................20:16
   1) Prologue/The Education Of A Gentleman ....................................................5:34
   2) Love At First Sight .........................................................................................5:36
   3) Letters From The Front .................................................................................5:18
   4) Honourable Company (A March) ..................................................................3:46
9. Pirates .....................................................................................................................13:22
10. Affairs Of The Heart ............................................................................................3:47

Emerson, Lake and Palmer, Works Live (Remastered In Concert with many additional tracks), 1993, Sanctuary CMDDD 229 (1993)

Disc One
1. Introductory Fanfare ............................................................................................0:52
2. Peter Gunn ............................................................................................................3:33
3. Tiger in a Spotlight .........................................................................................4:10
4. C'Est la Vie ..........................................................................................................4:14
5. Watching over You .........................................................................................3:59
6. Maple Leaf Rag ....................................................................................................1:13
7. The Enemy God [Dances with the Black Spirits] ..............................................2:46
8. Fanfare for the Common Man ............................................................................10:55
9. Knife Edge .........................................................................................................5:03
10. Show Me the Way to Go Home ......................................................................4:20

Disc Two
1. Abaddon's Bolero ...............................................................................................6:03
2. Pictures at an Exhibition ....................................................................................15:42
3. Closer to Believing .............................................................................................5:29
4. Piano Concerto No. 1, Third Movement .........................................................6:42
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1. Hand of Truth .............................................................. 5:22
2. Daddy ................................................................. 4:42
3. One by One ............................................................ 5:08
4. Heart on Ice ............................................................ 4:19
5. Thin Line .............................................................. 4:46
6. Man in the Long Black Coat ..................................... 4:12
7. Change .............................................................. 4:44
8. Give Me a Reason to Stay .......................................... 4:15
9. Gone Too Soon .......................................................... 4:11
10. Street War ............................................................. 4:25
11. Pictures at an Exhibition ........................................... 15:26


1. From The Beginning ...................................................... 4:15
2. Jerusalem .............................................................. 2:48
3. Still... You Turn Me On .............................................. 2:55
4. Fanfare For The Common Man ..................................... 3:00
5. Knife Edge ........................................................... 5:07
6. Tarkus ................................................................. 20:42
7. Karn Evil 9 (1st Impression - Part 2) .............................. 4:46
8. C'est La Vie .......................................................... 4:19
9. Hoedown (From Rodeo) .............................................. 3:47
10. Trilogy ................................................................. 8:54
11. Honky Tonk Train Blues ............................................ 3:12
12. Black Moon ........................................................... 4:49
13. Lucky Man ........................................................... 4:41
14. I Believe In Father Christmas (original single version) .... 3:31


1. I Believe In Father Christmas ........................................ 3:32
2. Troika ................................................................. 4:19
3. Humbug ............................................................... 2:26
4. I Believe In Father Christmas ........................................ 3:18
5. Nutrocker ............................................................. 3:49

1. The Barbarian ........................................................................................................... 5:08
2. Take a Pebble ........................................................................................................... 11:51
3. Pictures at an Exhibition ......................................................................................... 35:47
4. Nutrocker .................................................................................................................. 5:23
5. Emerson, Lake and Palmer Discuss the Isle of Wight Festival ............................ 6:12


Disc One: Then – Cal Cam ‘74
1. Toccata ....................................................................................................................... 3:33
2. Take a Pebble ............................................................................................................. 18:19
   1) Still…You Turn Me On
   2) Lucky Man featuring Greg Lake
   3) Piano Improvisations featuring Keith Emerson
   4) Take a Pebble
3. Karn Evil 9 ............................................................................................................... 19:34
   1) 1st Impression Pt. 2
   2) 3rd Impression

& Now Tour ‘97/’98
4. A Time and a Place ................................................................................................. 4:03
5. Piano Concerto No. 1: Third Movement ................................................................. 4:49
6. From the Beginning ................................................................................................. 4:13

Disc Two: & Now Tour ‘97/’98 Cont.
1. Karn Evil 9: 1st Impression Pt. 2 ............................................................................ 5:24
2. Tiger in a Spotlight ................................................................................................. 3:33
3. Hoedown .................................................................................................................... 4:53
4. Touch and Go .......................................................................................................... 4:10
5. Knife Edge ............................................................................................................... 6:11
6. Bitches Crystal ........................................................................................................ 4:28
7. Honky Tonk Train Blues ......................................................................................... 3:41
8. Take a Pebble .......................................................................................................... 7:08
9. Lucky Man ............................................................................................................... 5:02
10. Fanfare for the Common Man/Blue Rondo a la Turk ............................................ 22:07
11. 21st Century Schizoid Man/America ..................................................................... 4:51
EMERSON SOLO ALBUMS


1. Inferno (Main titles theme) ................................................................. 2:55
2. Rose's Descent Into The Cellar ......................................................... 4:56
3. Taxi Ride (Rome) .............................................................................. 2:13
4. The Library ...................................................................................... 0:55
5. Sarah In The Library Vaults ............................................................. 1:13
6. Bookbinder's Delight ................................................................. 1:09
7. Rose Leaves The Apartment .......................................................... 3:28
8. Rose Gets It .................................................................................. 2:04
9. Elisa's Story .................................................................................. 1:07
10. A Cat Attic Attack ................................................................. 3:08
11. Kazanian's Tarantella ................................................................. 3:32
12. Mark's Discovery ................................................................. 1:21
13. Mater Tenebrarum ................................................................. 2:36
14. Inferno Finale ............................................................................. 2:24
15. Cigarettes, Ices, Etc .......................................................... 2:50
16. Inferno (Outtakes suite) ............................................................ 10:13


1. Hallo sailor (including Bach before the mast) ......................... 8.52
2. Salt Cay ....................................................................................... 4.59
3. Green Ice ..................................................................................... 6.15
4. Intro-juicing ................................................................................ 0.23
5. Big Horn Breakdown ............................................................... 2.13
6. Yancey Special ........................................................................... 4.30
7. Rum-a-Ting ............................................................................... 5.15
8. Jesus loves me ........................................................................... 5.01


1. Nighthawks-Main Title Theme .................................................... 2.25
2. Mean Stalkin' ............................................................................... 2.22
3. The Bust ....................................................................................... 2.07
4. Nighthawking ............................................................................. 6.18
5. The Chase ..................................................................................... 6.04
6. I'm A Man ................................................................. 4.19
7. The Chopper ......................................................... 3.03
8. Tramway ............................................................... 3.24
9. I'm Comin' In ......................................................... 3.04
10. Face to Face ........................................................ 2.51
11. The Flight of A Hawk .......................................... 3.09


1. Dream runner ....................................................... 2:41
2. The runner .......................................................... 3:31
3. Wha'd ya mean ................................................... 5:05
4. Straight between the eyes ...................................... 2:41
5. For those who win ............................................... 3:37
6. Orchestral Suite to Best Revenge ............................. 15:28
7. Playing for keeps (Main title theme) ......................... 4:19


1. Harmagedon (Aoki) ................................................. 3.05
2. Theme of Floi (Emerson) ........................................ 3.35
3. Toccata & Fugue In D Minor (J.S.Bach-Emerson) ........ 3.31
4. Saionikusu Princess (Aoki) .................................... 2.14
5. Joe and Michiko (Emerson) ..................................... 2.42
6. Yomigaeru Shimel (Aoki) ....................................... 3.55
7. Children of the light (Emerson) .............................. 3.56
8. Genma Hooko (Aoki) ............................................. 1.47
9. Sonny's skate state (Emerson) ................................ 4.15
10. Horuka naru toki (Aoki) ....................................... 2.07
11. Zamedy Stomp (Emerson) ...................................... 2.58
12. Challenge of The Psionic Fighters (Emerson) ............. 4.10


1. Murderock .......................................................... 2:49
2. Tonight Is Your Night ............................................ 3:35
3. Streets to Blame ................................................. 2:40
4. Not So Innocent .................................................. 3:37
5. Prelude to Candice ............................................... 1:48
6. Don't Go In The Shower ......................................... 1:05
7. Coffee Time ........................................................ 2:37
8. Candice ................................................................. 3:42
9. New York Dash ...................................................... 1:32
10. Tonight Is Not Your Night ......................................... 1:13
11. The Spillone .......................................................... 1:54


1. Troika ................................................................. 4.17
2. Variations on "O little town of bethlehem" .................... 6.11
3. We three kings .................................................... 4.27
4. Snowman's land ................................................... 4.42
5. Aria from Bach's Christmas Oratorio ......................... 4.23
6. I saw three ships .................................................. 4.55
7. Glorietta (for my mother) ....................................... 9.35
8. Petites litanies de Jesus ........................................ 4.15
9. It came upon a midnight clear .................................. 6.47
10. Silent night ......................................................... 4.37

Keith Emerson, Goblin, and Zooming on the Zoo, *La Chieza*, 1989, Cinevox CD MDF 329

1. The Church (Main Theme) (Emerson) .......................... 3:56
2. La Chiesa (Goblin) .................................................. 5:20
3. Prelude 24 (From Well Tempered Clavier) (Emerson) .... 2:20
4. Possessione (Goblin) .............................................. 3:14
5. The Possession (Emerson) ....................................... 2:21
6. Lotte (Goblin) ........................................................ 3:02
7. Go to hell (Zooming on the Zoo) ............................... 3:37
8. The wire blaze (Definitive Gaze) ............................... 3:35
9. The Church Revisited (Emerson) ............................... 4:21
10. The Church (single mix-bonus track) (Emerson) .......... 3:50
11. La Chiesa (suite) (Goblin) ..................................... 4:03
12. Suspence Chiesa 1 (Goblin) .................................... 3:42
13. Suspence Chiesa 2 (Goblin) .................................... 7:05


1. Iron Main-Main Title Theme .................................... 1.06
2. And the sea shall give up it's dead ......................... 18.58
3. I am ultimo, thy deliverer ..................................... 16.15
4. Data in chaos out ................................................ 17.00
5. Silence my companion, death my destination .............. 19.19
6. Iron man-Theme Alternate ...................................... 1.01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vagrant</td>
<td>2:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Creole Dance</td>
<td>3:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Solitudinous</td>
<td>2:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Broken Bough</td>
<td>4:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A Cajun Ally</td>
<td>4:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prelude To Candice</td>
<td>1:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A Blade Of Grass</td>
<td>2:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Outgoing Tide</td>
<td>1:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Summertime</td>
<td>3:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Interlude</td>
<td>1:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Roll'n Jelly</td>
<td>1:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>B&amp;W Blues</td>
<td>5:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>For Kevin</td>
<td>1:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Dreamer</td>
<td>2:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hammer It Out</td>
<td>2:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ballad For A Common Man</td>
<td>3:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Barrehouse Shakedown</td>
<td>3:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nilu's Dream</td>
<td>2:07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Soulscapes</td>
<td>2:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Close To Home</td>
<td>3:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Honky Tonk Train Blues</td>
<td>3:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Medley (Nicola, Silver Shoes &amp; I'll See You In My Dreams)</td>
<td>2:07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Theme Of Godzilla (Akira Ifukube)</td>
<td>0:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The King Of Monsters (Daisuke Yano)</td>
<td>1:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Beginning Of The End (Nobuhiko Morino)</td>
<td>1:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Manda Vs Gotengo (Keith Emerson)</td>
<td>2:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Manda Vs Gotengo Part 2 (Keith Emerson)</td>
<td>2:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Training Facility Fight (Keith Emerson)</td>
<td>1:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Edf Museum (Keith Emerson)</td>
<td>1:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Infant Island (Keith Emerson)</td>
<td>1:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rodan Attacks N.Y.C (Keith Emerson)</td>
<td>4:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Arrival (Daisuke Yano)</td>
<td>2:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Proof (Nobuhiko Morino)</td>
<td>2:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reveal (Nobuhiko Morino)</td>
<td>3:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>High Battle (Keith Emerson)</td>
<td>2:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Operation:Final War (Nobuhiko Morino)</td>
<td>3:26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disc One**
1. Medley (Keith Emerson Aged 14): Nicolette/Silver Shoes ........................................ 1:23
2. Rock Candy (#) .......................................................... 2:55
3. Lumpy Gravy (#) ......................................................... 2:17
4. Lament for Tony Stratton Smith (#) ........................................ 8:04
5. America/2nd Amendment .................................................. 6:15
6. Fantasia: High Level Fugue: 4th Bridge ................................. 1:04
7. Three Fates: Clotho/Lachesis/Atropos ..................................... 7:45
8. Old Castle/Blues Variations .................................................. 5:24
9. Fugue ............................................................................. 1:57
10. Karn Evil 9 2nd Impression ...................................................... 7:08
11. Piano Improvisations (Live) ............................................. 11:49
12. Fanfare for the Common Man .............................................. 9:40
13. Carrelhouse Shakedown ..................................................... 3:48
14. Honky Tony Train Blues .................................................. 3:11
15. Introductory Fanfare/Peter Gunn Theme (Live) ....................... 4:26
16. Up the Elephant and Around the Castle .................................. 2:26

**Disc Two**
1. Inferno Main Title .......................................................... 2:55
2. I'm a Man ........................................................................ 4:14
3. Hello Sailor/Bach Before the Mast ..................................... 8:51
4. Orchestral Suite to Best Revenge ........................................ 15:34
5. Locomotion ...................................................................... 4:33
6. Desde la Vida (Medley): la Vista/Frontera/Sangre de Toro .......... 7:02
7. Church (#) .......................................................... 5:20
8. Hammer It Out ......................................................... 2:34
10. Changing States .......................................................... 6:02
11. B & W Blues .......................................................... 5:22
12. Soulscapes .................................................................. 2:31
13. Blade of Grass ........................................................... 2:06
14. Close to Home (Live) ................................................... 3:39
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Beatles, the. “Roll Over Beethoven” (1963) In With The Beatles, Parlophone CDP 7 46436 2 (1987)
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