



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
JOURNALS + DIGITAL PUBLISHING

Music, Television, and Aesthetics

Author(s): Robert B. Cantrick

Source: *The Quarterly of Film Radio and Television*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Autumn, 1954), pp. 60-78

Published by: [University of California Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1209893>

Accessed: 06/06/2013 15:18

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of California Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Quarterly of Film Radio and Television*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Music, Television, and Aesthetics

ROBERT B. CANTRICK

ROBERT B. CANTRICK is an assistant professor of music at the Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Penna. He has done advanced study in conducting with George Szell and in composition with Jacques Ibert. Although this is Mr. Cantrick's first publication in the field of television, his interest in the field was aroused while he was attending the University of Pittsburgh Workshop in Educational Television last summer.

TELEVISION IS A HIGHLY CONTROVERSIAL subject. Within the field, there is sharp controversy over production procedures; outside the field, over the quality of programs. All the way round, things are just tumultuous. Don't be so naïve, however, as to conclude that for this reason the subject should be approached with caution. Your genuine scholar—who begins by scrupulously confessing the general lack of experience on all sides, who goes on to summarize the chief conflicting points of view, and who ends with a few highly tentative conclusions—ought to be gently shepherded back to his Sanskrit. This attitude will never get you anywhere in television. Ask any expert (i.e., anyone with six or more weeks of experience). It is absolutely necessary to be dramatic. Unless you rock the audience with a tremendous emotional impact in the first two minutes, well—dolly back, brother. You'll get your dials flipped.

No, the following remarks are not calmly reasoned. I have abandoned myself, heart and soul, to the spirit of this great new medium. Away with scholarly detachment! This is going to be as provocative as possible.

My subject is the telecasting of musical performances. I contend that TV directors are fumbling this business and that a little clear thinking can easily solve the problem.

There is no doubt that this is a problem. So far, the general reaction of music lovers to TV concerts has been "Please give us radio back again." And, of course, if the video portion of the telecasts they have seen has been a disturbing influence, who can

blame them for complaining? On the other hand, no music lover in calm possession of all his senses will maintain that a telecast of a concert has to be objectionable by nature. Indeed, if he is in possession of all his senses, he has his eyesight, which he himself uses when he goes to a concert. He may not always enjoy what he sees; he may turn and whisper to his neighbor, "Isn't she a witch!" Nevertheless, he turns back again to stare some more at the witch and comes away from the concert with a more significant recollection than if he had been blind. Television can add the video element to musical broadcasting. Therefore, television should make the total experience richer for the viewer than radio could. Why doesn't it? The cause is not any inherent defect in the medium; rather, it is bad directing—the pictures draw attention to themselves, rather than to the music.

The problem, in short, is to plan a pictorial sequence sufficiently skillful to efface itself completely from the attention of the viewer who can then transfer all of his interest to what he hears. He should not only hear music; he should "see" music. Let's get one thing clear right at the beginning, though. The TV camera cannot take the place of human eyes on the scene—not literally. It is not like eyes. It does not have the same angle of vision; it does not move in the same manner; it does not see binocularly. Therefore, to attempt to use the television camera as you use your eyes is a mistake. Rather, use the camera in ways which come naturally to it. Since the camera has a narrower angle of view than the eyes, it is more selective. Therefore, turn this selectivity to expressive advantage. Since it can dolly, tilt, pan, and truck—in ways totally different from the movements of the eyes—make these techniques reveal aspects of the performance inaccessible to the eyes alone. Since it transmits a picture in two dimensions—whereas the eyes work as a pair to give stereoscopic vision—exploit the flatness of the picture according to all the familiar principles of pictorial composition. Since it possesses enormous potentialities for fantasy, let it experiment with sub-

jective-camera techniques, with choreography, and with abstract imagery. Then the television medium will be exploiting the great advantage it possesses over radio—not to take the place of a person present at the performance but, on the contrary, to witness in its own unique way. Television experience is no substitute for real experience, but it can get us closer to the real thing than radio can by exploiting its own characteristic way of “seeing” the music.

Now this visualization requires an enormous amount of planning by the TV director. It cannot be ad-libbed. To be convinced of this, you need only reflect what an enormous amount of planning the composer puts into his “audio sequence.” The director’s first responsibility is to reconstruct in his mind the course of thinking which has already taken place in the composer’s mind. Such a re-creative process has proved a challenge to listeners of the highest intelligence for generations. Even the most gifted director will devise a superficial treatment if he underestimates the amount of musical insight required at the very outset. Yet this is only one third of his task. In the second place, he must find ways to translate the musical meaning into visual terms by exercising all the imagination at his command. Finally, he must critically review his work to guard against the possibility of having overdone the job and having created too much visual interest. The kind of creative work the director does, and the amount of it, have to be subordinated to the ironclad dictates of the composer.

This is a tremendous responsibility. It is not unlike the position in which serious composers find themselves when they undertake to write film music for the first time, after having done a great deal of concert music. They use the same basic tools and skills of their craft, but in a totally different way. They cannot allow their music to develop according to purely musical principles; it must follow and be subordinate to the pictorial sequence. Most movie music is not very interesting on the concert platform for this reason—too dull. By the same token, a TV director doing a telecast of a concert is under obligation not to allow his pictorial sequence

to develop according to purely visual principles; it must follow and be subordinate to the musical score. Were this telecast to be exhibited in a kinescope later, without the audio element, it would probably be a little on the dull side too. Thus, the director is not really boss in this situation; he is a collaborator—not in an administrative sense, but in a more fundamental, more challenging sense—creatively. Can he grasp the composer's structural outline and its aesthetic content? Can he use the skills and tools of his craft to enhance the significance of the composer's message?

I wish more directors understood this profound challenge and would take it up. Composers for the films—and even long before them, composers of songs—have found the challenge of collaboration with other arts to be stimulating. By their contribution, composers have raised poetry, drama, and cinema to artistic heights of unique significance. The same exciting potentiality lies before any imaginative television director who is entrusted with the responsibility for putting music on the air.

Now when I say directors are fumbling this business, I do not refer to the handful who have already understood the problem and, indeed in some instances, have already proposed highly original and imaginative solutions. I refer to the great majority who haven't taken the trouble to face the problem at all. We see their work on the airways time and again. There is no excuse for it. The simple discussion I have given above is not so profound that it could not have occurred to any director with a conscience. Any time you see a bad telecast of a musical performance, don't blame it on the nature of television. Blame it on the nature of directors.

(I warned you this was going to be provocative.)

So much for the evils in present practice. What about solutions to the problem? Once a director fully accepts the nature of the challenge involved in telecasting concerts, he is bound to find himself in the realm of aesthetics. Whenever you have to search for general concepts which apply with equal validity to several arts, you become a philosopher of art. In the present example, I

do not think it necessary to have read Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Kant, Hegel, Croce, and Dewey. I hope not, for the sake of getting something done within the next hundred years. But I do think the reading of some of the literature on the aesthetics of the films—of which a respectable amount is lying around, unjustifiably neglected—is a great help. In fact, if any serious student of the films has steeled himself to stay with me this far, he is undoubtedly muttering, “Old stuff!” For thirty years, the art cinema has been working on the aesthetics of those same audio-visual relationships now operative in television—those which are to be found wherever camera and microphone are simultaneously trained on moving, sounding subject matter. Apropos of our problem, there is also another body of literature which antedates even the classic studies of film: the essays of Jaques-Dalcroze and his disciples, concerned with the relationships between music and motion in general.

As far back as 1933 in his *A Grammar of the Film*, Raymond Spottiswoode said, “The study of the cinema must ultimately take a place within the province of the science of aesthetics.” Seventeen years later, an eloquent tribute to this viewpoint was paid by the University of California Press, when it brought out a new American edition of his book. The preface to this 1950 edition asks candidly:

How, then, does this early study of film stand up to the passage of time? . . . The answer seems to be that. . . There is . . . a continuing need to go back to fundamentals. . . Film makers do not for the most part search in the film’s arsenal of powers for an apt means of expression.

Does this have anything to do with television? The preface continues:

[the author’s] stress on the distinction between . . . the stage . . . and the screen seems to need just as much emphasis now as then. Films like *Mourning Becomes Electra* continue to be produced; and television offers a flat and melancholy reminder in many an American home

that personality cannot be projected through the ether by a mere representation of the actor's face and gestures!

In short, telecasters, no less than film makers, need, as stated in this same preface,

to lay aside conventions and think themselves into the very stuff of their medium, as the poets, painters, and composers of the last sixty years have found it necessary to do.

Why shouldn't the aesthetics of cinema have much to contribute to the understanding of the television medium? Both media use motion-picture cameras to photograph moving subjects; therefore, such manipulative techniques as camera movement, choice of lens, composition, etc., are equally applicable. Both media use microphones to record continuing sounds; therefore, such manipulative techniques as boom movement, direction, distance, etc., are equally applicable.

Of course, this is only half the story, as any curbstone expert knows. There is also a great difference. Whereas film makers record events for showing *later*, telecasters record events for transmission *simultaneously*. This is a difference, not in camera techniques, but in purpose—camera techniques are employed for different ends in television. Therefore, although the aesthetics of film are valuable in analyzing the whole repertoire of technical devices of camera and microphone, they are mostly of negative value in suggesting the proper uses of these devices in television. Applied to music, at any rate, they tell us what *not* to do.

So, we have to begin with a "Declaration of Independence": **WHEREAS**, The motion picture has little or no interest in reporting a concert simply for its own sake, just as it took place; and **WHEREAS**, This is exactly what telecasting has a major interest in doing; therefore be it *Resolved* that the following practices are taboo in television: (1) treating the performance from the viewpoint of a dramatist by emphasizing people's reactions to it (e.g., showing a beautiful lady in the audience moved to tears); (2)

playing up spectacular aspects of the performance for the sake of showmanship (e.g., showing the conductor's graceful hands or the flashing sequins of the prima donna's gown); (3) sight-seeing with the camera during the performance in search of constant novelty for its own sake; (4) using, generally, any technique which draws attention away from the composer's message and interrupts the continuity of the musical thought.

However, we cannot celebrate our independence with unconfined joy unless we have a "Constitution" ready. Otherwise, we shall have plunged into anarchy. I propose the following preamble: We, the telecasters and musicians of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish aesthetic justice, provide for common understanding, insure the domestic viewers' tranquillity, promote the general adoption of artistic procedures, and secure the blessings of artistic collaboration to ourselves and our public, do ordain and establish this "Constitution" for the telecasting of musical performances.

What are the "Articles of our Constitution" to be? This is a job for many minds. I propose herewith a shopping list as an aid to the discriminating customer in choosing his own "Articles." As notes jotted down on the back of an old envelope, these are not supposed to be complete or systematized—merely, as we hoped in the beginning, provocative.

We shall not take over the complex categories of the film aestheticians. Admirable as these are, we need to rethink the problem in the light of new purposes. To keep things as simple as possible to begin with, we shall point out only two basic purposes: the video element may reinforce or counterpoint the audio element—two categories as old as the history of aesthetic thought: similarity and contrast.

VIDEO REINFORCEMENT

Video reinforcement is always accomplished by picturing the source of the sound—the singer, the pianist, the player in the

orchestra who has the melody at the moment, etc. This is, of course, the most obvious thing to do; and everyone does it—the thoughtful and the thoughtless alike. Unfortunately, it is not successful when done thoughtlessly. How many times have we seen a soft, tranquil solo passage in the orchestra photographed as an intense, dramatic close-up? The camera gets as close as possible to the soloist at the most sensational angle possible. This is like seasoning white wine with catsup. By all means, let us really make the drama of the music visual; but sheer sensationalism is not the answer. Drama is more complex than that; it has many elements and utilizes every degree from the least to the most intense of the expressive spectrum. Moreover, it is constructed in time—with a beginning, a middle, and an ending, plus carefully balanced areas of tension and relaxation along the way. We must differentiate many ways of showing the source of the sound, each with its appropriate purpose. Here, the aesthetics of the film are very helpful. They analyze for us the complete catalogue of photographic techniques. Let us consider the things we can do, one by one, and fit them to appropriate musical situations. Never forget that we confine ourselves at present to video reinforcement of the music; counterpoint comes later.

FACTORS INHERENT IN THE CAMERA ITSELF

Composition.—A close-up is more intense than a long shot. An angle shot is more dramatic than a straight one. Two shots or three shots have greater complexity than one shots. With these things in mind, compose the picture as sensitively as the music was composed. If a singer is just beginning Schubert's "Ave Maria," let the camera select and arrange those pictorial elements of the scene which form the most spiritual, peaceful composition conceivable. A dramatic close-up would not serve this purpose; a medium or long shot would. Choice of a one shot, two shot, three shot, etc., is often dictated by the music. A musical or pictorial composition may include more than one main theme simultane-

ously. For example, if a violinist and a pianist reach a point in a sonata where each of the two main themes is played fortissimo, a two shot is definitely needed.

Choice of lens.—A lens which increases the sense of depth in a picture adds overtones of significance not present in a flatter, more two-dimensional shot. A lens which makes the subject seem distant affects the viewer differently than one which makes the subject seem closer. For example, it is possible to take a close-up from a distance by using a narrow-angle lens, but this does not have the same intensity as a close-up taken with a wide-angle lens from a position closer in. This could be put to musical use, for example, by using a “long” close-up on the wood-wind soloists at the beginning of Ravel’s “Bolero” and increasingly “closer” close-ups on each recurrence of the theme on a new instrument. One close-up would not be framed any more tightly than another, but they would reflect the growing intensity of the music.

Distance.—Given two cameras using lenses of equal focal length, the one farther from the subject produces pictures of greater emotional objectivity—the greater the distance, the greater the sense of detachment; the closer the camera, the greater the sense of emotional involvement. In the romantic music of the late nineteenth century, close-ups would frequently be appropriate; in the classical music of the early eighteenth century, rarely.

Focus.—A clear image likewise gives a sense of emotional stability; a blurred image, a sense of emotional duress. It is conceivable that a series of shots, building intensity as they followed the progress of a Tchaikovsky symphony, would move closer to the performers until at the climax the viewer would be swept into the very vortex of the situation by means of a blurred image.

Movement.—The camera can pan, tilt, dolly, and truck. What appropriate devices to use during connecting passages, moving from one subject to the next! In the first movement of the Mozart *G Minor Symphony* during the grand pause for a measure’s duration between the first and second subjects, why not pan from the

first violins who had the chief role to the wood winds who now come into prominence?—a more expressive depiction of the brief silence than a cut, since it stresses the continuity of the music. In a Bach organ fugue where a stretto passage builds up intensity to a climax, the camera might dolly in toward the console and arrive at a close-up just as the musical climax was reached. Long crescendos, as in Rossini overtures, can be expressively depicted by a slow dolly in; long diminuendos, by a slow dolly back. In a string-quartet opening where (as in numerous instances) the performers join each other one by one, the growth from one shot to two shot to three shot to four shot could be achieved by a carefully planned trucking movement, thus conveying the feeling of continuous growth inherent in the music. Very important in connection with camera movement is the speed with which it is executed. A slow truck or dolly is entirely different in effect from a zoom. Trucking also lends itself to long passages of music which do not serve thematic purposes but act as extensions, transitions, excursions, etc. The listener's attention is not supposed to be completely absorbed at such times; he finds a slow shift of the visual scene a welcome "breathing space." The tilt, like the pan, will reflect the continuity of the musical thought better than a cut when the melodic thread passes from one performer to another seated farther upstage. This might happen, for instance, in the Brahms "Double Concerto" where the cellist and the violinist play, seated and standing, respectively.

In general, the mobility of the TV camera is what distinguishes it most characteristically from the listener in the concert hall. The camera's privilege to move around is a tremendously expressive asset.

FACTORS INHERENT IN THE SWITCHING SYSTEM

The cut.—Switching from one camera to another in the flick of an eye lends itself aptly to music in which the ideas are introduced with this kind of crisp incisiveness—for example, in the keyboard music of Bach.

The dissolve.—In music where the thoughts melt into one another at a more leisurely rate, a dissolve is a more appropriate way to connect different shots. This is true of music of an improvisatory character, such as that of Debussy.

The fade.—Pianissimo beginnings and endings suggest fading in or out to black. Because the fade has conventionally come to denote the passing of time, it could probably be used effectively only between movements of a large work or between whole pieces. For example, at the end of the funeral march of the *Eroica Symphony*, the camera might fade a shot of the strings to black, then fade in again on the conductor as he changes expression and attitude completely for the scherzo to come.

The wipe.—There are times when music seems to be erased from one level to recur at another—for example, in a *concerto grosso* when the theme is taken over by the small *concertante* group from the larger *ripieno*. In such instances, a wipe would be an expressive visual representation of what is happening musically.

The superimposition.—In highly dramatic music when two or more themes—announced separately at first—are combined, a superimposition sometimes provides the effective visual climax. This device is limited by the nature of the subjects concerned. They must have individuality of appearance so that the eye immediately perceives the superimposition for what it is. A piano keyboard, for example, can be effectively supered over a close-up of a singer because the two subjects are completely different in appearance. But an attempt to super the wood-wind section of an orchestra over the brass section would result only in confusion, since there is very little difference in appearance between the two on the small scale represented by the television screen. The technique of superimposition reminds one of the techniques of twentieth-century painters who show the viewer more aspects of the subject at once than his eye could perceive by looking at the subject. Here again, the unique expressive potentialities of television

are illustrated, not as a substitute for seeing the thing itself, but as a unique medium of communication in its own right.

Split screen.—This is a concept which has run into considerable confusion in the hands of film aestheticians. Here, we intend it to mean the use of one image inserted in a part of another larger image which fills the rest of the screen. For example, the telecasts of the recent political conventions sometimes “wiped” the commentator down to one corner of the screen where he remained in close-up as the rest of the screen was filled with a shot of the convention floor. This device would be of extraordinarily powerful use in musical realms to show the activities of a conductor and his players at the same time. One camera would photograph the conductor’s head and shoulders; this shot would be inserted in miniature in one part of the screen, and the remainder of the screen would show the players as seen from the audience. In effect, the conductor would comment on the music as it was played. This device should naturally be limited to those conductors who are expressive in appearance.

FACTORS INHERENT IN THE SEQUENCE OF SHOTS

The scale of the musical conception.—Some pieces of music are simple, some complex; some short, some long; some dramatic, some merely decorative; some intimate, some not. A pianist doing a Bach “French Suite” does not require pictorial treatment on a grand scale. In some of the movements in simple two-part form, a half-dozen shots might do the trick, even counting the ones which are repeated. One shot would cover the opening period to the double bar, and a slight modification of the shot (e.g., a short dolly or truck) would cover the repeat. A second shot would begin after the double bar; and, as the phrase lengths of the music contracted and began to build to the high point of the movement, a third shot would be added—possibly a fourth. On the repeat of the strain, the second, third, or fourth shots would be repeated, probably literally—a total of seven shots, at the outside. The

minuet and trio form is an example of a longer movement, but the problem is still not on a greater scale. You would simply put together three sequences of the type described above and come out with a total of about 20 to 25 shots. Since the treatment is still basically simple, the large number of shots should not mislead you to build some kind of dramatic sequence by using all the tricks in the bag to reach a great climax somewhere around shot 16, say, and then to recede gradually into profound meditation by shot 25. However, if the same pianist follows this Bach suite with Beethoven's "Hammerclavier Sonata," the most complex pictorial treatment would be appropriate. There could be dozens of conceivable shots, running the gamut of expressive possibilities; and these would have to be connected in long formal developments requiring many minutes to run their pictorial course.

Length of shots and rate of cutting.—In the Bach suite discussed above, there might not be marked variation in the length of shots. The opening period might be 25 seconds long (50 with its repeat); the second section after the double bar might be 40 seconds long (divided into three or four shots; 80 seconds long with repeat). The total length would be 130 seconds. If we use five shots, the average shot length would be 26 seconds; if seven shots are used, the average shot length would be 18 seconds. Such tediousness would probably drive the typical New York TV director to cutting paper dolls, but it happens to express the symmetry and serenity of this music. There is no way to change the situation, unless you know how to get in touch with Mr. Bach and advise him that a prospective sponsor would like him to pep up his production a little bit. Some up-and-coming young man with an advertising agency ought to be happy to try this as a terrific publicity gag.

In the "Hammerclavier Sonata," on the other hand, the length of the shots would vary markedly. The sonata-allegro form of the first movement requires a moderate rate of cutting—recalling in many respects the architectonic scheme of the two-part form dis-

cussed above—raised to a grand scale with innumerable complexities inserted. The scherzo requires a very rapid rate of cutting with its musical ideas flashing by in rapid succession. That shots as short as a half second might be used to great effect is not inconceivable. The songlike third movement demands a very leisurely rate of cutting. Some shots might be held on the screen, varied with movement, for as long as several minutes. The final movement with its complexities of fugal procedure and fantasy should combine fast and slow cutting rates in complex successions.

Repetition versus variation.—As we have already seen, there is every reason to repeat shots when the music repeats passages. However, the effect on the listener of a musical repeat is to establish symmetry. Symmetry involves the matching of two distinct entities. To achieve this effect visually, the use of two different shots of the subject possessing symmetrical qualities is often desirable. For example, when the pianist plays the first period of a two-part form, a medium shot at a side angle might be used. Meanwhile, have the second camera take up a position slightly more to the front; but in every other respect, match the composition to that of the first camera—the same distance from the subject, the same position of the subject in the frame, the same lens, etc. When the musical repeat begins, cut immediately to the second camera. The viewer is shown a picture which he recognizes to be somewhat different, but only enough different to identify it as a second shot. The most striking fact about this second shot is its symmetry with the first picture. The two shots follow each other directly in time, just as does the musical repeat. They are really two different *occurrences* of the same thing, just as the music is. In a sonata form where themes are literally brought back after much contrasting material has been used, a literal repetition of the original picture is in order. Notice, though, that a composer rarely allows literal repetition to continue for long in this form without variation; therefore, be ready to modify the original shot sooner than on its first occurrence.

VIDEO COUNTERPOINT

When the picture adds aesthetic factors not present in the normal experience of the concert-hall listener, it counterpoints the music. This is a far more difficult matter to handle successfully than video reinforcement because of the delicate balances involved. What kind of addition can be accepted as an enrichment of the total experience, rather than as an interference with it? How much can be added? These questions are moot at the present time. Some purists reject any attempt at this kind of thing; whereas, some experimentalists welcome every attempt, however extreme. Between the two extremes are to be found all degrees of acceptance.

There are three ways to achieve video counterpoint:

By realistic means, picturing the source of the sound.—The camera has unexpected powers of editorializing. It need not be confined to reporting what is before it, but can add its own comments. With the subjective-camera technique, the camera seems to take on the personality of a human being and to react to what it sees. In relation to music, the most obvious use of this device is humorous. Imagine a telecast of a band concert. After a serious piece, the audience applauds for an encore; and the band roars into “The Stars and Stripes Forever.” The camera in delight could wag its head back and forth in rhythm; or it could fasten its gaze on the bass-drummer’s stick and tilt rhythmically up and down with it on every beat. Suppose that the tuba player comes forward to play “Rocked in the Cradle of the Deep” as a solo. When he reaches his famous passage, descending note by note lower and lower, the camera might jerk note by note higher toward the ceiling. Serious uses of the subjective-camera technique might include a combination of camera movement with blurring of focus at a point in the music where visual fantasy is to be introduced. Suppose, for example, that the conductor’s motions happen to be extraordinarily rhythmic in some long passage.

A camera in the balcony with a zoom lens might pass from a long shot of the ensemble to a close-up of the conductor, gradually blur the image of his rhythmic motions, and slowly dissolve to abstract movement on another camera matched in rhythm to the conductor's motions.

By realistic means, picturing something other than the source of the sound.—This approach involves picturing any real objects present in the concert hall, except the performers. Suppose, for example, the music is built of highly stylized blocks of phrases, as in the Prokofiev *Classical Symphony*. The camera's gaze might wander to a backdrop or proscenium arch decorated with highly stylized panels. One setting could be held in view for one musical phrase, a second could be quickly panned into view for the next musical phrase, etc. During a transition passage to a new theme, the camera could slowly tilt up along a molding and arrive at another series of stylized designs, such as decorative motifs painted on the set, just as another main section of the music begins in another key. This would call for flawless timing to match the movements with the musical ideas. Otherwise it would become a distraction. Only if the pans and tilts coincide very obviously with the phrase lengths (or period lengths) would the technique succeed in illustrating the character of the music rather than calling attention to its own cleverness. When columns, arches, and steps are part of the stage setting, this technique is particularly adaptable. Another use of camera movement away from the source of the sound can be employed with lighter music. Suppose the telecast comes on the air during a children's concert and the solo cellist is playing "The Swan" from Saint-Saens's *Carnival of the Animals*. After picturing the soloist, the camera could slowly slip away and orient the viewer to the situation by looking around the hall and the audience. The music dreams on, pleasantly and smoothly, not requiring intense concentration, while the viewer gets his bearings. Not only is the announcer spared considerable explanation when the piece ends, but also the story is told more effectively than by words.

By nonrealistic means.—The camera can leave the scene of the concert altogether and visit realms of fantasy. Rudy Bretz (television director on the staff of City College of New York) and Burton Paulu (professor of music at the University of Minnesota), in cooperation with the Fund for Adult Education of the Ford Foundation and the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra, recently made a number of important experiments in telecasting symphonic music. Among the devices they used, in addition to realism, were abstract images moving on a rear-projection screen. In one sequence, a dancer in the wings off stage interpreted the music choreographically. Her shadow was projected onto the rear of the translucent screen and photographed from the front by the camera (all off stage). In another sequence, a flexible mirror made of steel was treated so that its surface reflected myriad points of light; these were projected onto the rear of the screen as an operator bent the mirror back and forth to the rhythm of the music in a variety of ways, making the points of light “dance” through endless variations of abstract patterns. It is worth noting that these highly imaginative techniques involved visual performances taking place simultaneously with the music, not anything “canned” in advance. Thus, the characteristic immediacy of the television medium was being exploited; these techniques were not simply poor makeshifts for those which Hollywood might be able to stage in a slicker manner. Paulu and Bretz also used the device—suggested by Jaques-Dalcroze in 1925—of picturing drawings or paintings related to the spirit of the music.

The script for these symphony telecasts was an ingenious business. Each page consisted of four vertical columns. The first on the left gave the number of the shot—first, second, third, etc. The next column showed which of three cameras was to take the shot. The third column gave the subject of the shot—for instance, “bass trombone”—plus information about the composition of the shot and the appropriate lens. The final column at the right gave the number of measures for which the shot should be held. When

the telecast went on the air, musician-supervisor Paulu, following the score, counted the measures aloud over the intercom system into the earphones of the director, cameramen, and floor manager. As the proper bar number came along, director Bretz broke in with instructions to the crew. This is a good, thorough method to be followed when the director is a nonmusician carrying out the ideas of the supervisor (or producer) who is a musician. However, if the director can memorize the musical structure, he can greatly simplify this script into a run-down sheet for use on the air. The bar-numbering device will then be replaced by actual knowledge of phrase lengths, and the elaborate description of each shot will be replaced by accurate foreknowledge of what instrument has the melody when. The director will then be working only from a list of the shots in order. This more practical and more sensitive method of working will come about in the future when a nucleus of musicians learns enough about television production to direct shows. Then they will be able to plan their productions carefully in advance in collaboration with TV producers and crew; and when air time arrives, they can take over the active direction themselves.

And so, we come to the end of the shopping list—at least, for the present. No doubt, tomorrow or the next day someone will come along with additions—probably with deletions too—but that will simply serve to keep the controversies boiling. Nothing better for the health of TV than some good arguments! We are apt to be behind the times in this matter of audio-visual artistry, anyway, as it concerns music. We need to get the subject out for a good airing and stir up some constructive action. As long ago as 1925, Émile Jaques-Dalcroze—a man with great vision—had these things pretty well figured out in his discussion of music and cinema. It's time we caught up with him:

Certainly then there are many ways of blending aural and visual impressions. . . . the forms of the visual symphony have not yet been determined. The seventh art is hesitant among a number of new pos-

sibilities; it is so young and vital that it is continually being carried off into hitherto unexplored fields; assured of success, it is quite ready to throw away the forms it momentarily adopts as soon as it glimpses the possibility of conceiving new ones. How could it accept any ultimate style when it constantly sees its means of expression grow in number?

The projected and mutually consenting union has not yet come about; it will take place only on quite special conditions—the same as those which secured the partnership existing between words and music. . . . In the present state of things, music that desires close alliance with the moving image finds itself continually thwarted by the accumulation on the screen of effects of extreme variety and interest. . . . Development is necessary for every musical idea, to unite with which the ever advancing pictorial ideas should also be developed continuously, adapting themselves to various forms. These forms are probably to be found in slight variations of nuances and progressive modifications of light and movement, during the somewhat prolonged exposure of a typical picture.