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Introduction—Means and Ends: Music and Politics Between Cold War and Millennium

In late summer 2000, the Europäisches Musikfestival Stuttgart presented four newly commissioned settings of the Passion of Christ. The primary theme of that year’s festival was the 250th anniversary of J.S. Bach’s death, in commemoration of which the new works were commissioned. The composers selected for “Passion 2000” were each assigned one of the Gospels, and asked to write in their languages of origin. They were Wolfgang Rihm, Gospel of Luke, German; Sofia Gubaidulina, Gospel of John, Russian; Osvaldo Golijov, Gospel of Mark, Spanish; and Tan Dun, Gospel of Matthew, Chinese/English.

Critics from around the world flocked to the Passion 2000 premieres, which were also broadcast live across Germany by SWR. The sponsoring institution, the Bachakademie Stuttgart, has in its archives dozens, even hundreds of reviews, previews, and interviews pertaining to the project, the individual Passions, and the subsequent commercial release of recordings taken from the world premieres.¹ The Passion 2000 project had a wide and ambitious reach, and helped organize subsequent performances for each of the pieces following their Stuttgart premieres. By bringing in musicians from around the world, Passion 2000 also extended its reach, with performers including new music “stars” such as members of Bang on a Can; internationally known conductors like Valery Gergiev and Helmuth Rilling (then the Bachakademie Stuttgart’s artistic director); and musicians who had growing profiles outside of classical music altogether, such as the singer Luciana Souza.

In its music-historical ambitions, its stylistic range, its millennial location, and its Bach connections, Passion 2000 raises multiple questions. How can we interpret the aesthetic pluralism of so-called “new music” of the 1990s? How can we understand these Passions as

¹ Three of the four premieres were commercially released on the Hänssler label; Tan Dun’s Water Passion was released later by Sony.
products of a post-Cold War world? How do they engage with the contemporaneous debates about “ends”—of history, of art, of the millennium—as well as contemporaneous questions about “beginnings”—of globalization and multiculturalism? How, and by what means could composers compete with one another in the 1990s new music market? Did older twentieth century musical values based in issues of complexity and autonomy inform the production and reception of these pieces, and what does that tell us about the sources and discourses of prestige? And, drawing from Jean-Francois Lyotard, perhaps the master historiographic question, “Where, after the metanarratives, can legitimacy reside?” Where, at a time widely described as “posthistorical,” could posthistorical music find legitimacy?

My reference to Lyotard is also an acknowledgement of the fact that new music from the end of the twentieth century has not been much considered outside of the theoretical frame of postmodernism, which is important but not central to my idea of the period. I am, however, interested in postmodernism where it intersects with intimations of historical lateness, endings, or eschatology. In Fredric Jameson’s study of postmodernism he encapsulates a widespread preoccupation with such themes in the last quarter of the twentieth century:

The last few years have been marked by an inverted millenarianism, in which premonitions of the future, catastrophic or redemptive, have been replaced by sense of the end of this or that (the end of ideology, the art, or social class; the ‘crisis’ of Leninism, social democracy, or the welfare state, etc., etc.); taken together, all of these perhaps constitute what is increasingly called postmodernism.3

In music scholarship, Peter Schmelz has identified an “obsession with the end” that “appears to have arisen nearly simultaneously in many different places, often without direct

---


This “obsession” has manifested itself in music criticism, as in Alex Ross’s history of twentieth century music, *The Rest is Noise: Listening to the Twentieth Century*, whose final chapter is titled “After the End.” And as early as the 1960s, Leonard Meyer had argued that the anti-teleological turn of Cage and other American experimentalists spelled the end of music history. Schmelz also cites Arthur Danto’s thesis about the “end of art,” which intersects with postmodernism when Danto describes “post-historical art” as being produced in “an art world unstructured by any master narrative at all, though of course there remains in artistic consciousness the knowledge of the narratives that no longer apply.”

Arguments about history’s various ends, and about the impossibility of writing historical narratives, are generally attempts to write historical narratives. In the case of art histories, they are efforts to establish a discernible trajectory along which reception can be undertaken, and possibly underneath which artistic production can also be influenced, all while trying to make sense and out of the works of the recent past, or even the present. Similarly, the kinds of end-of-history claims made by political observers like Francis Fukuyama after the Cold War were themselves historical writings that attempted to make order out of a world at a historical moment in which it seemed to have come unmoored from an anchor—the grand binaristic structure of the Cold War, however reductive—that, in immediate hindsight, had enabled fraught, but relatively stable and comprehensible, global geopolitical conditions.

There are three fundamental tensions that are crucial to my reading of Passion 2000. First is a *historiographical tension* at the heart of the commission. A suspension of music-historical master narratives can almost be assumed of such an eclectic group of works (although I will

---


attempt to demonstrate it below), in which no style or aesthetic is elevated above another. At the same time, the deep appeal to canonic music history inherent in the commission itself, with its assumption that Bach culture has a universal meaning, suggests that surface incredulity toward the musicological master narrative might be covering up some very old-fashioned uncertainties, as reception tends to show. Second is a periodizing tension, since this commission arose between the end of the Cold War, at one end, and the end of the millennium/beginning of the new millennium, on the other. Shadowing the latter are the events of 9/11 and the beginning of the “global war on terror,” which arguably brought to an end the period of American hegemony that followed the fall of the Berlin Wall. In general, what I call “the post-Cold War period” refers to the span between the Wall coming down in 1989 and the 9/11 attacks—a period delimited by the destruction of concrete symbols of state and economic power at either end. Like other endings, the end of the Cold War and end of the century contained beginnings within them, and in this way, the choice of the Passion for this commission—an almost moribund genre by the end of the twentieth century—was poetic. The Passion genre carries within its narrative an unmistakable end, but also the promise of a new beginning, and tapped into both millennial hopes and anxieties.

The third tension is one between a locally or nationally produced identity, and a claim to universalism, both manifested here largely in musical terms. The post-Cold War period was marked by renewed tensions between the local and the global, in cultural, economic, and political terms, and theories of “glocalization” both raised new questions about where they intersected and emphasized their interaction. The rise of East Asia as a trade center, the introduction of the euro, and the often violent emergence of new nation-states in the former Soviet bloc characterized this immediate post-Cold War period, offering premonitory examples
of the new political formations emerging: trade as a regional strength in a decentered world; the
European Union’s path to post-ideological borderlessness; and a simultaneously virulent
revanchist rise of pre-Cold War nationalist ideologies. The year 2000 saw the introduction of a
new EU slogan: “Unified in Diversity.” Both were crucial, not only for Europe but far beyond;
unity and diversity are also in tension in the Passion 2000 project, and, musically, within some of
its constituent works.

In approaching these four Passions, I continually reflect on the question of history’s ends
in every sense: its uses in the production of prestige, as a political foil, as an aspirational status,
as a series of alternatives; its finitude in art, music, and on the grand scale imagined by
Fukuyama. As a period, the immediate post-Cold War has received little attention in music
scholarship, its repertoires being analyzed primarily through the multiple lenses of postmodern
theory, including the incorporation of ideas about late capitalism and cultural production in the
work of Fredric Jameson and David Harvey, the disintegration of the high-low aesthetic divide in
Andreas Huyssen’s analysis, the antagonistic relationship to Cold War modernism outlined in
Georgina Born’s work on IRCAM, and stylistic tendencies such as those outlined by Jonathan D.
Kramer, or Ihab Hassan more broadly: quotations, fragmentation, pluralism, multivalence, etc.\(^6\)
These stylistic factors are important for the Passion 2000 works, but it is one of the arguments of
this dissertation that the end of the Cold War itself led to a new set of conditions for musical
production that should be included when looking at music from the period. It is also by focusing

---

\(^6\) Jameson, Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991);
Harvey, The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change (Cambridge, MA:
Blackwell Publishers, 1990); Huyssen, After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism,
(Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986); Born, Rationalizing Culture: IRCAM, Boulez, and the
Institutionalization of the Avant-Garde (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Kramer, “The Nature and
Origins of Musical Postmodernism,” in Postmodern Music/Postmodern Thought, Judy Lochhead and Joseph Auner,
Theory and Culture (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1987).
on the end of the Cold War as a dividing point in history that issues of globalization, American triumphalism, pluralism, reconfigured universalism, and eschatology are brought together. In the West, and especially in the U.S., the overriding response to the end of the Cold War was triumphalist. Historian Ellen Schreker writes, “Outside of the left and a handful of academics, few even question the notion that American ‘won’ the Cold War… an undemanding patriotic celebration prevails, glorifying Washington’s past actions in order to justify its present ones…the triumphalist history of the Cold War contains little nuance or ambiguity.” She outlines the ways that triumphalism was articulated in military, moral, and economic terms: “Just as winning the Cold War vindicated the West’s military buildup, so too it conferred a similar legitimacy to the neoliberalism that came to dominate economic thought by the 1980s.”

Part of what Schrecker, and others in her volume, reject is the simplistic account of pundits like Fukuyama, whose musings about the “end of history” were briefly influential in the post-Cold War period. Fukuyama’s argument was that the fall of communism meant that the world had reached “the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government,” a purely triumphalist account.

In something like opposition to Fukuyama, Samuel Huntington’s theory of a post-Cold War “clash of civilizations” assumed the emergence of religiously-aligned “civilizations” that would dominate global politics in the new configuration, “shaping the patterns of cohesion, disintegration, and conflict in the post-cold war world.” Other post-Cold War predictions emphasized emerging tensions between global capital and local identity. Among the most user-

---

friendly was Thomas Friedman, a *New York Times* columnist, who translated Fukuyama’s low Hegelianism into a prediction of economic triumphalism, arguing that the world had been unified by U.S. power and shrunk by information technology and the (now unimpeded) flow of capital; in this “flat” world, in Friedman’s terms, only countries that could accommodate capital’s needs would be rewarded. Friedman thought the U.S. was especially well-positioned to reap globalization’s rewards, while those who resisted—partly by clinging to outdated ideas about national or regional identity—would be left behind. Political scientist Benjamin R. Barber’s article (later a book) “Jihad vs. McWorld” saw a similar tension between a reactionary localism—“retribalization”—and a globalized consumer culture. Unlike Friedman, who took the opportunity to cheerlead for the U.S., Barber predicted the erosion of the nation-state, and with it, democracy itself, in the face of these two symmetrical threats: globalization was indifferent to the *demos* and to citizenship, while tribalism actively rejected it.10

Both Friedman and Barber wrote for the mainstream public, but their arguments echo those made by geographer Manuel Castells, whose massive three-volume study of what he calls “the information age” similarly analyzed an epoch-defining tension between local identity and “global flows.” Unlike Huntington, Castells does not see regionalism as inherently prone to conflict; he describes the emergence of regional trade centers as part of a global system of networks that contributes to a split “between abstract, universal instrumentalism and historically rooted, particularist identities.”11 The complexities of this split include the impact of economic globalization on the power of the nation-state; the emergence of non-state actors and their resistance to state domination; and the growing attractions of “local” identities, rooted in a


physical place or point of origin. While some of these arguments are based on American perceptions and experiences of the post-Cold War period, Castells’s arguments demonstrate that the spread of market capitalism, information technology, and neoliberal economic formations, and their tension with “historically rooted” identities, was a worldwide phenomenon.

A version of this tension drove Passion 2000, which took an ostensibly “global” stance toward millennial classical music, while nonetheless counting on its composers to demonstrate in musical (and possibly marketing) terms their own historically-rooted local identities. This musical friction between universal and particular goes back at least to the nineteenth century debates about nationalism in music. In these largely German-language debates, German music was understood to simultaneously represent a German “spirit,” while at the same time transcending the boundaries of the national, to accede to a (internally proclaimed) universal status. By contrast, non-German repertoires that purported to represent a national spirit were understood to be solely representative of their own national roots, and because of that specificity, excluded from the universal. This historiographical tradition is often traced back to the theories of Johann Gottfried Herder, who “employed national song to map two of the most fundamental concepts of the Enlightenment on the nation and thus to connect the nation to European history. On the one hand…‘folk songs’…had a universal quality: folksong had the potential to represent all of human culture. On the other hand, folk song possessed the particular power to represent culture in its specific, bounded forms….”12 In Passion 2000, this friction is both further complicated, and in a sense reemphasized, by the suggestion that the commission’s global character demonstrates the ongoing relevance of German classical music—Bach, in particular.

---

In Germany, the end of the Cold War meant, among other things, grappling with the 1990 unification of East and West, which came about much sooner than had been anticipated in 1989. In addition to the immediately pressing economic difficulties brought about by unification, the process brought with it a renewed bout of soul-searching, as the two German states had developed entirely different historiographic traditions on contrasting—often oppositional—senses of German identity were built. Consequently, unification of the state led paradoxically to a paradoxical state of disunity; in 1993, Mary Beth Stein could write, “Germans may have been more ‘united’ by the border that divided them, than by its absence.” Konrad Jarausch and others have noted the delayed uneasiness that came only after the process of unification was underway: “Due to the euphoria of winning the Cold War, Westerners only gradually realized that the old FRG [Federal Republic of Germany, the former West Germany] had also disappeared and that their previously comfortable existence was threatened not just by massive transfer payments but by new political responsibilities.” Jarausch, one of the most notable scholars of post-war Germany, also toys with the historical dialectic, when he and his co-editors write that the 1945 defeat of Hitler “seemed to have ended history, since the dissolution of the Third Reich provided a negative closure to national development. Hence the postwar period appeared to many participants as a space beyond history, a timeless moment of recovery that at best constituted a postscript to the completed master-narrative of Germany. With the fall of the Wall, history returned with a vengeance….” If post-Cold War triumphalism in the U.S. was
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widely understood to imply release from the burden of ideological history, it was understood, uneasily, to imply the resumption of that historical burden in Germany. It is through this historical uneasiness and persistent division—the so-called “Mauer im Kopf,” or the “Wall in the mind”—that I approach the specifically German dimensions of Passion 2000.

During the late Cold War years of the 1980s, several scholars had produced studies of nationalism, including Ernest Gellner, Benedict Anderson, Anthony D. Smith, and Eric Hobsbawm. Gellner argued that pre-national geography was characterized by “great diversity and plurality and complexity,” and homogenized into a political and national unity partly out of economic necessity. Smith argued that the “nation” could be produced across ethnic and other divisions but was built on existing belief systems, and required generating a belief in the nation as part of a “natural order.” Hobsbawm suggested that nationalism was in retreat, making way at the end of the twentieth century for new, extra-national formations. In his 1983 book, however, Anderson argued that nationalism—more than capitalism, democracy, or communism, for example—could be considered the “most universally legitimate value in the political life of our time.”

However, political theorists outside the U.S. often agreed with Barber that one of the greatest risks of globalization was the waning power of the nation-state to protect its citizens. For Jürgen Habermas, who welcomed its decline even as he worried about the consequences, the search for alternative modes of protection was especially important in post-unification Germany. Habermas saw in economic globalization the production of a global society, best governed by a non-territorial set of protections and requirements. He was especially interested in the European

---

Union as a test case, and argued for a trans- or extra-national organization to regulate political and social issues, as well as devise economic protections. Drawing on liberal theories of cosmopolitanism, Habermas names the desirable attributes of a “citizen of the world,” who should simultaneously have an attachment to a nation of origin; reject political apathy; and participate in the complexities of globalization. The “world civic solidarity” Habermas seeks should be “based on a moral universalism, which is expressed in human rights.”

Habermas’s postnationalism is in line with that of other theorists, including David Jacobson, Alison Brysk and Gershon Shafir, and Joseph H. Carens. For all, endowing individuals with irrevocable human rights regardless of location was both a reaction to waning state power under economic globalization, and a response to increases in migrant flows. In recent scholarship, these ideas about the universality of human rights, specifically vouchsafed by a non-state entity, are linked to cosmopolitanism, which also offers some valuable insights into Passion 2000.

In his introduction to a colloquy in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Dana Gooley traces the evolution of cosmopolitanism in musical discourse, especially the largely negative connotations it carried in the nineteenth century, when cosmopolitanism was “understood only negatively, as an absence of roots, folk spirit, developed subjectivity, or the capacity to transmit authentic feeling…” This mistrust of the cosmopolitan persisted into the post-Cold War period, counterpoising a negative orientation toward the non-local with a romanticized vision of “rootedness.” Habermas, Martha Nussbaum, and others have also been
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concerned with the kinds of exclusion that could result from this mistrust; an exclusion that strips individuals of their “right to have rights,” in Hannah Arendt’s terms. World citizenship” became more pressing in the post-Cold War period partly because labor attempted to follow capital in its global migrations, but found far fewer protections than capital enjoyed. Both Arendt and Giorgio Agamben have argued that only citizens can claim any rights at all; consequently, individuals without citizenship are largely devoid of agency and vulnerable to other political interests.

In Nussbaum’s words, the “very old ideal of the cosmopolitan” referred to the individual “whose allegiance is to the worldwide community of human beings,” and cosmopolitanism in this definition was understood as a universalizing ideal, standing in contrast to the specificity of nations. In the first post-Cold War decade, Nussbaum advocated for this kind of allegiance, warning that patriotism—as an excessive allegiance to one’s home state—is potentially a “moral danger” that can invert the principles it claims to serve. “National unity in devotion to worthy moral ideals of justice and equality,” can come to mean, for the non-citizen or the person outside that “unity,” justice and equality meted out in unequal measure. Nussbaum’s complexly-balanced, Kantian interpretation of cosmopolitanism offers a political homology to a commission like Passion 2000, which sought equal representation of global voices without regard to citizenship, while leaving a sense of “roots” intact.

While Nussbaum advocated for an ideal form of cosmopolitanism, in 1998, Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins argued that “cosmopolitan” should no longer be used solely to designate an empowered, transnational elite, but particularized as “cosmopolitanisms,” to include “transnational experiences that are particular rather than universal and that are unprivileged—
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indeed, often coerced.” Unprivileged transnationalism is not much of a concern in the context of Passion 2000, whose eminent participants were far from the kinds of economic migrants that Cheah and Robbins were talking about. (Three of the four Passion 2000 composers had at the time the kinds of transnational backgrounds made possible by an existing elite status, either economically, artistically, or both.) Nonetheless, Passion 2000 is linked with a universalist cosmopolitanism, drawing on a similarly universalizing discourse of classical music, whose purportedly inherent value—like the Rights of Man—translates across borders or boundaries. At the same time, Passion 2000 relied on existing particularist and nationalist traditions in classical music for marketing and promotion. The Passion 2000 composers were not strangers to the idea of marketing their identities, whether national, linguistic, or religious.

In his study of the Viennese celebrations of the Mozart anniversary in 2006, ethnomusicologist Eric Usner compares 2006 to the previous Mozart year of 1991. He writes that both festivals “in their own way also musically embodied and opaquely delineated periods of Viennese (musical) history: the passing of the quaint and isolated neutral Cold War Vienna, and the emergence of a new Vienna, one becoming part of a European Union and once more (New) Europe’s gateway to the East…The Mozart Year 1991 was still very much a rehearsal of the past in the present. By 2006, however, the anniversary celebrations had become—at least in part—a multivalent performance of new possibilities of this cosmopolitan tradition of classical music in a city entering a new (its second) millennium.”
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2000, which took place in a unified, post-Cold War Germany, unlike the previous big Bach Year of 1985, which had been another in a series of Cold War opportunities for the two halves of a divided Germany to stake competing claims on the canon. As with the 2006 Mozart celebration, Passion 2000 was more concerned with the “new possibilities of this cosmopolitan tradition of classical music,” seeking to explore what Bach might now mean to the world outside of Europe.

Seeking cultural legitimacy on a national, regional, and international scale requires different artistic and reportorial choices. Gooley paraphrases William Weber’s argument about cosmopolitan cultural authority in the 19th century: “In Weber’s view, institutions with cosmopolitan repertoire [i.e., repertoire that mixed music from different countries] were usually making a bid for cultural authority on a European scale, as opposed to that of region and nation.”24 The Mozart Year 2006, Usner suggests, was used partly as a bid for European cultural authority, with Mozart “deployed to project notions of ‘European-ness’ by the European Union.”25 In the post-Cold War period, the Bachakademie Stuttgart had made a bid at the European level, with its 1995 *Requiem of Reconciliation*, marking the 50th anniversary of the end of the Second World War with requiem, collectively written by fourteen composers from countries involved in the war. While the commission included an American composer (John Harbison) and a Japanese composer (Joji Yuasa), the majority of the composers involved came from European countries, including both allies and opponents of Germany. Passion 2000 made an even larger bid, for cultural authority on a global scale, inventing at one stroke a cosmopolitan repertoire with an unusual global reach.

On the other end of this period was the approach of the millennial turn. Hopes for the coming millennium—the idea of a clean historical slate, a movement toward a one-world society
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25 Usner, 417.
or system of governance, other modes of salvational thinking—were amplified as the actual year 2000 (widely, if inaccurately, celebrated as the calendrical Millennium) approached. I will address some of the millennialist literature in the pertinent chapters, but it is important to understand at the beginning of this dissertation that millennialism is generally understood as a belief system that seeks an “imminent transition to a collective salvation…[where] the unpleasant limitations of the human condition will be eliminated.”

Other disciplines and fields I have drawn on in this dissertation include German studies, particularly around ideas of divided Germany, post-war German guilt, and German unification; Bach studies and Bach culture; Kunstreligion; religious studies; and sociology, particularly of prestige. These topics and theories frame a series of recurring issues, questions, and periodizing concepts. My methodology is mixed, and includes archival research, discourse analysis, and musical analysis. While I did not personally participate in any performances of these works, nor observe them in preparation or performance, I cannot pretend to have stood fully outside of this extended historical moment, either. As a former performer and presenter of new music, questions about its meanings and uses have interested me for a long time. I am also a child of the late Cold War, and of a German parent whose own family and friends experienced life on both sides of the Wall. Finally, and on a personal note, I spent the late 1990s debilitated by illness. My situation came to a head in the summer of 2000, coincidentally as the Stuttgart organizers, far outside my awareness, were making their final preparations for Passion 2000. During that time, I had a strange, otherworldly musical experience. Running high fevers every night, I would have wildly

26 Throughout the dissertation, I will use the word “millennial” to refer to things having to do with the year 2000, and “millennialism” to refer to any number of belief systems oriented toward ideas of collective, earthly redemption or renewal. When those ideas intersect, as they often did in the late twentieth century, I will refer to the belief systems as “millennialist.”

vivid dreams, and toward the end of summer, a recording of the Mozart Requiem somehow became programmed in the stereo to come on at midnight. For three midnights in a row, I woke up precisely at the moment in the Confutatis when the high-pitched voices entered: “Voca me cum benedictus,” “Call me among the blessed:” my immediate assumption (before waking up fully to find myself still in Texas) was that I had died. I share this story not only because it affected me deeply, contributing to an already powerful yearning for a personal resurrection, but because in placing my own illness into dialogue with old music and the new millennium, with other narratives of redemption and restoration, I became aware of how strong my impulse was to make meaning out of suffering. The Passion 2000 works premiered with, as we shall see, wildly diverse takes on death and resurrection; an ocean and half a continent away, I grappled with my own. Passion 2000 has been an unexpectedly personal object of inquiry.

**Passion 2000 as Structure**

How to consider these four musical works, which present many noteworthy and overlapping similarities? Golijov and Tan Dun might easily be paired as composers from “outside of Europe,” in the organizer’s terms, approaching the task of Passion writing. Tan and Golijov were furthermore the most successful in the United States, and part of this dissertation looks at their U.S. reception. While this “multicultural” pairing is attractive (Mina Yang, in *Planet Beethoven*, has already made the comparison), it is also problematic, proving Dipesh Chakrabarty’s point about historicism within political modernity: that it posits “historical time as a measure of the cultural distance (at least in institutional development) that was assumed to exists between the West and the non-West [characteristic of] the ‘first in Europe and then
elsewhere’ structure of time.”

That so many countries and states have used classical music as a sign of arriving at “modernity” only makes it more important not to succumb to a music-historical epistemology that sees in Golijov or Tan evidence of such belatedness. Nonetheless, the new Passions’ range of geographic and cultural origin was filtered through a European musical institution, and therefore Europe once more assumed, in this case, the role of standard-bearer and collector of global culture.

There is also the order in which the pieces were premiered: Rihm, Gubaidulina, Golijov, and Tan. In this configuration, the Passion 2000 works begin closest to Bach geographically, and gradually move outward, culminating at the furthest geographical point (if Tan is read as Chinese), and at the point where classical music achieves maximum universality by the standards of 1990s globalization: music by a transnational, migratory Anglophone, embodying a market-responsive form of postnational citizenship.

Choosing neither of these logical orders, I am presenting these pieces in thematic pairs, beginning with Rihm and Golijov. These two composers chose the Gospel texts whose settings by Bach have been lost, and yet the Luke and Mark settings in Passion 2000 take music history as their subject matter. Rihm’s piece is intensely engaged with the music-historical aspect of the commission, and its terms as a German commemorative project centered on Bach; his piece engages Bach’s historical roles and tropes, and political uses, ultimately putting Bach historiography through the filter of German discourses about historical guilt and absolution. As the German composer for Passion 2000, Rihm carried a unique historical burden in the
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29 For more on East Asian immigrants who model this kind of citizenship, see Aihwa Ong, *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1998).
commission, one that he responded to by rejecting the image of Bach as a “healer” and the idea of German millennial redemption. Golijov, who had already written a Bach-inspired piece for the Oregon Bach Festival, offers an inversion of Rihm; rejecting the music-historical dimension of the commission, Golijov takes Western music history itself as an archive of tropes and allusions, without necessarily according them a great historical weight. Somewhat ironically, it was the reception of Golijov’s Passion in the U.S. that brought Passion 2000 itself to wider awareness here; Golijov, who affected to carry the least music-historical weight, helped Passion 2000 achieve the music-historical status its organizers clearly sought.\(^{30}\)

In Gubaidulina’s Passion of John, and Tan’s Passion _after_ Matthew, it is the millennium, more than the Cold War’s end, that is especially influential. Both composers take the idea of millennial (or millennialist) renewal or redemption as their themes. Gubaidulina wrote what she would refer to as the commission’s “only religious work.” In her vision, the John of the Gospel fuses with John the Revealer. Her Passion becomes a vehicle for emphasizing God’s cleansing wrath, and by extension, for articulating hope of a millennialist, apocalyptic redemption. By stark contrast, Tan produced a meliorist, non-doctrinal version of the Matthew Passion that offers a one-world, New Age, non-doctrinal vision of resurrection.

As Passion 2000 was intended to mark the 250\(^{th}\) anniversary of Bach’s death, Bach permeates both the project, and my readings of all its works. For some of the composers, Bach has been a lifelong influence on their work, while others take a looser, more conceptual approach to the question of influence or homage. Regardless of what they have said, or not said, about Bach, it is fair to say that he haunts these pieces.

\(^{30}\) Journalists paid the Golijov far more attention than musicologists have done, but their enthusiasm for the piece has little precedent in late twentieth century music. The Golijov, and Passion 2000, are also discussed near the end of Richard Taruskin’s _Oxford History of Western Music_ and in Alex Ross’s _The Rest is Noise: Listening to the Twentieth Century_, which straddles a divide between journalism and scholarship.
Chapter 1 examines Wolfgang Rihm’s *Deus Passus: Passions-Stücke Nach Lukas* in the context of German memory, guilt, and forgetting. I argue that Rihm’s Passion engages with two specifically German discourses of memory: that of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, or “coming to terms with the past,” and that of the *doppelte Vergangenheit*, the “doubled past.”

*Vergangenheitsbewältigung* was a post-war discourse that eventually permeated much of German culture, even as some critics—Adorno in particular—warned that it was inadequate to the task of facing up to the monumental horrors Germany had inflicted during the war, and especially the Holocaust. At stake in *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, among other things, was the question of German identity in the post-war era.

Long tied to such questions was the figure of J.S. Bach, who had been used for over a century in processes of producing German nationhood. In the post-war period, Bach became a site for contesting the meaning of the German nation, as both East and West Germany sought to stake a claim on Germany’s cultural heritage (*Erbe*), which they often did by way of arguing for a particular vision of the German musical canon. Bach historiography in divided Germany makes an interesting test case for this, as the East Germans—who could stake a geographical claim on Bach thanks to his years in Leipzig—rewrote his biography and produced new interpretations of his works that suggested Bach was essentially a proto-socialist. West German musicology, caught up in *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, continued to appeal to Bach’s “universality” as carried in his formal structures and techniques. Both states poured a great deal of support into Bach culture, with Bach-fests, Bach Days, and Bach *Wochen* taking place all over Germany.

The problem of “two pasts” emerged with painful intensity after the fall of the Wall, when Germany was suddenly faced with two very different historiographic traditions. Most
crucially, East Germany had taken no responsibility for the Holocaust, casting itself as a “victim” of National Socialism, while West Germany had, in addition to developing a robust memorial culture, been paying reparations to Israel since the 1950s. The difficulties of uniting these traditions proved difficult, particularly as the economic and moral power of the West led to a widespread and wholesale discrediting of the East German sense of a past (and, among other things, the rejection of East German historical scholarship as propaganda, and the purging of East Germans from university positions). I argue that Rihm’s piece engages with Bach tropes as a means of rejecting the idea of millennial redemption for Germany, and that it takes on various historical ideas about Bach that were filtered through the recent German past.

Chapter 2 looks at the reception of Golijov’s eclectic and pan-Latin *La Pasión según San Marcos* following its multiple premieres in the U.S. shortly after the performances in Stuttgart. U.S. critics had an overwhelmingly enthusiastic response to the Golijov, which they couched in music-historical terms, suggesting that *Pasión* was “musical history starting over,” “the future of classical music,” or “modern music history being made.” In this chapter, I seek to determine what compositional strategy could elicit such a response. Golijov will be seen to exemplify what I call the “multicultural turn” of new music of the 1990s, which, I will argue, suggested a new approach to the idea of musical progress, in which the terms of progress were shifting from those of technical innovation to those of personal representation. I will lay out the techniques of what I identify as an “incorporation aesthetic,” a compositional approach that emphasized pluralism within the context of the personal, national, or religious “difference” of a given composer. An expanded musical pluralism in new music of the 1990s can be partly attributed to this approach, which also included composers like Tan Dun, Arvo Pärt, and Sofia Gubaidulina. Composers from former Eastern bloc countries fared especially well under these terms in the post-Cold War
period, as they could provide Western audiences with a personal, post-Communist narrative of emancipation from state domination, thereby contributing to a sense of historical progress that suited a moment of Western triumphalism.

Yet even as “new voices” were warmly welcomed on stage, I will show that older, “covert values,” particularly a standard for new music that valorized complexity, were still at work, and eventually complicated reception of Pasión and other Golijov works. Nonetheless, I show that Golijov’s piece was an exemplar of the incorporation aesthetic, a case study on its limits, and an unexpected departure from it.

In chapter 3, I turn away from the post-Cold War period as a framing device and toward the dissertation’s other theme, the millennial turn. Sofia Gubaidulina’s violent Johannes-Passion is the subject here. Where the other Passions bring in non-Biblical sources as commentary or interpolation, Gubaidulina chose to gloss her setting of the John Gospel with texts and scenes from Revelation, with the expressed intention of creating an intersection of “earthly” and “heavenly” time. I contextualize this Passion by way of other millennialist and apocalyptic movements that gained ground as the year 2000 drew near. Gubaidulina’s is the most eschatological of the four, and offers no millennial absolution. Her choice of Revelation as the primary, almost sole source, of textual interpolations for the John Gospel demonstrates a catastrophic historical vision of ending, a vision that is supported by the almost relentless bleakness of the music.

At the same time that this positions her Passion in the “end times,” “end of art,” and other lateness discourses, it also suggests—again, along with the musical aesthetic—a rejection of modernity and contemporaneity, and with it, a return to an imagined, earlier alternative. As Peter Schmelz points out, the sense of imminent ending was not unique to the post-Cold War
triumphalism of Francis Fukuyama, but was “in the air worldwide in the 1970s and 1980s, informed by the imagined imminence of nuclear apocalypse... Russian attitudes toward time and recurrence, apocalypse and utopia also may have played a role.”\(^{31}\)

In addition, I offer an excursus on the question of writing a John Passion at all, “after Auschwitz,” as it were. Here, I review some of the discussions about the alleged anti-Semitism of Bach’s John Passion, and look at more recent debates about contemporary settings, ultimately arguing that the alleged anti-Semitism of Bach’s Johannes-Passion is perhaps less important than a John Passion that links the Gospel’s depiction of “the Jews” to millennialist, apocalyptic destruction.

Chapter 4 links Tan’s Water Passion After St. Matthew, and his career trajectory, to the long tradition of Kunstreligion, a religion of art, in classical music, and to the discourse of classical music’s “universalism.” Writing about Mendelssohn’s 1829 performances of Bach’s Matthew Passion in Berlin, Celia Applegate has argued that Kunstreligion and Bach especially offered an anchor for “free-floating piety” and spiritual feeling that was religiously unanchored. I argue that Tan has attempted to anchor his music to a similar “spiritual” desire, which especially in the 1990s made him part of a popular trend toward manifestations of “spirituality” in music, with examples from both classical/new music and world music. Tan has also tried to attach his music to a long tradition of using classical music for public, historic, and state occasions, where in another link to Kunstreligion, classical music has often stood in for explicitly religious music or content. Tan has been part of multiple high-profile events of this kind, including the 1997 handover of Hong Kong to mainland China, the BBC’s “millennial” broadcast on December 31, 1999, and more recently, the Beijing Olympics. These commissions have raised his profile, but
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they have also allowed him to hone a sense of himself and his work as having “no boundaries,” a theme that comes up again and again in interviews, Tan’s writings, reviews, marketing materials, and program notes.

I argue that Tan’s desire to stake a claim on an existing discourse of “universal” music is achieved by way of a musical style that most closely resembles New Age music, emphasizing the sounds of nature, and like New Age as a spiritual practice, drawing freely from global influences without adhering to any particular practice. Tan’s Passion also stood out from the others by way of its final movement, “Water and Resurrection,” which offered a New Age, non-doctrinal vision of one-world redemption.

I also tie Tan to the incorporation aesthetic I discuss in chapter 2. Tan has simultaneously claimed to produce a “boundaryless” music, demonstrating this ambition through the unbounded use of musical materials, he has also relied on his identity as a Chinese composer for self-promotion, and in the service of a personal mythology. It is in Tan’s Water Passion that the tension between universalism and particularity that recurs throughout this study, and that was so far-reaching during this period, is perhaps most clearly manifested.

I conclude by touching on the events of 9/11, which in hindsight cast a long shadow over both historical triumphalism and millennial exuberance. I then consider changes in new music culture between 2000 and 2016. Despite the relatively short period between then and now, the ways musicians are working—in the U.S., where I will focus in extending this work—are quite different, and generating different kinds of projects. Without waxing elegiac, I propose that in a post-recession, globalized, individualized moment like this one, there will not likely be another commission like Passion 2000, whose works have entered a performing repertoire, are mentioned in textbooks, and are inextricably bound to one another. The scale of musical possibility is
smaller; the desire to have an individual impact greater. Whether or not this anticipates trends in non-musical sectors remains to be seen.
PART I: POST-COLD WAR
Chapter 1: Passion as History, History as Passion

Wolfgang Rihm’s contribution to Passion 2000, *Deus Passus: Passions-Stücke nach Lukas*, takes human suffering as its theme, and calls perpetrators of violence to account. The subtitle of the piece (*Fragments of a Passion after Luke*) suggests an uneasy and fractured relationship to the task of Passion writing, and introduces one of the piece’s structural elements: its alternation between Latin and German texts, which Rihm uses to confront, often covertly, political and historical issues. Moving between German texts taken primarily from the Gospel of Luke, and Latin texts from the Good Friday portion of the Roman Gradual, Rihm employs a range of musical allusions that are inflected partly by the languages they set, with the Latin movements often offering a gloss on the German. Commissioned in 1996 and written in 1999-2000, *Deus Passus* is indeed fragmentary—many of the movements are around two minutes long—and embeds its narrative of human suffering and elusive redemption in a structure that narrates through text selection, orchestral narration, and especially stylistic references and vocal construction.

In the self-consciously multicultural context of Passion 2000, Rihm was the sole German-speaker, a significant historical burden for a composer who, a year before receiving this commission, had represented the now-defunct West Germany in a piece for the same institution. Passion 2000 was devised to celebrate J.S. Bach at the 250th anniversary of his death, and the long-standing practice of using Bach (with varying degrees of political legitimacy) to exemplify ideas of “Germanness” meant that Rihm’s musical orientation toward Bach became crucial to the piece’s narrative. In this chapter, I will analyze certain key movements from *Deus Passus* in terms of their relationship with major aspects of Bach historiography in the two German states.
The Passion 2000 project was Janus-faced, looking both to the past and future; in this regard it aptly symbolized the turn of the millennium, marked in the West on January 1, 2000. Passion 2000 looked backward by its revival of an especially archaic classical music genre, and by placing an eighteenth-century composer at its center: according to project organizers, it was the 250\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of Bach’s death, more than the “much discussed” millennial turn, that was the impetus for the commission and the most important aspect of the year 2000 for the Bachakademie Stuttgart.\footnote{Christian Eisert, “Passion 2000: Zum 250. Todestag von J.S. Bach,” in program book for Passion 2000, ed. Ulrich Prinz, Band 11, (Kassel: Bärenreiter), 2000, 26. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations in this chapter are my own.} Nonetheless, the bulk of the commission also looked confidently ahead to the coming century, through its claims of global representation (especially relevant given the rapid economic globalization of the 1990s), its polystylism, and its linguistic diversity.

Each of the four Passions offered for critical reception a different perspective on the relationship of past to present. Osvaldo Golijov’s \textit{La Pasión Según San Marcos} was heard as a millennial reorientation of classical music, with at least one critic hearing the possibility of “musical history…starting over.”\footnote{Alex Ross, “Resurrection: The Passion according to Osvaldo Golijov,” \textit{New Yorker}, 5 March 2001, http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2001/03/05/resurrection-5.} Tan Dun’s \textit{Water Passion after St. Matthew}, unlike either completed Bach setting, ends by transcending the Passion story itself with a movement titled “Water and Resurrection.” Tan, who had a good year in 2000—he won an Academy Award for his score to the film \textit{Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon}, and premiered another major piece, “A World Symphony for the Millennium” as part of the global television broadcast “2000 Today”—showed an orientation toward the anticipated New Age, or at least a savviness about how such upbeat music might be welcomed.
In the Passion 2000 project, the impulse to celebrate the unknown future was homologous with the central mystery of the staged, performed Passion, which assumes, and tacitly celebrates, the anticipated, though not enacted, resurrection, which can only come after the violent catharsis on stage. While the essence of the Passion narrative is the death of Christ, its ultimate meaning is resurrection; similarly, a project celebrating the turn of the twenty-first century could acknowledge the twentieth, but only anticipate a resurrectionary time to come. Golijov’s piece works by this dual process of acknowledgement and hope, as does Tan’s. While Sofia Gubaidulina’s *Johannes-Passion* does end darkly, with what critic Mark Swed called “a terrible warning for Russia,” she very quickly wrote a companion piece, the *Johannes-Ostern* (2001), which explicitly stages the resurrection.³

_Deus Passus: Passions-Stücke Nach Lukas_ therefore stands out in the Passion 2000 commission for being explicitly and stubbornly oriented toward the past. Commissioned six years after _die Wende_, the irrevocable “change” of German unification, and premiered when Germany had been united for a decade, _Deus Passus_ engages with contemporaneous debates about the meaning of Germany’s twentieth century. Unification had reopened discussions about “coming to terms with the past,” or _Vergangenheitsbewältigung_, a term first used in reference to immediate postwar attempts in West Germany to comprehend and take responsibility for the crimes of National Socialism. After 1990, some historians further theorized a “double burden” in the recent German past, arguing that unified Germany and its citizens, whose struggle with the legacy of National Socialism was still far from complete, would have to also address, study, and come to terms with the 50-year legacy of East German socialist dictatorship (1949-1990). This sense of an unresolved past is part of what animates _Deus Passus_, and Rihm rejects with finality

the millennial idea that certain pasts can be absolved by “coming to terms” with them. This rejection was clear at least to some of the listeners in 2000: one German critic wrote of the premiere, “The question of the Passion today is not a question about Bach, but about understanding the German past, a question that is clearly not very deeply anchored in the collective awareness.”

The idea of the “double past,” or a double burden of the past, originated with an article in Der Spiegel by historian Eberhard Jäckel, who argued that while there was a need to come to terms with the repressive socialism of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), which constituted one part of the double burden, that its crimes were not equivalent to the enormity of those committed under National Socialism, which remained unresolved. A year later in 1992, Jürgen Habermas analyzed the idea of the double past in an essay titled “What Does ‘Working off the Past’ Mean Today?” Habermas’s title was a reference to his teacher Theodor Adorno, an originator of the term Vergangenheitsbewältigung, which he presented with characteristic dialectical pessimism in a 1959 talk. Adorno critiqued the very idea of coming to terms with the past, warning of the potential consequences of considering the past resolved, particularly for Germany, where despite the veneer of postwar democracy there was still ample evidence of fascist tendencies. Adorno contrasted “Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit,” that is, an active psychoanalytic “working through” or “working off” of the past, with the repressive acceptance implied by Vergangenheitsbewältigung, arguing that the latter, rather than functioning as a spur
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to collective remembrance, was ultimately an effacement of memory that allowed the roots of National Socialism to remain intact. Habermas wrote, “Adorno’s commitment to ‘working off’ our own past…does not represent starry-eyed trust in the dynamics of bringing-to-consciousness, but reflects solely the insight that today…there exists no alternative to self-reflection when we seek self-understanding. Publicly conducted ethical-political self-understanding is the central — although only one—dimension of what Adorno called ‘working off the past.”’

Despite Adorno’s warning, the term Vergangenheitsbewältigung, and the ideas behind it, emerged as a moral ideal over the course of the first postwar decades, as it became increasingly clear that the idea of a postwar Stunde Null, a “Zero Hour” that wiped the historical slate, was unsustainable in West Germany’s present. Among intellectuals, and eventually politicians as well, Vergangenheitsbewältigung “came to denote all discussions about the appropriate political, social, and moral agendas for the post fascist age and all initiatives designed to implement these alleged historical lessons.”

If Adorno was correct in arguing that “coming to terms with the past” represented not a commitment to remembering but instead a "wishing to turn the page, and, if possible, a wiping from memory [of the past],” Rihm’s Deus Passus follows Adorno in rejecting the latter and any efforts to resolve, forget, or efface, twentieth century German history. The use of the Passion genre, and Rihm’s dialogue with Bach in this piece, associate it with German history by linking it to German musical history—including that of divided Germany—and to attempts within that historical discourse to remake Bach as a figure of Germanness. In this relinking, Rihm over and

---

8 Habermas, 18.


10 Adorno, 115.
over associates the figure of Bach with his own structural and musical commentaries on the dark passio of German history.

Within that history have been many efforts to identify manifestations of “Germanness,” or German national or cultural identity, in music. Celia Applegate and Pamela Potter, among others, have pointed to the difficulties inherent in this undertaking, raising questions of composer intention and the elusiveness of defining any kind of German identity, particularly prior to nineteenth century efforts at cultural consolidation. Many claims about the relationship between German national and musical identities have been made not by musicians, but by critics and other writers, who invented and attached “national” characteristics to music retroactively. This is particularly true with regard to Bach and other eighteenth century composers, who were reconstructed as embodiments of various German ideals after the fact; Applegate and Potter point out that “the composers and musicians of the eighteenth century practiced their art mainly within the confines of either the court of the town. The former was cosmopolitan, the latter provincial. Neither was in any meaningful sense national.”\(^{11}\) Bach especially has been something of a blank screen for the projections of German national and cultural values across political and historical periods, and has been assigned roles ranging from national musical patriarch to revolutionary to healer.

Within this discourse, constructing Bach as a figure of Germanness—in both a political and cultural sense—has a long and somewhat disreputable history in institutional music criticism.\(^ {12}\) In 1802, Bach’s biographer Johan Nikolaus Forkel “Germanized” Bach, famously

---


\(^ {12}\) Pamela Potter surveys the search for German identity in music in Potter, *Most German of the Arts: Musicology and Society from the Weimar Republic to the end of Hitler’s Reich*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 200-234.
calling on the German “Fatherland” to be both proud and worthy of its “greatest poet.”\textsuperscript{13} It was Bach who inspired one of the first of the nineteenth century’s major musicological projects, the complete Bach edition presented by the Bach-Gesellschaft, launched at the centenary of Bach’s death in 1850 and published beginning in 1851. Almost a century after Forkel’s biography, the Bach-Gesellschaft, having fulfilled its mission, shut its doors in 1900.\textsuperscript{14} At the same time and in its place, the Neue Bachgesellschaft was founded in Leipzig to perpetuate, Walter Frisch writes, “the image of Bach as an embodiment of the German \textit{Volk}. The goals of the NBG…were to promote Bach among the German public through performances, practical editions, and the integration of the his sacred works into the Protestant church service.”\textsuperscript{15} This quasi-religious linkage, in which Bach figures as the “incarnation” of German identity, persisted through the ruptures of the twentieth century to play a role in Passion 2000. According to Christian Eisert, who organized the Passion 2000 project, “There could be no doubt that a German composer would be represented. The German language tradition of Passion writing, which Bach built on and to some extent completed, was too important to get around or omit.”\textsuperscript{16}

Bach had already been at the center of two cross-German collaborations during the Cold War. The first was the Neue Bachgesellschaft’s \textit{Bachfest} project, which supported annual \textit{Bachfests} during the Cold War in addition to publishing the annual \textit{Bach Jahrbuch}. While the


\textsuperscript{14} “Johann Sebastian Bach.” \textit{Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart} second edition, Bärenreiter, Personenteil, v. 1, 1514-1516.

\textsuperscript{15} Walter Frisch, \textit{German Modernism: Music and the Arts}, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2005), p. 144. The “alte” Bach-Gesellschaft had, as planned, disbanded in the same year, upon completion of its massive publication project. See also Lars Klingberg, “Die Neue Bachgesellschaft.” In \textit{Politisch Fest in Unseren Händen: Musikalische und musikwissenschaftliche Gesellschaften in der DDR}, (Kassel: Bärenreiter-Verlag, 1997), 76-102.

\textsuperscript{16} Eisert, 29.
Neue Bachgesellschaft had been sponsoring Bachfests since 1903 (with a hiatus from 1939 to 1949), those presented during the years of German division were planned so that they alternated each year between East and West German cities. This allowed for a particular emphasis on Bach as German Erbe (heritage), a crucial concept in East German Bach reception, and Erbe as indivisible. The other, more far-reaching collaboration was the production of the Neue Bach Ausgabe (NBA), the second complete critical edition of Bach’s works, which was launched in 1951 and grew to include teams in Leipzig (East) and Göttingen (West). The making of the complete NBA exceeded the lifespan of the divided Germany itself, concluding only in 2007 (with revisions and corrections still to come). Both of these projects suggested that Bach, and Bach scholarship, could be a balm for the wounds of German history, and especially a bridge over German division. The NBA’s importance as a cultural artifact of shared German heritage was summed up in a 2007 article in Die Welt, which interpreted the complete NBA as a symbol of the continuity of shared cultural priorities between the two states under the punning headline “A Prelude to German Unity.” The completed NBA was “a marvel, a divine gift of a type not given to every era,” which, in a characteristic if not particularly imaginative journalistic conceit, “turn[ed] out to be a harmonious prelude to the sometimes dissonant and creaking fugue of political unity.”

This response to the NBA project was well-nigh inevitable, given the existing trope in Bach reception of the composer as a healing figure for and from German culture, a tradition that has operated in a tense dialectic with the equally powerful image of Bach as “universal.” The notion of Bach as a regenerative musical “healer” dates as far back as the turn of the twentieth century, as Walter Frisch has shown in his study of Max Reger. Frisch’s diagnosis that “In

---

German musical life around 1900 Bach becomes seen as ‘healthy’ and restorative for a culture—and not just a musical culture—that is perceived as decadent or sick,” prefigures uses of Bach after 1945, and furthermore—at the center of a circle of contemporary composers from the four corners of the troubled world—in Passion 2000.18

The 2007 article shared some aspects of both East and West German Bach historiography and reception. With East German Bach reception, it shared a presentist impulse in its reading of contemporary political or national meaning into bygone moments or periods of musical production. On the other hand, its argument that Bach was now “officially” (amtlich) proven to be greater than Mozart—a question it deemed “one of the trickiest among music lovers”—simply because of the number of linear feet required for his complete works, aligned ironically with the twentieth-century orientation toward positivism and “hard” evidence that followed World War II in West Germany, which was renewed in major former East German institutions like the Bach-Archiv Leipzig after unification.19 It also has a historiographical basis in old discourses of musical “greatness” and in nineteenth-century and twentieth-century polemics around aesthetic dominance and legitimacy. The Neue Bachgesellschaft and its Ausgabe are therefore an important part of twentieth- and twenty-first century Bach reception in Germany, creating a sense of connection across a divided Germany while also bridging the divergent historiographical practices of the two German states.

In her work on German music and identity, Celia Applegate has argued that the link between the two is part of a search for “something I will simply label continuity, that is, the very human search for things that persist in the face of fragmentation, integration, disintegration,

18 Frisch, p. 139.

19 The Bach-Archiv Leipzig now does almost exclusively positivist or non-interpretive work, including an extended project on dating manuscript paper and its digitization project Bach-Digital.
Such continuity was particularly important for the divided nation, as it suggested a persistent German identity that could weather political fragmentation and catastrophe, and might in fact have a role to play in once again “starting over.” Given Passion 2000’s claims to being not only a Bach reception project, but to “begin[ing] where Bach ends,” Rihm’s work as the musical representative of Germany is particularly entangled with Bach culture, Bach reception, and the legacy of Bach as a politicized figure in twentieth century Germany. It is largely the politicized Bach that Rihm takes on in Deus Passus, and the image of Bach as healer, perhaps even bringer of Vergangenheitsbewältigung (that is, effacer of history), is one that Rihm largely rejects. Formal and stylistic analysis of the piece will show just how dramatically Rihm rejects the Bach-as-balm trope, positioning it as a cynical attempt to gloss over a violent past.

Rihm’s division of his setting into two languages—German and Latin—is reinforced by the musical choices he makes in setting them. The Latin text represents a lingua franca, a language predating nationalism and modernity, and therefore unaffiliated with the twentieth-century horrors committed in their name. Rihm also uses Latin to offer respite from those horrors, which in its German sections the piece vividly, even theatrically evokes. The Latin texts, largely from the Roman Gradual, take the role of Bach’s Passion chorales in glossing the German selections, which are largely from the Gospel of Luke. In keeping with the effort at a moral neutrality, the Latin texts are mostly set in an austere postwar style that calls to mind Rihm’s early connections with Darmstadt and the development there of an International Style, whose practitioners sought a musical practice they could argue was “objective.” By contrast,


21 Eisert, 26.
Rihm’s setting suggests that German is the language of suffering, violence, and ultimately of guilt, as the German language movements are primarily where he places his deliberate, narratively important references to Bach’s music and style.

While cultural undertakings in East and West Germany were imagined quite differently in terms of ambition, content, and state support, the Neue Bachgesellschaft and its projects allowed for continuing contact between scholars and performers on both sides. The Neue Bachgesellschaft-sponsored *Bachfests* were especially important for the East German city of Leipzig in those years when the festival arrived there. Beginning in 1966, the festivals that took place in Leipzig in conjunction with the Neue Bachgesellschaft were designated “Internationales Bachfest Leipzig” and included additional activities such as symposia and scholarly publications. Because of Bach’s years in Leipzig, the town was (and is) a center of Bach culture, and under the GDR regime, Bach’s life work in the territory that became East Germany made him especially useful for propagandistic purposes. During the war, and for years afterward, however, so-called Leipzig Bach festivals (with or without the sponsorship of the Neue Bachgesellschaft) were held at irregular intervals. Conflicting agendas and Bach organizations meant that there were only twenty-six *Bachfests* in Leipzig between 1904 and 1989; sixteen of those took place during the years of division, between 1950 and 1989.22

The programming of *Bachfests* across Germany would be a worthwhile topic in its own right, especially a close reading of the differences between programming and program book rhetoric in East and West; it is beyond the scope of this argument.23 There are, however, some important points to make about the programming of Bach’s Passions in Leipzig during the Cold

---

22 *Geschichte des Bachfestes*, http://www.bachfestleipzig.de/de/bachfest/geschichte-des-bachfestes. Since 1999, the Bachfest Leipzig, sponsored by the Neue Bachgesellschaft, has been an annual event.

23 Not every *Bachfest* in the German states was part of the Neue Bachgesellschaft; multiple towns and cities have or had their own *Bachfests*, *Bachtage*, *Bachwochen*, etc., usually underwritten by the city and the state.
War. First, fewer than half of these Leipzig Bachfests included a performance of one or both of the Passions, despite the pieces’ strong associations with Leipzig’s Thomaskirche and Nikolaikirche. The Mass in B Minor was performed as frequently as the Passions during the Cold War in Leipzig. These festivals also had an affinity for Bach’s *dramma per musica*, a group of secular cantatas, mostly on mythological themes, which were frequently programmed.

Second, the John Passion was performed far more frequently than the Matthew Passion at the Leipzig Bachfests. Insight as to why can be found in a press release for the 1950 festival, the founding Bachfest of the GDR, which notes the following:

> On the evening of the 200th anniversary of Johann Sebastian Bach’s death, his famous John Passion sounded in Leipzig’s Thomaskirche. This great work, in which—in contrast to the Matthew Passion—the chorus fills the most important role, was performed by the Thomaner Choir under the direction of Professor D. H.C. Günther Ramin.

The implications of this interpretation for a socialist regime are clear: the collective voice is the most important voice. Regardless of the question of the John Passion’s anti-Judaism (particularly in the *turba* portions), especially fraught after the war as an issue of modern anti-Semitism, the East Germans—whose historiography often designated them “victims” and not perpetrators of German crimes—found in the John Passion’s choruses an embodiment of the

---

24 All information on the Bachfests and their repertoire comes from the original program books, available at the Bach-Archiv Leipzig.


26 This first festival lists multiple partners: the 27th German Bachfest of the Neue Bachgesellschaft Leipzig; the Musicological Bach Conference; the Society for Music Research – Kiel; and the International Bach Prize Leipzig 1950.

Volk. Subsequent programming committees took the preference for John over Matthew to heart. Between 1950 and 1985, which saw a total of fifteen Bachfests in Leipzig, the John Passion was performed seven times, the Matthew Passion only twice; those Matthew performances were in 1975 and 1985, that is, nowhere near the early years of the regime. In contrast, the John Passion was performed at the first Bachfest in the new state in 1950, several times in the 1950s and 1960s, and again, along with Matthew in 1975 and 1985.

There was only one year in which the Matthew Passion was performed without the John Passion: 1989, when the festival took place in early September, at exactly the time that the Friedensgebete, the Monday evening prayers for peace at the Nikolaikirche, were resuming after a summer hiatus and over the objections of authorities. These meetings grew into the protests that ultimately helped topple the East German regime. Matthew, in other words, in which the chorus does not “fill the most important role,” was performed on its own only at the beginning of the East German regime’s very swift end; the Wall fell in early November that year. At the time of this performance of Matthew, the real Volk, supposedly represented by the John Passion’s choruses, was in fact filling its most important role: occupying the plaza in front of the Nikolaikirche. Paul Elie quotes an artist who was there: “There was no head of the revolution. The head was the Nikolaikirche and the body the center of the city. There was only one leadership: Monday, 5 p.m., St. Nicholas Church.” Rihm’s Passion is aligned with Bach’s John Passion in that it also uses the chorus as a representation of “the people,” although the large collective does not have the most important role. But Rihm’s conception of the Volk is far more

28 The Matthew Passion requires much greater performing forces; however, the Leipzig Bach Festivals were well-supported financially, and were a point of pride for, and a rare opportunity for international tourism in, the GDR. Accordingly, I find it unlikely that the preference for John was a simple matter of practicality.

sinister, as I will show, and thus perhaps more in keeping with Bach’s eighteenth-century representation than with the benignity this East German interpretation intends to demonstrate.

Wolfgang Rihm was born in Karlsruhe in 1952, benefitting from what former West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl (quoting the journalist Günter Gaus) would later call the “Gnade der späten Geburt,” the blessing of having been born late. Characterized variously as “neo-Romantic,” “neo-expressionist,” or as a proponent of the so-called “New Simplicity” (neue Einfachheit) Rihm takes “whatever he wants from music history, though it is generally a European past he looks to.” On Rihm’s own concept of “musical freedom,” which he first outlined in 1983, Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart says, “The points of reference for this compositional approach [“musikalische Freiheit”] are late Beethoven, Schumann, Debussy, Schoenberg (after 1910), Busoni and Varése,” an amalgam of European musical orientations that leans heavily toward the German. In addition to these earlier influences, Rihm also has an impeccable twentieth century German pedigree, including a year’s study with Stockhausen in Cologne, Klaus Huber in Freiburg, and at the Darmstadt Ferienkurse beginning in 1970. With the Passion 2000 commission, Rihm’s music, already “saturated with historical memory,” extended further into the past to incorporate Bach into this Austro-Germanic lineage.

With this kind of musical Erbe, it is fitting that Deus Passus addresses the process of Vergangenheitsbewältigung in its Adornian sense as a dangerous, even cynical attempt to resolve the past without the necessary critical acts of self-reflection. Deus Passus itself attempts this kind of reflexivity, a task it takes on partly by means of a dialogic relationship with Bach. Rihm

---


primarily addresses the politicized Bach of the twentieth century by pairing his German texts with his musical allusions to the great uniter of German culture. “Bach” therefore becomes part of the larger narrative of violence, fear, and betrayal, this association being woven into the musical textures of the Passion story itself. The piece does at least three distinct types of interpretive work: first, it takes a critical stance toward *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* and with it, musical Germanness, both through texts and references to the historical Bach; second, it attempts to use a deliberately “international” high-modernist style to create an alternate, non-political (or less politicized), unmarked musical space; and, third, it addresses allegorically, through the important role played by the chorus, some of the most severely repressive and violent aspects of the German twentieth century. Rihm himself wrote, “A Passion event today is no longer only fused with religion, it’s no longer a self-contained cultural text, but a process that reminds me, as a German composer who was born after the war, in a tremendous way of our own history, in which I stand.”\(^{33}\)

Turning now to the opening of *Deus Passus*, I analyze multiple formal factors that Rihm introduces in the first movement, and that become essential to the piece’s narrative and commentary. These include the construction of the voice of Christ (the “red text” passages)\(^{34}\); the use of the chorus; text selection and setting, including language and source; and, to a lesser extent, orchestral texture. Combining these elements, Rihm rejects the idea of a single, centralized authority, and with it the concept of a single source of salvation. He repeatedly draws the listener’s attention to the consequences of violence: not just the suffering of the victim, but the wider, communal reverberations of such suffering. Yet Rihm’s piece does not elevate the


\(^{34}\) In many contemporary editions of the Bible, words attributed directly to Jesus are published in red.
collective in rejecting the solitary voice; his small vocal ensembles in particular, in which he sets the voice of Christ, strive to demonstrate the possibility of a benign collectivity, despite the suspicion of the human capacity for violence that the piece also exhibits. Rihm’s addressing of the politicized Bach, especially Bach as German healer, and his references to particular Bach styles, function as additional layers of commentary within the piece’s themes.

Like Bach in the *John Passion*, Rihm introduces his narrative themes in the opening movement. The opening of Bach’s *John Passion* is a swirling, powerful, almost chaotic declaration from the full orchestra. The first vocal entrance matches that force, as the whole chorus enters contrapuntally on the text “Herr, unser Herrscher.” This acts as a frame for the drama to come: the chorus sings in first person collective (*unser Herrscher*) to the piece’s central figure, who is separated from the *moment* of the singing by being its subject, rather than making a first appearance “in the flesh,” as it were. Rihm also opens with a short orchestral introduction, but unlike Bach, introduces Christ in the first person at the first vocal entrance, with a text from the Last Supper: *Das ist mein Leib, der für euch gegeben wird...dass ist der Kelch, der neue Testament in meinem Blut, das für euch vergossen wird*. By opening in the middle of the action, Rihm is already eschewing the kind of narrative distance provided by Bach’s opening. Rihm demonstrates immediately that this is the story of the corporeal Christ, whose suffering is indicated from the first texted passage. Rihm’s Passion uses the familiar story to focus on human suffering, both spiritual and physical; but suffering is established first and foremost in the opening movement as a bodily experience.

The most powerful rhetorical aspect of the opening is not in the choice of character or text, but in how Rihm sets those aspects. Christ is not, as in Bach’s Passions or in much of Christian doctrine, the solitary Lord and Savior of the world; his words are not given to a single
voice. On the other hand, his texts are not given to the massed chorus, either; there is no implication that the voice of God, of moral and religious authority, is collective. Instead, Rihm devises a rhetorically sophisticated middle ground, in which the voice of Christ is in fact five voices, five soloists (or, perhaps, a chamber ensemble) who articulate the great majority of the “red letter” text, splitting phrases and sentences among them. Rihm does not use this small ensemble to enact a contrapuntal kinship with Bach—this multi-voice device is not built on the close counterpoint of Bach’s John opening, in which each voice part covers the same textual ground. Instead, Rihm offers just the most distant hint of fugue, when in the first two vocal utterances, the mezzo-soprano answers the alto’s first entrance at the fifth. (See example 1.1, p. 73-74.) Any impression of a contrapuntal beginning is immediately dispelled, however, when the two voices proceed to go their own ways, melodically and rhythmically, while adhering to the same line of text. This setting places what seems an unlikely emphasis on the word/syllable “das,” a simple article, which is sung alone by the alto, and alone by the mezzo-soprano, together occupying almost a measure and a half. And yet this odd emphasis results in an unexpected urgency, drawing attention to what is immediately before the listener—this (“das”), as the rest of the line brings the listener’s attention to the centrality of the physical Christ: this is my body.

The other three solo voices join one by one to complete the phrase, which ends with a descent, from soprano through baritone. The overlap of voices is often tenuous, with the leading voice on its last moment of sound when the next one joins; there is very little unison, with the exception of a perfect unison of alto and mezzo-soprano on the fragment “in meinem Blut.” Yet the division of these already short textual phrases into five parts, often mere fragments of a sentence, has narrative impact. It makes a claim that becomes foundational to the structure and meaning of the piece: that the voice of Christ can come from every (kind of) body, and
everybody—every one, that is, every solo voice—must, in turn, play the part of Christ. This theatrical conception seems based not on a gnostic (or New Age) belief that the divine spark is in everyone, but instead on the universality of human suffering. At the same time, suffering remains individual—that is, it must be borne individually—and consequently, the voice(s) of Christ never blend into a mass. Their textual individuality is supported here by their vocal autonomy, as they mark out the solo ranges they will use when they return as narrators throughout the piece.

By dividing both the narration—each of the soloists is the narrator more than once—and the voice of the sacrificial protagonist among five voices, Rihm precludes the possibility that one voice will become dominant, or that one version or portion of the story will become authoritative by virtue of the absence of other (potentially dissenting) voices. It is by means of these devices that Rihm begins his commentary on the past, and this rejection of centralized vocal authority is crucial to the piece’s meaning. Rihm creates a homology, embedded in the fabric of the piece, between that rejection of singular vocal authority, and a rejection of singular political authority.

Of particular relevance to musical choices about authoritative or narrative voice, the singular authority of National Socialism was at least partly embodied in Hitler himself, and especially in his vocal utterances: Josef Goebbels wrote of Hitler, “The magic of his voice reaches men’s secret feelings….It is also a classic proof for the outstanding rhetorical brilliance of the Führer that his word alone was enough to transform an entire period, to defeat an apparently strong state and to bring in a new era.”35 This association between the force of one man’s word and the devastating consequences of that force suggests adequate reason to reject the solitary musical voice in writing a German Passion for the year 2000. Rihm does not elevate the collective in response to that rejection, however; instead, his small vocal ensembles in particular

---

strive to demonstrate the possibility of a *benign* collectivity, despite the suspicion of the human capacity for violence that the piece also exhibits.

Rihm’s choices can be read within the ambit of postwar divided Germany and the musical politics on both sides of the German border, where politicized, state-specific interpretations of Bach clashed with the impulse to demonstrate Bach’s universality. In East Germany, musical content was largely interpreted through a political lens, and understood from there to universalize Bach; in West Germany, Bach’s universality was attributed to his musical and formal language. For representative examples of both perspectives in the East and West German republics, it is useful to turn to 1985, the 300th anniversary of Bach’s birth and the last major Bach Year before unification. Like 1950, the first Bach Year in divided Germany, the *Bachjahr* 1985 was a significant moment in the commemorative calendar of both states. Periodicals on both sides of the border promoted Bach festivals, Bach scholarship, and performances through articles and interviews, enlisting expert performers and scholars to offer their insights into Bach’s meaning for the contemporary world. A pair of articles, one from the GDR and one from the FRG, indexes the music-political divisions between the states, as well as some of their similarities. In December 1984, the West German newspaper *Die Welt* ran a Bach Year piece by conductor Helmuth Rilling, founder of the Bachakademie Stuttgart (and later, commissioner of the Passion 2000 pieces). In March 1985, the *Leipziger Volkszeitung*, an East German daily, published an interview with Prof. Dr. Werner Felix, director and founder of the

---

36 Over the course of 65 years, there were four major Bach celebrations under three different German regimes: 1935 (250th of his birth); 1950 (200th of his death); 1985 (200th of his birth); and 2000 (250th of his death).

37 There are at least two substantial accounts of the Bach Year 1950 that analyze its uses and meanings in newly divided Germany. Elizabeth Janik’s *Recomposing German Music: Politics and Musical Tradition in Cold War Berlin* devotes a chapter to it, as does Toby Thacker’s *Music After Hitler, 1945-1955*.
Nationalen Forschungs- und Gedenkstätten Johann Sebastian Bach der DDR. These two musicians and scholars were well positioned to articulate the range of ideas about Bach, his music, and its significance for the contemporary world that circulated in the two German states.

Rilling’s article asked rhetorically, “Why is Bach’s music of such great interest to us today? Why do people from such disparate nationalities, confessions, religions, even ideological spheres listen to and concern themselves with it?...Just about everyone who hears it is drawn in to its musical organization and its structural conception.” Thus it is Bach’s formal properties that give the music its universal and enduring interest. This universalizing gesture assumes a neutral listener (“just about everyone who hears it”) who, despite “disparate nationalities,” etc., is remade as a universal listener by the universally pertinent, comprehensible, and moving aspects of Bach’s formal genius. Rilling hints at an awareness of Bach performance and commemoration behind the Iron Curtain (other “ideological spheres”), and by his reckoning, it is Bach’s music as music that is the means by which all men, ideology aside, become brothers.

Rilling derives the universal appeal of Bach’s music as music from its formal properties in the following ways. First, he appeals to the music’s “quality of organization” (Ordnungsqualität), which he suggests affects all who encounter it: “[they] are drawn in to its musical organization and its structural thought.” Second, in a story familiar to any Western musicologist, Bach’s music draws from and synthesizes multiple musical sources: Protestant as well as Catholic liturgical music, sixteenth-century vocal polyphony, Vivaldi’s instrumental music, Italian madrigal and opera, and French dance music. This stylistic and temporal melting

---

38 Felix was a Party loyalist, an ambitious musician who founded the National Forschungs- und Gedenkstätten Johann-Sebastian-Bachs, an organization that took over the Bach-Archiv in 1979 with the mission of collaboratively producing the first Marxist Bach biography. That project did not come to fruition, but Felix produced his own biography, in three volumes, 1984, 1986, and 1989. Information on Felix from a conversation with Marion Söhnel, Musikwissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin (since 1979) at the Bach-Archiv Leipzig, 13 June 2014, Leipzig.

pot is essential to the “meaning” (Bedeutsamkeit) of Bach’s music, although Rilling doesn’t address the question of why any combination of these European styles would have meaning outside the West.\textsuperscript{40} Third, Rilling notes for the record Bach’s influence on (Western) music history and development, especially following his nineteenth-century revival. Finally, Rilling points to the basic theme (Grundthema) of Bach’s work, which he identifies as the “Christian message of faith, hope and love.” Despite the increasing secularity of the western world, Rilling asks whether by distancing “ourselves” from the intellectual history of the Christian West, we exclude a kind of “mature human consciousness” (gewachsenen menschlichen Bewußtsein) as well. Throughout the article, Rilling relies on a casual and repeated use of the words “us” and “ourselves,” pronouns that, left unspecified, beg the very argument he is attempting to answer.

In the introduction to the second article, the LVZ’s Bach Year interview with Werner Felix in March 1985, the interviewer asked rhetorically, “who, in fact, was this Bach, and why do we take it upon ourselves to honor him in such celebratory ways? Why is the care of the materials he left behind…such an inalienable possession of the socialist national culture?”\textsuperscript{41} Having aligned Bach with East German socialism, the interviewer posed an opening question and statement to Felix that was strikingly similar to Rilling’s:

What does Bach mean today, what makes him contemporary? It is truly remarkable that in the last decades there has been a Bach renaissance. His works are ever more frequently performed, and ever more people want to hear him – although we live under completely different conditions, although we have a completely different image of the world, there is scarcely any common ground…(es also kaum noch Gemeinsames gibt…).

\textsuperscript{40} Perhaps Rilling was assuming readers would be familiar with the long tradition of universalizing Bach by demonstrating the multinational elements of his music. See Potter, 204-209.

There is resonance between the “completely different image of the world” and Rilling’s disparate “ideological spheres,” as well as with the assumption that people from these various backgrounds are increasingly committed to Bach. Like Rilling, Felix makes a claim about Bach’s universality, but unlike Rilling, Felix’s claim is not based on formal aspects of the music, but on the relevance of the Passion story to the construction of political solidarity. In discussing the *Matthew Passion*, Felix said:

The crucified Christ represents an experience of suffering that we also have. What happens in the fascist concentration camps, in Chile, in Lebanon, in South Africa, in El Salvador or wherever else, is a “crucifixion” of the people. An innocent (*Unschuldiger*) who wants to do good and who, because of it, is sentenced to death against right and law—this is a process that has repeated itself a million times in the class struggle, and that remains highly relevant.\(^{42}\)

For both East and West German Bach scholars and performers, then, Bach was seen to have universal appeal and reach, but for very different reasons. Yet at the same time, Bach’s kinship with Germanness was maintained through institutions like the Bach-Archiv Leipzig, the Bach-Haus (in Eisenach, supported by the Neue Bachgesellschaft), Rilling’s own Bachakademie, and the many Bach festivals, weeks, and days around East and West Germany. Felix’s perspective on Bach came from decades of East German musicological writing, transmitted to lay readers through journalism, program books, and other non-academic sources, which constructed Bach as a champion of the oppressed. In East German historiography, Bach’s life was rewritten to fit a “progressive” and “humanist” narrative: he was only marginally Christian, and he deliberately composed his music to be accessible to all. While there was no comparably deliberate revision of Bach in West German scholarship, Rilling’s article is representative of contemporary Western scholarly priorities, which kept the emphasis on the elucidation of formal mastery as canonic validation. Rilling’s perspective was that of nineteenth-century

\(^{42}\) Hofman, 1985.
Musikwissenschaft, filtered through a postwar turn toward positivism and away from musical hermeneutics, after the grotesque cultural abuses of the Third Reich. This presents a sharp contrast with East German music scholarship, where as early as 1951, musicologist Ernst Hermann Meyer had decried formalism as “psychopathy,” far from the universal value it was assumed in the West to hold.\footnote{Ernst Hermann Meyer, “Wie entwickeln wir ein neues fortschrittliches Musikleben?” Speech for the founding conference of the Union of Composers and Musicologists. March 21, 1951. E.H. Meyer collection 215, AdK. “Der Formalismus mit all seinen Varianten von Weltflucht, Mystik, kaltem Rechnertum und Psychopathie hat in der Tat in den kapitalistischen Ländern die grosse Mehrzahl der Talente und geschulten Fachleute erfasst.”}

These two articles are reasonably representative of mainstream Bach interpretation in the two states; Rilling and Felix occupied important Bach-related positions and were therefore seen as experts on Bach’s contemporary relevance.\footnote{Rilling enjoyed a better international reputation than Felix. According to Söhnel (fn 33), beginning in 1989 there was a letter-writing campaign against Felix involving Bach scholars from around the world, accusing Felix of being a party hack and, more damningly, a poor scholar. I was not able to verify this first-hand, as the internal documents of the Bach-Archiv Leipzig remain unprocessed and inaccessible. According to Söhnel, this situation is unlikely to change until all the parties involved in Archiv leadership during division have died.} In these two quite different conceptions of the universal Bach, the composer and his works still play a benign, potentially healing role, one that brings people together and reveals their commonalities. This is paradoxically assumed to be a quality of Bach’s Germanness. The fact that Bach’s music escaped the Third Reich relatively unused and thus unscathed allowed his music to stand in for a larger untainted landscape of German music in the decades after the war.

This complex, politicized, double historiography complicates the question of a contemporary German composer’s kinship with Bach and Bach’s music. Despite Eisert’s easy assertion that any contemporary German composer would naturally be concerned with the “German language tradition” of Passion settings, that tradition had been complicated by its very Germanness in the context of German historical crimes, especially against the Jews. The overt anti-Semitism of the Passion story, even in Bach’s hands, could hardly be swept under the rug if
one was going to “work through” Germany’s more recent musical history. The Bach figure to which Rihm responds is less universal than either Rilling or Felix would have made him; while Bach is indeed associated with Germanness here, it is not in the benign and restorative way of these histories and interpretations. Instead, Rihm alludes to Bach partly as a means of resisting any effort to, as Adorno suggested, wipe the past from memory.

This resistance on Rihm’s part is especially notable in movement 7, “Eripe Me,” which is at the nexus of a complex set of texts and musical references. “Eripe Me” has particular musical weight in Deus Passus, first because its opening is largely identical with movement 3, the only instrumental movement, and second because those movements’ very recognizable opening musical gesture returns again in movement 25, “Und alles Volk, das dabei war;” the two bars that open all three of these movements become one of the few memory devices that Rihm gives the listener, and thus carry particular weight. Movement 25 is close to the end of the piece, and is the only moment in which the crowd, represented by the chorus, acknowledges responsibility for Christ’s suffering and its own rejection of his offerings. The trajectory from movement 3 to 7 to 25 is an important arc in the piece, and its music draws not only on Bach chorale writing, but on a certain kind of Bach performance, a mid-century symphonic interpretation of Bach, with large forces, slow tempi, and heavy homophonic textures. The core of this material is the two-bar orchestral phrase, built on C, consisting of a heavy downbeat followed by a three-chord dissonant descent that resolves rhythmically on the second beat of the next measure. This short gesture is one of the orchestra’s most important narrative functions, and I will return to “Eripe me” and its related movements below.

As with many of Rihm’s Latin-texted movements, “Eripe me” is partly a gloss on the movement that precedes it, and the texted portion of this narrative arc actually begins there.
Movement 6, “Siehe, da kam die Schar,” sets the portion of the Passion story of the narrative that deals with Judas’s betrayal and Jesus’s arrest. This is the chorus’s first entrance in the piece, which it makes in textual and musical support of the solo mezzo-soprano as she describes Judas’s betrayal. (See example 1.2, p. 75.) Where the mezzo-soprano’s melodic lines and rhythms are relatively smooth, as befits her narrator’s role, the chorus’s role is clearly to disturb. Marked pp, the chorus sings in articulated eighth notes that move either by half step or by small, often dissonant leaps. The text speaks of potential danger—“behold, the crowd came there”—and while the mezzo-soprano narrates, the chorus enacts the incipient violence of an approaching mob, muttering the same text in unison and at the octave, in perfect lockstep despite the detached, syncopated rhythms. This construction creates an aura of danger, and at least potential violence, which the chorus retains throughout the piece.

An exception to the chorus’s role as the agent of danger seems to come in the middle of this movement, when the chorus, which is usually played off against the voice of Christ, is suddenly given a red text line: “Do you betray the Son of Man with a kiss?” (See example 1.3, p. 76-77.) This brief passage is one of the piece’s most interesting rhetorical moments. The chorus simultaneously plays at narration, ventriloquizes Christ, and remains part of the action. The result of this combination is a kind of moral slipperiness, in which the group enacts danger in one moment, and accuses someone else of betrayal in the next. Moreover, the accusation is Christ’s (Luke 22:48); it is not the chorus’s to make. This is also one of the first clear references to Bach’s music. The texture of this line is largely homophonic and syllabic, evoking the choral interpolations of Bach’s Passions. The voices move by step or small interval, and while there are no suspensions in a tonal sense, the rhythmic construction gives the effect of suspension and resolution (e.g., 221-222). The harmonies enact a Bach-like tension between extreme dissonance
and fleeting moments of consonance (even unison), and the effect of the dynamics supports the accusatory nature of the text.

However, Rihm provides reason to doubt the chorus’s sincerity. The sudden appearance of sweet, quasi-tonal harmonies—for example, the progression from an F major to a C major chord on the word “Menschen”—seems completely out of place; in addition, the swelling and receding dynamics give the passage a feeling of overacting, the kind of gesture that a very young performer might try in the service of being “musical.” This passage begins with a struggle between dissonance and consonance, with the bass singing a perfect fourth on the word “Judas” while the tenor sings a tritone; in the orchestra, the celli play a major seventh divisi. The phrase gains in consonance as it proceeds, culminating with “Menschen Sohn,” but the effort at sweetness is not sustainable. Where the phrase seems to be heading for a recognizable cadence, arriving on the word “Kuss” it is disrupted by a sforzando in the baritone oboe whose F-sharp disrupts any pretense at resolution. Perhaps this dissonance is narratively predictable: the kiss as an act of betrayal calls for some musical illustration. Yet while the crowd is hardly in a position to accuse others of betrayals and misdeeds, it does so here, and it is the music’s consonance, combined with the dissonance, that suggests a dangerous collective in the process of deflecting attention from its own wrongdoing by taking on the voice of virtue, both textually and musically. The F-sharp therefore does double duty, narrating the crowd’s accusation while reminding listeners where the danger really lies.

This puts the figure of “Bach” into an interesting position. Rihm uses aspects of Bach’s style as filtered through twentieth-century reception and performance practice—quasi-tonal chord progressions; homophonic chorale textures; most dramatically, a certain heavy contrapuntal sound associated with mid-century performances of Bach—to demonstrate
insincerity and disingenuousness. This hardly alludes to the healing Bach of divided Germany, or the German Bach whose worth all Germans should strive to equal. “Bach” instead becomes a persona, one that the crowd can assume in order to take a posture of blamelessness and virtue. Significantly, it is not a style that Rihm gives to the actual voices of Christ; there is never a moment in the piece where the five-voiced Christ sings in this specific Bach-like style (although Rihm does appear to obliquely allude to the vocal sextet of “Et Carnatus Est” from the B-minor Mass in movement 22b, “Vater, ich befehle meinen Geist”).

This passage is therefore the first indication of Rihm’s rejection of the Bach figure as the balm of German pain or as a uniter of the German nation; and by extension, as the stand-in for Christ in his role as the absolver of guilt and culpability. Rihm also uses the chorale-like style to reiterate the physical dangers the crowd poses, not just its moral slipperiness. For example, in movement eleven the chorus-as-crowd’s dangerous nature is apparent again when Rihm gives it the interrogator’s role in a chorale-like texture on the words “Are you Christ? Tell us!” While the turba in Bach’s John Passion is famously violent, it is not presented as pretending otherwise. By contrast, Rihm repeatedly constructs the chorus as dissembling, and links its most morally dubious and outright violent actions with references to Bach’s music.

Of his decision to accept the commission, Rihm said that he chose the Luke gospel because it was the least tinged with anti-Semitism, and he felt that as a German composer, he had no other choice. From its inception, then, Rihm engaged German history with regard to his passion, and there was an explicit link for Rihm between that history and the ethical possibilities of the commission. Perceptions of anti-Semitism or anti-Judaism in Passion settings vary depending on the Gospel text. The perceived anti-Semitism of Bach’s John Passion has been

---

extensively discussed both in and outside of musicology, particularly the chorus “Kreuzige Ihn!” and the role of the chorus more broadly. This debate carried unique weight in the FRG, where scholars disagreed on whether the piece and its text were genuinely anti-Jewish, or whether they were increasingly perceived that way through the lens of German guilt. In the GDR, the question of anti-Semitism in the John Passion was less pertinent, partly because of the prevailing interpretation of the chorus as an embodiment of the Volk. This politically expedient interpretation was in keeping with the GDR’s refusal of responsibility for the crimes of National Socialism, its rejection of Israel’s requests for financial support, and the fact that East Germany did not take official responsibility for the Holocaust until 1990, just prior to unification. But while the role Rihm’s chorus plays allows no textual case to be made for claims of anti-Semitism, because the Luke Gospel does not, it is hardly benign. Rihm’s characterization of the chorus expresses a deep distrust of the Schar and speaks to a suspicion of the collective as always a potentially oppressive force.

This impression of the chorus’s role in movement 6 and beyond is enhanced by its role in “Eripe Me.” (See example 1.4, p. 78-79.) The opening of this movement is a statement of the orchestral gesture first heard in movement 3, although the tempo is different; movement three is marked “slow and heavy,” “Eripe Me” only “heavy,” and at least in Rilling’s recording, the difference is audible. The pitch content is almost identical, but the orchestration is altered, with woodwinds and strings switching places. The text is a Response from the Good Friday service,

---


drawn from the opening lines of Psalm 140: *Deliver me, Lord, from the evil man; from the violent man, deliver* (or rescue) *me.* This Psalm is an individual lament, interpreted since the sixteenth century as a prayer for preservation from “the hands of the ungodly” and “emphasizes the ways in which evil speakers lay traps to ensnare the unwary.”

The question of who the “ungodly” might be is part of Rihm’s message of moral ambiguity: one can be the perpetrator one moment and the victim the next, as many twentieth century Germans on both sides of the Wall knew all too well.

Rihm composes an individual lament at the beginning, with the baritone soloist singing the entire text. Although Rihm does not identify any of his movements as an aria, there are several in the piece, and this is one in function if not in name. The orchestration is thick, using every instrument but percussion, and the text setting is ponderous, with “eripe me” set syllabically with accents on each syllable, supported by equally emphatic articulation in the strings and trombones. “Domine” is an agonized neumatic descent, and the baritone reaches his highest pitch on the first syllable of “malo,” which slows the movement’s forward motion with longer note values and a *ritardando.* After a two-bar orchestral introduction, the baritone sings the rest of the phrase, again in a high tessitura and this time as an augmentation.

By the conventions of the piece established in the two previous Latin movements, the baritone should continue alone with “Libera me.” Instead, in the next measure, the chorus bursts in, appropriating the last two words, “Libera me,” in heavily accented chorale style, homophonic and syllabic. They conclude with one of the only major chords at a cadence in the entire work; the voices arrive at a fifth (B-flat and F), and the orchestra shifts beneath them to the same pitches in the last two beats. The chorus is also supported by a large orchestral force, including

---

49 Karen Britland, “Psalm 140 and Diana’s Crux in *All’s Well That Ends Well,*” *Notes & Queries,* 61/2 (June 2014): 243.
brass and organ; the latter is especially important in enhancing the impression of resolution at the cadence, moving a half-step to open the fourths in both upper and lower registers (B-E) to fifths (B-flat-F). (See example 1.5, p. 80)

The same chorus whose jagged “here comes the crowd” in the previous movement was alarming, turned around and attempted to take a moral high ground with Judas. Now, in this interpolation, they—the embodiment of at least potential danger—piously ask for deliverance from the evildoer, the violent man.

To cry for deliverance from the “evil man,” even as violence is perpetrated in one’s name: Rihm’s Passion setting questions the integrity of such an action. For a German born in the first generation after the war, such ethical contortions would be familiar and enraging. The idea of collective blamelessness may have seemed viable after the individual accountings of the post-war Nuremberg trials (1945-1946) and the trial and execution of Adolf Eichmann (1961); even the first Chancellor of West Germany, Konrad Adenauer, who as a former Nazi resister had significant moral authority, spoke out against denazification and insisted that “Nazi fellow travellers, “ i.e., those who had sympathized with or joined the party but perhaps not actively participated in genocide, be left alone.50

Such moral calculation, in which the perpetrator, or even the bystander, refashions him or herself as a victim, has resonance with various dimensions of Vergangenheitsbewältigung. Adenauer himself, in agreeing to make reparations to Israel, spoke of “frightful crimes of a previous epoch…in the name of the German people, unspeakable crimes were committed, which impose on us the duty of moral and material compensation.”51 Despite the accepting of national


responsibility in Adenauer’s government manifested in reparations, Adenauer only took responsibility for crimes committed not by Germans, but “in the name of” Germans.

Thirty years later, unification brought with it a renewed emphasis on dealing with the past, an emphasis made more urgent by the opening of East German state archives to Western scholars. The exposure of East German scholarship and historiography, along with the darker contents of state archives, including millions of individual Stasi (Secret Police) files, gave all Germans an opportunity to encounter East German narratives both about the GDR’s history and about National Socialism, a historiography that differed drastically from the West German version.

In the East German historiographical tradition, the socialist state founded in 1949—whatever its repressive tendencies—was justified as the only legitimate form of anti-fascism. Indeed, the anti-fascist stance was a foundational myth in East Germany, where in fact many German resisters of Nazism had chosen to live following the war. Alan Nothnagle argues, “according to this myth…German ‘antifascists,’ led by the Communists and aided by the Red Army, had liberated their homeland from Nazi rule….The antifascist myth established the Communists’ prestige as the liberators and rightful leaders of Germany….{It] also served to promote a *negative* identification with the Federal Republic by depicting the latter as a continuation of fascism by other means.”52 East German triumphalism, whose stated goal was the re-unification of Germany on anti-fascist terms, was summed up in a slogan of the SED (Sozialistische Einheits Partei, the dominant political party of the GDR): “Sieger der Geschichte,” the victors of history.

---

The depth of this self-conception permeated musical scholarship, as in Felix’s subtle disavowal of the “fascist concentration camps,” as though East Germany’s history was completely severed from the legacy of National Socialism. Musicologists were heavily involved in reinforcing the myth and creating supporting ones about German music. Scholars like Ernst Hermann Meyer and Walther Siegmund-Schultze helped construct the GDR’s musical culture by multiple means, including scholarship, mentorship of younger scholars, and involvement in the Verband deutscher Komponisten und Musikwissenschaftler (League of German Composers and Musicologists, VdKM) and with public music festivals and concerts. These two were especially influential in the early years of the state with regard to both the reception of canonic German composers, on the one hand, and the orientation toward future and contemporary music, on the other. Meyer was especially active in rewriting the biographies of German composers to suit socialist ends. Among West Germans and other Western scholars who evaluate the whole range of East German scholarship, “virtually all such analyses [are] now generally treated as primary sources rather than as academically significant approaches in their own right.”53 So much of the academic and public history produced under socialism was oriented toward state ends, and toward legitimizing East German claims to being the “real” German nation, that GDR historiography has largely been seen in the West as pure propaganda.

The musical aspects of this anti-fascist historiography include a dimension of twentieth century Bach reception that has received some close attention specialists in musical life behind the Iron Curtain, although it remains relatively little known outside those circles.54 Some


54 There are some notable exceptions: Toby Thacker’s Music After Hitler, 1945-1955 (Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007) and Elizabeth Janik’s Recomposing German Music: Politics and Musical Tradition in Cold War Berlin (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005) both devote a chapter to the 1950 Bach Fest in Leipzig. Anne Shreffler has examined on a larger scale some of the fundamental differences in scholarly approaches to music in divided Germany; see Anne C. Shreffler, “Berlin Walls: Dahlhaus, Knepler, and Ideologies of Music History,”
scholars have examined the propagandistic uses of canonic music in socialist Europe, including their echoes of National Socialist tactics. Elaine Kelley has looked at canon formation in the GDR as a means of using “the humanistic musical tradition”—a common phrase in East German musicological writing—as a “foundation stone for a collective socialist future….The revolutionary spirit of Germany’s pantheon of composers functioned as a template for GDR citizens, urging them to galvanize themselves into the action need to achieve a socialist utopia.”

Beyond that goal, East German musicologists were aligned with official efforts to legitimize the state by “claiming” existing German art and music for the GDR. I will draw from musicological documents, program books, and political speeches to show specifically how Bach discourse became part of the East German process of coming to terms with the past, built on a mythology of heroic resistance to Nazism and the triumph of the socialist future.

Felix’s 1985 description of Bach’s Passion, cited above, hits multiple keynotes of East German historiography, musical and otherwise: the alliance of Bach with “the people;” expressions of solidarity with the global oppressed; a reference to class struggle. For musicologists in East Germany, beginning almost at the founding of the state, Bach was a central figure in devising a new national identity in keeping with the establishment of the “first socialist state on German soil.” Felix may have been committed to socialist doctrine, but he inherited this perspective on Bach from, among others, Meyer, one of the musicologists who set the tone for Bach scholarship in the GDR. Born in 1905, Meyer became a respected authority on English

---

chamber music. A German Jew who became a communist, Meyer emigrated to England after Hitler took power in 1933. He was an active composer as well as a musicologist (he studied with Hornbostel and Sachs, both of whom lost their positions during the war), and while in London Meyer wrote propaganda songs and workers’ choruses, scored documentaries, and contributed occasionally to *Music & Life*, published by an organization called the Music Group of the Communist Party.\(^5^6\) Upon returning to Germany in 1948, Meyer settled in the Soviet Occupied Zone and became professor of music sociology at the Berlin University (soon to be Humboldt University in East Berlin). Meyer’s 1950 *Mansfelder Oratorium* was one of the earliest pieces of “realist” music written in the GDR. “Realism,” an offshoot of Soviet realism, was central to musical doctrine in the GDR, and its goals were applicable to both the production of new music and the interpretation of old. The *Mansfelder Oratorio*, with its accessible musical language evocative of Handel oratorios and its subject matter (the miners of the Mansfeld district), adhered to Meyer’s own ideas about realism, outlined below.

Meyer was a true realist believer, and instrumental in its definition as a compositional aesthetic during the very early years of the GDR, ca. 1950-1953; his influence was increasingly opposed by composers thereafter.\(^5^7\) According to Meyer’s 1952 book *Musik im Zeitgeschehen*, realist art “must rest on the essential realities of society,” which he defined as “those that move the working masses, the people”; the artist must find fulfillment in the “great realities” of “the fight against the war-mongers, the peaceful building of the great new future, the growth and becoming of a new, liberated, creative people.” Furthermore, realist art was bound to


“progressive movements” that supported world peace and progressive development. It must be made from a place of love for the people who fight for and build socialism, with sympathy for their sorrows and joys; it must help discover the truth; it must be heroic and move forward. But, above all, it must be national: “The artist is accountable to the people, certainly, but to his own people” (emphasis added). Drifting away from the line of the Marxist International, Meyer argued that the socialist artist must build upon his or her own national tradition.

In the same year Musik im Zeitgeschehen was published (1952), Meyer gave a lecture at the Karl-Marx-Hochschule für Musik under the title “The Progressive Meaning of the Classical Heritage in Music.” Moving from antiquity to the founding of socialist Germany, Meyer gave pride of place to national styles within socialist historiography:

Only in the national schools of the late 19th century is the core of something great and new to be found. Only there is music really carried by progressive, forward-looking socialist movements in the process of self-liberation of the people as independent nations from the pressure of feudalism and the new class rule of the bourgeoisie.

Nationalism now became a viable rhetorical tool for claiming East German legitimacy via guardianship of the German canon and Erbe. The nationalist tactic was readily applied to Bach, who along with Handel and Schütz, once lived and worked in regions of Germany encompassed by the new GDR. This linking of canonic music with East German nationalism was also a regular feature of journalistic reporting on Bachfests and other cultural events, where the specifically socialist significance of canonic composers was both assumed and rearticulated, and where the state’s support of artistic endeavors could also be argued for as a crucial part of the socialist vision. In the West a few years later, by contrast, Adorno would reflect that,


“Nationalism no longer quite believes in itself, and yet it is required politically as the most effective means of bringing people around to insisting on objectively outmoded relations.”\textsuperscript{60}

While nationalism was part of Adorno’s warning against an easy coming to terms with the past—and its nationalistic fervors—on its own, “outmoded,” terms, there was little cause to mitigate the top-down enthusiasm for claiming national legitimacy in the GDR via German musical heritage.

At least in terms of music historiography, however, the nationalist reading of Bach required some newfangled tricks. In the GDR, the combined demands of realism and nationalism meant moving away from central points of the traditional Bach Bild, especially his personal Pietist religiosity, revising Bach into a proto-secular humanist intellectual. Meyer’s stance on the social significance of new and old music was remarkably consistent, as was his disdain for “formalism,” i.e., any compositional technique that might result in music that was inaccessible to its audience. Arguing that formalism led to “withdrawal from the world, mysticism” etc., Meyer emphasized the link between composer and society:

\begin{quote}
It would be good if we could get used to seeing composers like Bach, Handel, Gluck, Mozart, Beethoven, etc., not as isolated phenomena, but as representatives of their time, as people, that is to say, representatives of the society who created for their society and for the people of their time.
\end{quote}

Meyer advocated the excision from the Bach biography of Romantic-era fantasies of his “otherworldly” spirituality, with their intimations of political quietism:

\begin{quote}
It is therefore enormously important to roll back the fairy tale that Johann Sebastian Bach was someone who sought escape from the world…who was not of this world, who created in the church sphere and thought only of the better world that he talked about so much in his motets and cantatas. That is incorrect. What is correct is that Johann Sebastian Bach’s output—it would be foolish to try to deny it—took place in the context of the church. In the context of the church, though, spiritual life was played out along with philosophical thought. The very progressive political theories of his time were disguised as religious or
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{60} Adorno, “What Does Coming To Terms With The Past Mean?”, 123.
ecclesiastical. Thus, there is no particular insight to be gained from the fact that Bach worked in the context of the church. He was an employee and an official of the church. But to infer from there the same escapist tendencies of today’s church would be a grave mistake.\footnote{Ernst Hermann Meyer, “Die fortschrittliche Bedeutung des klassischen Erbes in der Musik,” 4.4.1952, uncorrected manuscript, Archiv der AdK, E.H. Meyer 216.}

Meyer’s Bach, in other words, was a political progressive who happened to be an employee of the church, not a personally religious composer. From a post-New Musicology perspective in the West, historiographies like Meyer’s are a reminder that East German musicology, whatever its faults, insisted on engaging and analyzing music as a social phenomenon and practice, thereby (as Anne C. Shreffler has shown) anticipating trends in music-historical writing that did not emerge in the U.S. until decades later.\footnote{Anne C. Shreffler, “Berlin Walls: Dahlhaus, Knepler, and Ideologies of Music History,” \textit{Journal of Musicology}, V. 20, No. 4 (Fall 2003), 500.} By absolving themselves as a nation from the historical burdens carried by their West German counterparts, East German musicologists avoided the formalist turn of West German scholarship, rejecting its apolitical ambitions.

Of course, it was not only musicologists who held Bach up as a representative of the best of German culture, and East Germany as the true keeper of Bach’s legacy. At the first, 1950 \textit{Bachfest} in the GDR, the Democratic Republic’s first president, Wilhelm Pieck, gave a substantial speech on Bach’s meaning for the state, and took the opportunity to set his nation apart, culturally, from the Federal Republic to the West. He explicitly acknowledged that the celebration of Bach was a \textit{national} celebration, saying, “It is no coincidence that the celebration of the 200\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of Bach’s death in the GDR have the character of a national celebration.”\footnote{Wilhelm Pieck, “Rede des Präsidenten der Republik am 28.Juli 1950,” Sächsisches Staatsarchiv-Leipzig, Bestand 21772 Bachausschuß No. 2.} He appealed to national sentiment in the new republic by situating Bach’s life in
the chaotic aftermath of the Thirty Years’ War (1618-48), suggesting a historical parallel with an earlier moment of war and division: “Bach lived in a time of the worst national brokenness (
Zerissenheit) and the deepest cultural decay of our German people.” For the East German citizen of 1950, a reference to “the worst national brokenness” could hardly have been more timely, or more emotionally manipulative. The Allied occupation zones had just led to a permanent division of Germany into two states, and the threat of “cultural decay” in a fragmented Germany dominated by foreign military powers must have seemed very real. Pieck’s speech was a jeremiad against American culture and its influence on and in West Germany, full of talk about the “other” Germany’s cultural decline and by extension, staking an early claim that the East was the genuine guardian of German culture. Pieck used Bach as a means of drawing a line from one of the lowest points in German history to the newly founded GDR, staking a claim on the struggle for that history—and for German legitimacy. Later political leaders who addressed Bachfesten would on occasion quote this speech of Pieck’s, using it to redraw the historical analogy and extend it to the politics of the present moment.

Despite the best efforts of the VdKM, however, realism did not impress the musical intellectuals of the West, who saw its stylistic affiliations as regressive, even dangerous. Under the spell of Adorno, whose Philosophy of New Music was published the same year as the division of the two Germanies, young composers agreed that contemporary music, as Leon Botstein would later summarize it, “has taken upon itself all the darkness and guilt of the world. All its happiness comes in the perception of misery; all its beauty comes in the rejection of beauty’s illusion.” There was a moral urgency to the recovery of formalism, especially Schoenbergian serialism, along with other styles and aesthetics that had been banned under National Socialism. Serialism in particular, however alienating it may have been to audiences,
“gained a rhetorical momentum entirely out of proportion with its currency or success.”64 With this aesthetic ascendant, there was little room for musically conservative, or regressive, voices—as long as “regressive” was defined in such a way as to avoid scrutinizing the regressive (or at least retrospective) practice of taking up serial techniques from the pre-war period.

This kind of self-justifying historicizing, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, is precisely what Rihm seems to reject in Deus Passus. Whether or not the histories (musical or otherwise) are “true,” their subtext is the ideological thinking that had already led Germans down terrible paths. If Bach’s rebranding as Saxon revolutionary was intended to inflate an East German sense of national legitimacy, and if in West Germany the formalist Bach offered a soothing sense of “continuity” with the most heroic, pre-Nazi moments of the Weimar avant-garde, Rihm wants nothing to do with either. His combination of the postwar formalism with Latin texts separates him from both species of musical Germanness and the ideological weight they carried, even into the 21st century. Rihm’s Latin movements are not serial, and yet their style, one critic wrote, is “coolly abstract.”65 As critics have consistently noted, Rihm’s general aesthetic is “an inclusive one capable of embracing whatever style or sound fits his needs,” and so his severe abstraction in these Latin-texted movements must therefore be understood as deliberate, part of an effort to create a neutral, unmarked musical ground by employing a kind of “generic,” non-German atonality.66

While Rihm’s version of twentieth century musical “abstraction” is hardly unmarked in its own right, evoking Webern, Adorno, Boulez, even Babbitt to an imaginary listener, it does


65 Swed, “Honoring Bach With New Passions.”

not engage in direct quotation; it does not trade in emotional affect or in musical reference, beyond the reference to musical abstraction itself. That Rihm pairs this style predominantly with the Latin texts—with the notable exception of “Eripe me,” whose anguished tone is unmistakable—suggests that whereas the gospel portions of the piece contend with suffering and violence, which Rihm associates with the German language, the Latin sections represent a transnational attempt at real universalism, not the compromised universality of Bach the Uniter.

This tone and style are established in the second movement, “Potum meum,” whose text is taken from the Communion service on Wednesday of Holy Week. The opening of “Potum meum” is pointillist, a widely voiced and agitated set of lines that cover much of the orchestra’s collective range. (See example 1.6, p. 81.) Combined as it is with syncopations and other fragmented rhythms, this short opening could have been written by any number of postwar Western European composers: the Boulez of *Pli selon pli*, Hans Werner Henze, or Luigi Nono, or, from across the Atlantic, the Milton Babbitt of the string quartets or even *Philomel*. In this way, the music suggests a striving to be stylistically unmarked, or at least stylistically untraceable. There is not much of Rihm the German “neo-Expressionist” or the “neo-Romantic” in these settings. “Potum meum” is a gloss on the communion at the Last Supper; it is the first entrance of the mezzo-soprano soloist who, with the soprano, dominates the Latin movements.⁶⁷

While Rihm famously draws on multiple aesthetics in the ongoing development of his own, he does not make any avant-garde statements here, aside from references to earlier incarnations. The commissioners themselves played it safe by selecting Rihm, rather than (for example) a more dialectical, acerbically “anti” composer like Helmut Lachenmann, whose goals would likely have been quite different. Given the historical discourse in which I find Rihm engaged here, is his aim to liberate Bach? To liberate himself from Bach? If the latter, some of

---

⁶⁷ Of the nine Latin movements, five are for solo female voice, and one is for mezzo-soprano and alto.
the critics at the premiere would say that he failed; more than one review expresses
disappointment on the following grounds:

But then the disappointment. Despite Rilling’s commitment—he conducted the
piece by heart—this approximately 90-minute piece by Rihm does not come out
of Bach’s shadow.68

On the other hand, this reception of the Rihm may indicate that he succeeded in a
different project; that what is perceived as a failure to emerge from Bach’s “shadow” is instead a
successful refusal to use Bach in a way that critics might have expected, as the Ur-composer of a
majestic music history, or the beneficent healer of history.

Bach has become part of popular or mainstream culture, and these public uses of Bach
tend toward this “healer” model. The association of the Nikolaikirche in Leipzig with Bach, and
later with the Friedensgebete, enhanced this connection in the public’s awareness of die Wende.
On November 9, 1989, the GDR government made an enormous concession to the protesters by
lifting travel restrictions on East German citizens. By that evening, the Berlin Wall was
breached, and within a day the cellist Mstislav Rostropovich flew to Berlin, where he set up at
Checkpoint Charlie, the nexus of the divided city, and played Bach Cello Suites into the night.69
Rostropovich, whose personal and musical oppression under Soviet communism was well
known, chose Bach as a means to mark and celebrate the occasion. Paul Elie describes the scene:

Fresh graffiti claimed the place as free territory: WILLKOMMEN IN OST-
BERLIN, with the OST crossed out. There Rostropovich, just past sixty, with a
shock of white hair, in a sweater vest and a blue blazer, played Bach’s music for
solo cello for the German people and for West German and French camera
crews…it is, no question, a historic performance. November 11, 1989: Bach
marks the spot.70

Bach—performed here for “the German people”—was again enlisted both as a symbol of Germanness, and as a universal marker of what was assumed in the West to be universal rejoicing at the fall of the Wall.71

I return now to movement 25 in Deus Passus, a complex movement that brings the arc that began with movement three to a conclusion. Like “Eripe me,” this movement’s original focus is on the baritone soloist, and like “Eripe me,” it is an aria, at least at first. The style is ambiguous with regard to the rest of the piece: the opening chord is a widely voiced dissonant cluster, to which the strings counterpoint an agitated sul ponticello—but the texture quickly becomes calmer and more homophonic, almost chorale-like as the baritone’s entrance gets closer. Just prior to that entrance, the music begins a process of reaching and receding from consonance that persists throughout the baritone’s solo passages.

Textually and linguistically, this movement is unusual, in that it contains the only German language text interpolation in the piece aside from the Paul Celan poem, “Tenebrae,” with which the work concludes. It combines a Gospel text from Luke 23, sung by the baritone soloist, with another text from Isaiah 53, sung by the chorus. This combination makes the movement especially weighted with regard to the narration, by means of language, of German moral failure. The use of the text from Isaiah takes the movement outside the Gospel story of suffering and redemption; its import strays outside the Gospel story of suffering and redemption, back to the darker Old Testament prophecy of Isaiah.

Primarily concerned with the salvation of the Lord, the book of Isaiah is about judgment: the first half of the book especially passes harsh judgment on the nations of Israel and Judah.

71 Elie, 154.
Rihm’s text, familiar from Handel’s *Messiah* setting, comes from the second half, which predicts the coming of the Christian Messiah, and which addresses the promise of eventual salvation:

4 Surely he has borne our grief, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

5 But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.

(Isaiah 53:4-5)

Is this acknowledgement, finally, an accepting of responsibility on the part of the crowd? Or is it a premature claim to having resolved or come to terms with a bloody past? The music remains ambiguous, but it offers some insight via the conventions it has established. The choir’s entrance is introduced by one of the most agitated moments in the piece, a measure-and-a-half of sixteenth-note triplets in the strings. When the chorus enters immediately afterwards, once again marked ”schwer,” it is to the C-based gesture of movements three and seven, the heavy, accented descending line with emphatic trombones (Refer again to example 1.4, mm. 1-2, p. 78). Depending partly on its tempo marking, this gesture can also be used as another reference to Bach’s choral writing, using the usual markers of homophonic vocal texture, syllabic settings, and largely stepwise motion in the voices. The forces here are among the largest of the entire piece, with the organ making one of its rare appearances (it also accompanies the chorus in “Eripe me”), and heavy percussion. The words are an admission of guilt: he bore our pain, and we did not esteem him. Likewise, the words stake a claim on salvation: by his wounds we are healed. And yet Rihm does not set this as a triumph, nor does he orchestrate it with even a fleeting hint of the ambiguous tonality he has deployed before.

If the chorus considers itself “healed,” the orchestra does not necessarily agree. After the first statement of “sind wir geheilt,” (we are healed) the orchestra again plays the descending
gesture, this time with truncated values in the strings, giving it an especially aggressive edge. The chorus is silent for several measures while the orchestra develops this material, and it is completely unexpected when the chorus bursts back in reiterating its claim: “sind wir geheilt.” *(See example 1.7, p. 82-83.)* The chorus immediately repeats the text, this time slowed down for emphasis by a rhythmic augmentation. The orchestra takes on a tactic used by the chorus throughout the piece, that of false, musical affirmation. The music does not overtly deny the chorus’s claims to being “healed,” for example with dissonance, but instead reverts to the heavy-handed, outdated Bach performance style as a rhetorical device in accompanying this text.

Rihm also gives the orchestra the last word; after the chorus makes its final statement, the winds, trombones and strings respond immediately, this time with a wickedly dissonant chord, and the remaining measures, all marked **fff**, again seem to act as a false underscoring (rather than an overt undermining) of the chorus’s claim. The movement closes with a thunderous bass drum playing heavily accented sixteenth notes, two beats of complete silence, and a final bass drum attack. This percussive ending, combined with the ironic rejoicing of the previous section, brings to mind the ending of Shostakovich’s Fifth Symphony and questions about its meaning. Rihm’s use of augmentation to slow the tempo evokes the sudden halving of the tempo in the Shostakovich’s coda. The triumphant sound of this coda, with its long, high brass tones—very difficult to play—and pounding timpani, is altered in the final measures, where the addition of a brutal, hammering bass drum calls the sincerity of the triumphalism into question. Likewise, Rihm’s increasing drawn-out rhythmic values, exaggeratedly underscored, give the impression of

---

72 While Rihm’s stylistic references to Cold War-era Bach performances involve a slowing of tempi and a heaviness of articulation and orchestration, the Cold War recordings of Shostakovich 5 are notable for their up-tempo codas. Bernstein’s 1959 recording with the New York Philharmonic remains at the quarter note= 184 marking of the previous section, apparently with Shostakovich’s blessing.
moral triumph, and he seems to echo Shostakovich in calling that impression into question by means of thunderous percussion in the final moment.

The association between this “heavy” style and Bach is carefully established throughout Deus Passus, and is enhanced by recordings of Bach’s Passions and cantatas informed by a mid-century performance practice of using large forces and a symphonic style. (Ironically enough, Helmuth Rilling decried this performance practice in his 1984 article on positivist grounds, arguing that the “sinfonisch” approach disregarded contemporary Bach research.) Rihm’s outdated, overly Romantic Bach style is linked sonorously to a questionable relationship with the past—one mediated, perhaps, as it was in both East and West, by the ideological negation of “romantic” fantasies about Bach himself as spiritual Redeemer.

On the other hand, Rihm’s structures are multivalent. Perhaps, for once, the chorus is not morally questionable; perhaps they really are redeemed by the sacrifice of Christ. Or perhaps the ambiguity of the transitions between choral and orchestral writing is the answer to the question of redemption. Are they redeemed? Are we? Is the past resolvable by any kind of sacrifice? The chorus may believe what it is singing; it may be right or wrong. But to indulge in guilt after the fact is a luxury of the living, conducive to forgetting: or rather, feeling guilty can justify forgetting and stand in for the actual working through of criminal behavior by the conscious mind sitting in judgment. Adorno was compassionate toward those who wished to forget, because of the “powerlessness” to redeem the past, but warned: "The murdered are to be cheated even out of the one thing that our powerlessness can grant them: remembrance."73 To lament one’s crimes—or crime’s committed “in one’s name”—but not to have prevented or resisted them is a questionable stance, at best. It is this stance that Rihm assigns the crowd.

---

73 Adorno, 117.
Rihm’s *Deus Passus* thus rejects the idea of a single, centralized authority, and with it the concept of a single source of salvation. He repeatedly draws the listener’s attention to the consequences of violence: not just the suffering of the victim, but the wider, communal reverberations of such suffering. This piece engages the musical politics and histories of both German states, and it offers neither side, nor the united German nation, any kind of absolution. Rihm’s addressing of the politicized Bach, especially images of Bach as German healer, and his references to particular Bach performance styles, function as additional layers of commentary within the piece’s themes.

For Rihm, as the “German” (and German) composer of Passion 2000, his personal career history was also pertinent. For the Bachakademie Stuttgart, the choice of a single composer to represent Germany represented a profound change from the commission premiered the previous year. The 1995 *Requiem of Reconciliation*, commissioned to mark the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II, was written by fourteen composers “from countries in which World War II finally ended with the collapse of Hitler’s violent domination.”\(^7^4\) The process of selecting composers for this project, like the one that gave rise later to Passion 2000, revolved around geographic representation as much as musical compatibility or reputation: “Arne Nordheim writes for all of Scandinavia…. We wondered whether Schnittke, Penderecki, Kurtag, and Kopelent would be enough to cover Eastern Europe…. Could we ‘afford’ to have two composers from Germany; one for the ex-East Germany and the old West Germany?”\(^7^5\) In the end, Paul-Heinz Dittrich from the former East was selected for the *Dies Irae*, while Rihm was chosen to represent West Germany with a first *Communio* movement; in keeping with the theme of reconciliation, performers included the Cracow Chamber Choir and the Israel Philharmonic.


\(^7^5\) *Requiem der Versöhnung*, program book, 94.
By the time the Passion 2000 commission was being organized, in 1996, there was no longer a question of representing both former German states; there would be a single German composer, Wolfgang Rihm. Rihm, then, from one year to the next, went from representing the country in which he grew up—West Germany—to representing a reunified nation still struggling on both sides of the former divide, whose meaning and national place in the world was far from established. Furthermore, questions of memory, of commemoration, of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*, not only remained unresolved, but were renewed in the decade leading up to this premiere. Not only was there a fresh, painful historiography of National Socialism to contend with on both sides of the border, but an entire chapter of history had just become “the past” with the collapse of the GDR. How to come to terms with that, while still, and newly, contending with the prior past, made for a complex historical discourse. In its musical arguments and in its orientation to the past, Rihm’s *Deus Passus* participates in that historical complexity, and suggests that any ideas of a millennial redemption at the time of the piece’s premiere were, at best, premature. *Deus Passus* engages multiple historical claims, but ultimately refuses absolution; it addresses, but refuses to come to terms with, the recent German past.
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Ex. 2: Siehe, da kam die Schar
Ex. 3: Judas, Verrätst du des Menschen Sohn
Ex. 3, con't.
Ex. 4: Eripe Me
Ex. 4, con’t.
Ex. 5, “Libera me”
Ex. 6. “Potum Meum”
Ex. 7, “Sind wir geheilt”
Chapter 2: New Music’s Multicultural Turn

“Ah! Pluralism! There’s nothing like it for curing incomprehension… Everything is good, nothing is bad; there aren’t any values, but everyone is happy.” —Pierre Boulez, 1985

When Osvaldo Golijov’s eclectic, pan-Latin Passion, La Pasión según San Marcos (Pasión) premiered in Stuttgart in 2000, German critics heard the work through a scrim of exoticism, twittering about its “dark-skinned Jesus” and “slave dances” (capoeira) under wide-eyed headlines like “Bongo Bach” and “Buena Vista Bach.” After noting the work’s unusual materials and representation of Christ, most of the German critics did not really parse Pasión as a piece or as a Passion, focusing instead on Golijov’s biography as a Latin American descendant of Russian Jews, his use of non-Western (non-orchestral) instruments, and the audience’s enthusiastic response.

Pasión was thus received as something of a curiosity in Germany (and Golijov an interesting new voice), and its reviews were largely descriptive. In contrast, the work sparked a far more extravagant response in the U.S. during its premiere performances in 2001 and 2002. U.S. critics found Pasión nothing short of transformative, a new path offering redemption for “classical music” as a whole, and especially from the perception that new music was destined to alienate its audience. Alex Ross wrote in the New Yorker, “Pasión…has a revolutionary air, as if musical history were starting over, with new sensuous materials and in a new, affirmative tone.” Other critics wrote about a “wondrous new vitality for classical music,” claiming that Pasión would be remembered as “the work which did the most to lead classical music out of its ivory
tower.” A decade later, critic Mark Swed still remembered the excitement of his first hearing of *Pasión*: “My first impression…was that modern musical history had just been made.”

In their grandiosity and optimism, these were highly unusual responses to a new piece of classical music¹; indeed, it is difficult to find another piece by a living composer that has been so widely championed on similarly music-historical, rather than stylistic or aesthetic, grounds.² In this chapter, I speculate on some of the historical and discursive factors that contributed to Golijov’s critical success in the U.S., where he had previously enjoyed a warm but not exuberant critical reception. One of the crucial elements behind *Pasión*’s reception was a process of diversification in new classical music (new music) and its institutions in the decade preceding Passion 2000, which helped lay the groundwork for *Pasión*. In the U.S., what I am calling the “post-Cold War period” can be argued to extend, roughly, from the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 to the events of 9/11 and the beginning of the so-called Global War on Terror, thus corresponding primarily with the prosperous years of the Bill Clinton presidency, the rapid exportation of market ideals to former Eastern bloc countries, and above all, a powerful sense of historical triumph.³ I will spend much of this chapter examining this diversification, which I call

---

¹ This is clearly a problematic term; concert culture overall suffers from a problem with nomenclature in the English-speaking countries in a way that it does not in (for example) Germany, where “zeitgenössische Musik” (contemporary music) and “Neue Musik” (roughly, avant-garde music) have distinct meanings. For the purposes of this chapter, I will use “new music” to refer to music that comes from the art music tradition—that is, music written by an individual who identifies as a professional composer, intended to be performed by a second individual (or group)—and having been written, very roughly, in the last thirty years. This neither solves nor even addresses the problem, but it acknowledges a divide between canonic classical music and more recent work.

² The closest example might be Richard Taruskin’s championing of Steve Reich’s *Different Trains*, which he also described in music-historical terms. What Taruskin is describing is continuity, not only stylistic but moral, as he saw Reich’s piece as “one of the few adequate artistic responses in any medium…to the Holocaust.” By contrast, part of what critics responded to in *Pasión* was a sense of historical rupture, and the possibility of a genuinely new direction. Richard Taruskin, “A Sturdy Musical Bridge to the Twenty-First Century,” *New York Times*, 24 August 1997, [http://www.nytimes.com/1997/08/24/arts/a-sturdy-musical-bridge-to-the-21st-century.html?pagewanted=all](http://www.nytimes.com/1997/08/24/arts/a-sturdy-musical-bridge-to-the-21st-century.html?pagewanted=all).

the “multicultural turn,” in the context of Cold War-era musical values and their transmission through music historiography and music journalism. I am especially interested in how the multicultural turn intersected with received notions about musical progress. I draw on marketing materials, reviews, composer statements, and websites as primary sources, as well as scores, analysis, and historiographical work. I then look at Pasión itself as both a late exemplar of the multicultural turn and something of a departure from it. Near the end of the chapter, I look at the limits of the multicultural turn as multiculturalism, arguing that it eschewed the political obligations and expectations of multicultural activism in favor of a kind of surface, even token, diversification.

This multicultural turn in new music was partly a response to a set of circumstances including the end of the Cold War, the opening of old borders, and a widespread discourse of multiculturalism in the U.S. and elsewhere. Music-historical factors included the suspension of the kinds of narratives that had helped govern music composition and reception during the Cold War, and the subsequent search for an identifiable new direction. The U.S. reception of Pasión suggested that critics thought they had identified such a direction, but in their insistence on the radical newness of Pasión, critics seemed to overlook a decade’s worth of music by Golijov and some of his contemporaries, who included a group of composers from China and a number of composers from the former Eastern bloc, many of whom had had earlier success in the West, but who found in the post-Cold War period an especially attentive audience. These composers had been doing work for years that might have prepared listeners for the kinds of musical and rhetorical techniques they encountered in Pasión. Nonetheless, there are aspects of Pasión that inverted the expectations created by that previous work, and thus the critics were partly right to hear in the piece something unusual.
Musical Multiculturalism and the Incorporation Aesthetic

The post-Cold War period was a time when “a rapidly globalizing capitalism accelerates transcultural contacts, fracturing interpretive schemata, pluralizing value horizons, and politicizing identities and differences.” These pluralizing value horizons gave new urgency to existing discourses around multiculturalism, which, while they varied from place to place, stemmed especially from the discourses of decolonization in Europe, indigenous movements in Canada, and immigration and civil rights movements in the US.

Ideas about addressing pluralism through “tolerance” and assimilation, which had often dominated immigration policy in the West, were found wanting by later proponents of multiculturalism, who sought more explicit social recognition as well as full access to public, political life. While the term multiculturalism is used freely across discursive networks, scholars have attempted to delimit and define trends within it. Will Kymlicka has argued that there are three primary reasons that “non-dominant groups have become more vocal and assertive” in claiming rights, each of which has applications within new music culture. First is a matter of demographics; that is, states can no longer make policy based on the assumption that non-dominant groups will remain demographically marginal, or assimilate through marriage. Second is “rights-consciousness,” a post-1948 “international order that is premised on the idea of the inherent equality of human beings, both as individuals and as people…[which] has decisively repudiated older ideas of a racial or ethnic hierarchy….” Finally, Kymlicka points to democracy itself, arguing that in democracies, “there is no option but to allow ethnic groups to mobilise politically and advance their claims in public. As a result, [they] are increasingly unafraid to

---

The combination of post-war human rights consciousness, and a post-Cold War sense of democracy spreading, could create fertile ground for the spread of multicultural ideals into extra-political sectors, including new music.

New music production and reception were affected by these “pluralizing value horizons,” which arguably contributed to the success non-Western composers had on the U.S. concert stage. The multicultural turn in new music was similar to other manifestations of late twentieth century multiculturalism, in that it emphasized a West-centered inclusivity, and cultural representations of identity. However, it supported almost entirely immigrant composers, and was inflected with the values of what many scholars have called “liberal multiculturalism,” a largely white- and West-centered discourse which values diversity on putatively universalist grounds; that is, because the liberal values of equality, autonomy, tolerance, etc., are thought to be a universal good. On these terms, despite classical music’s historic whiteness, multiculturalism found an alliance with its similarly universalist ideals: both political liberalism, channeled through multiculturalism, and classical music were posited as possessing universal value.

Many of the composers who benefitted from the multicultural turn took an approach that became one of the most marked trends in 1990s new music in the U.S.; I am calling it the incorporation aesthetic, following a critical term often used to describe the compositional process of so-called postmodern composers. The incorporation aesthetic was (and remains) an expansionist tactic, fostered by a discourse not of technical progress, but of inclusivity, and supported by the desire of composers from around the world to make both reputations and a professional living within a consciously global new music culture. The incorporation aesthetic

---

operates by a three-part logic of diversity: *first*, a profession of ethnic, racial, national, or linguistic identity; *second*, a declaration that a work “incorporates” musical materials from the composer’s culture of origin into what is otherwise “Western” music, that is, into music primarily (although not exclusively) using Western instruments and structures. This declaration can come in multiple forms, including the composer’s official biography, publicity materials prepared by managers and disseminated to press, liner notes, interviews, reviews, and the like. *Third*, the incorporation aesthetic operates on a principle of inclusivity as *self*-representation; that is, the composer is understood to be representing his or her own culture or origin, not borrowing from others. In this way, crucially, incorporation largely avoids charges of appropriation, and differs from the colonialist exoticism of composers like Debussy, in the early twentieth century, or post-war “experimentation” with non-Western aesthetic philosophies on the part of John Cage, Lou Harrison, and the later Downtown minimalists. A fourth element of the incorporation aesthetic as it operated in the 1990s (and often continues to do) was a narrative of personal overcoming, particularly if it touched on political oppression. The incorporation aesthetic was therefore predicated on dual musical identity: one identity associated with the culture of origin or identification, and another associated with the culture of classical music—presumably unmarked. Both the Chinese composer Tan Dun and Golijov had early successes with pieces that embedded this duality directly into their instrumentation. Tan’s 1994 *Ghost Opera* and Golijov’s 1994 *The Dreams and Prayers of Isaac the Blind* combined one of classical music’s prestige genres—the string quartet—with non-Western instruments: in Tan’s case, the pipa, and for Golijov the klezmer clarinet.

---

6 “Western” and “non-Western” have been used very loosely in musical reception, with “non-Western” often standing in for any music that does not come from either the “classical tradition,” including new and experimental music of the 20th century, or Western popular music, especially rock. I follow this loose usage here.
Composers fared especially well if they could develop a musical language that would indicate—to Western listeners, crucially—the composer’s origin in, or personal identification with, a non-Western culture. All of this, of course, took place within, and sometimes in tension with, the frame of the Western concert stage and concert hall, which create “classical music” expectations in their mode of presentation: an autonomous musical “work”; a composer/performer divide; virtuosic levels of performance, etc. These expectations were not challenged by the multicultural turn; they were upheld by it. The music that resulted contributed to a growing stylistic and aesthetic pluralism, which carried with it a sense that new music was being renewed, restored from its alleged “difficulty,” and its audience alienation, which had long been blamed for a perceived decline in “classical music” culture overall.

The hope for art music’s renewal reached a zenith in the U.S. reception of *Pasión*. When it premiered in the U.S. critics responded with overwhelming enthusiasm. But more significantly, they couched that enthusiasm in music-historical terms, seeing in *Pasión* the future of classical music itself. Such grandiose historical claims in the immediate reception of new music were unusual in a postmodern episteme, but they were in keeping with the tenor of the post-Cold War period, in which many people had already raised the question, what does the future hold? This uncertainty offered opportunities for historians and pundits to make sweeping claims about the direction of the post-Cold War world.

The logics of the incorporation aesthetic combined to help form compositional identities, which were often taken up in public accounts of a composer’s work. In a 1990 *New York Times* article, for example, critic Raphael Mostel identified the emerging incorporation aesthetic as a compositional trend, writing of new music from Japan and from the Eastern bloc, “There is a resurgence of traditional ideals of sound and form, an appeal to ancient mystical imagery, and a
revival of interest in the use of traditional instruments. (In eastern Europe an analogous movement is occurring among composers—such as Arvo Part and Henryk Gorecki—who are adopting elements of ancient music to create the new Medievalism.)”

Also in 1990, the critic John Rockwell wrote of the new music emerging from Eastern European and Russian composers, “This Eastern European music is nationalist in that it breathes a Slavic modality, especially the incense-laden chant tradition of the Orthodox Church…and, of course, the music under consideration here determinedly opposed Communist political and esthetic orthodoxies…The persistence and ubiquity of this music suggest that repression can encourage the very thing censors hope to discourage.”

The references to “ancient music,” “Medievalism,” “mystical imagery,” “incense-laden” are fundamentally exoticizing terms, suggesting that certain elements of this music were outside of historical time altogether. This exoticizing existed side by side with the tacit demand that composers retain their legibility as composers, by way of formal musical training, the musical lineages they developed, their recognition by funding institutions, and other markers of both legitimacy and prestige. Accordingly, the incorporation aesthetic relied dually on identity or identification, and on what Pierre Bourdieu calls “institutionalized cultural capital,” that is, “a certificate of cultural competence which confers on its holder a conventional, constant, legally guaranteed value with respect to culture,” usually gained by academic qualification.

---


9 Pierre Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital,” in Social Theory Rewired: New Connections to Classical and Contemporary Perspectives, Wesley Longhofer and Daniel Winchester, eds. (New York and London: Routledge, 2012), 173. Bourdieu’s theoretical ideas are historically linked to an entire system of analysis; however, the idea of the “forms of capital” has gone beyond Bourdieu’s system and become widely used in cultural studies. I am using a free-floating version of it here.
Among the most notable musicians working in (and developing) the incorporation aesthetic was a group of successful Chinese composers who immigrated to the United States in the late 1980s and early 1990s. These were composer who had been excluded from formal musical training during the Cultural Revolution—for many of them, this was central to their official biography—and who had enrolled in Beijing’s Central Conservatory of Music at its reopening in the late 1970s. Among this first wave of Chinese immigrant composers were Chen Yi, Zhou Long, and Tan Dun, who have all sustained successful careers in the years since. Their current promotional materials demonstrate the incorporation principles at work. Zhou Long’s biography is representative of the role that narrative plays, as well as the appeal of personal stories in making a reputation. His official biography identifies him as “internationally recognized for…music that brings together the aesthetic concepts and musical elements of East and West…he is a pioneer in transferring the idiomatic sounds and techniques of ancient Chinese musical traditions to modern Western instruments and ensembles.”10 (The reference to being a “pioneer” has the benefit of setting Zhou apart from a younger generation of composers working in this vein, such has Huang Ruo.) Zhou’s biography also adds a note of political oppression, noting that while “Zhou Long was born into an artistic family,” “during the Cultural Revolution, he was sent to a rural state farm….” Having made the declaration of identity and incorporation, Zhou’s biography offers the necessary evidence of his compositional legitimacy, describing his subsequent musical training, his enrollment in the Central Conservatory’s first composition class, and—perhaps most crucially for new music prestige in the U.S.—his time at Columbia University, where he earned a Doctorate of Musical Arts in Composition.

10 Zhou Long, Faculty page, University of Missouri-Kansas City, http://conservatory.umkc.edu/faculty.cfm?r=152C.
Chen Yi’s official biography emphasizes her compositional legitimacy more, by focusing on her prestigious commissions, but also begins by describing her as a “prolific composer who blends Chinese and Western traditions, transcending cultural and musical boundaries…” Tan Dun, arguably the most well known of this group, has an elaborate personal website, whose “About” section includes a section titled “Explore Tan Dun’s story” in addition to his official biography. The extensive narratives on offer there include a long myth-making episode that claims, “Tan’s reconciliation of disparate and seemingly contradictory elements is a direct byproduct of his life’s experience,” before referring to Tan’s current life in “the 24/7…urban sprawl” of New York City, his upbringing in a “rural Hunan village” (where “shamanistic cultural traditions still survived”), and the changes wrought in his own and China’s life by the Cultural Revolution, during which Tan was “sent to plant rice alongside the local farmers in the Huangjin commune.” Very quickly, then, this hits the marks of (self)-exoticizing, the personal roots in China and the U.S., and the political oppression Tan experienced in China. The narrative shapes Tan’s compositional legitimacy through references to his education at the Central Conservatory, a list of composers who influenced him (among them Goehr, Crumb, and Henze along with Chou Wen-Chung and Takemitsu; lineage as legitimacy), his arrival in New York, and his immersion in the “downtown avant-garde scene.” All of this is resonant with the logic of representation at the heart of the incorporation aesthetic I outline above: the personal mythologizing, the narrative of overcoming, and the building of institutional capital. Reviews of Tan’s work from the early 1990s almost always refer to a musical blend of of East and West, along with exoticizing terms like “ritual” and “shaman,” and globalizing headlines like “An Eastern Sonic Ritual in an Imaginary Religion” and “East meets Beethoven, Cheerily.”

11 Chen Yi, Faculty page, University of Missouri-Kansas City, http://conservatory.umkc.edu/faculty.cfm?r=1925.

12 Tan Dun, personal website, http://tandun.com/about/.
Like the collapse of the Chinese Cultural Revolution, the collapse of Cold War ideology also had the effect of bringing new attention to compositional voices from outside the “free world.” Composers like Henryk Gorecki and Arvo Pärt (as Mostel has pointed out), and Sofia Gubaidulina, have found audiences responsive to their incorporation of musical elements from a real or imagined past, and of real or invented folk and liturgical traditions. In addition, the championing of their work by musicians like Gidon Kremer and Paul Hillier, who already had significant reputations in the West during the Cold War helped these composers build audiences and recognition in the West during the 1990s.

In addition, the story of overcoming political oppression or persecution was repeated by journalists and promoted by composers themselves; in both settings, it served a Western narrative of post-Cold War triumph, particularly the drama of religious overcoming that has often been part of the stories about Pärt, Gorecki, and Gubaidulina. Richard Taruskin has remarked that “in the super-affluent, triumphant post-Cold War decade audiences sought through art the monumentalization of their own historical experience.”¹³ A sympathetic backstory which situated new composers and music as part of a global move from “oppression” to “freedom” provided that kind of monumentalization, and made audiences especially receptive to artists from behind the Iron Curtain, the fundamental symbolic boundary of the Cold War.

As one example of this, a narrative of overcoming is thoroughly embedded in public understanding of Arvo Pärt. A 2012 guide to Pärt’s music in The Guardian draws on decades of Pärt reception, and is representative of the public narratives that have grown up around him. Written by music critic Tom Service, the piece includes as a matter of course the claim, “Growing up in communist Estonia, Pärt found himself at odds with the regime on pretty well

every aesthetic and spiritual level.” This immediately hints at Pärt’s identity as a “spiritual” composer, which has been crucial to his image; at the same time, it establishes a narrative in which Pärt is a lifelong resistor of state communism, beginning while he was “growing up,” and despite the fact that he won a joint first prize at the All-Union Young Composers’ Competition in Moscow in 1962 at the age of 27. The trajectory Service describes includes by-now familiar stories of Pärt’s initial musical resistance (1960’s *Nekrolog*, a piece rejected by authorities for its “decadence” and use of twelve-tone technique), followed by his experimentation with “postmodern” forms like collage as well as “aggressive” dissonance, “in ways that were bound to alienate him from the Soviet authorities but began to bring him respect in the west.”¹⁴ This claim plays into a recurring Cold War-era conflation of political ideology and musical aesthetics, with the implication—a regular feature of the reception and promotion of composition from the Eastern bloc—that dissonance itself demonstrated a kind of political resistance for Soviet composers.

In explaining Pärt’s “tintinnabuli” technique, Service describes early efforts to “fuse elements of the traditions Pärt was drawn to: Gregorian chant, harmonic simplicity, and the spiritual explorations into his Russian Orthodox faith he undertook at the same time.” Thus, Pärt was not only opposed to the Soviet regime, but his personal religiosity became part of his resistance, manifesting first in his music. Service goes on to conjure up and then allay any fears that the relative simplicity of Pärt’s music represents a continuation of socialist-era populism:

…it’s easy to be fooled by preconceptions…To dismiss (Pärt’s music) as clichéd and sentimental holy minimalism is simply wrong. The power of the ‘tintinnabulation’ he discovered comes from its combination of ascetic rigour and the apparent simplicity of its materials…

This aspect of Pärt reception reflects the persistence of what musicologist Janet Levy as called identified as “casual and covert values,” meaning musical or musicological values that underpin response to music without being named; originality, complexity, and innovation, the values of musical “progress,” were at work in the reception of Pärt, and in the critical response to much of music of the multicultural turn. In the Pärt example, tintinnabuli is described here and elsewhere as a “discovery,” rather than an invention, placing it into the realm of the “scientific” and giving it an aura of naturalism and mystery. In Service’s article, listeners are also warned against dismissing the music for being attractive—a covert value from the years of Cold War musical austerity—and assured that Pärt’s work is every bit “as strict as serialism” and that its structures depend on “the objectivity of thinking that serial composition demands.” The fetishization of “objectivity” and musical discovery were among the covert values that informed Cold War-era concepts of musical progress, and it was these values, among others that the multicultural turn would challenge.

Musicologist Golan Gur traces the origins of the idea of music-historical progress partly to the work of the critic and author Franz Brendel, editor of the Neue Zeitschrift für Musik (NZM), whose 1852 history of music was highly influential. Gur writes, “Brendel’s approach can be described as Hegelian in its focus on the development of music as part of a broad process of historical progress. Connected with this is another Hegelian notion, namely the role of art as a symbolic manifestation of the synchronic ‘spirit of its time.’” Brendel conceived of music history as a series of technical innovations, placed into the service of historical ends. Brendel had a wide sphere of influence through the NZM, where he contributed to later nineteenth century

---

polemics around musical progress and argued that progress was “not a chronological designation but an unambiguous value judgement.”\textsuperscript{16}

The progress discourse has also long been used for political ends, especially the politics of European and American nationalisms. It had an especially important role during the Cold War years. Western Cold War-era composers (by which I refer to U.S. composers and Europeans of the Western bloc) were drawn to abstraction and “objectivity,” partly in reaction to a perception (only partly accurate) of Communist composition as constituting exclusively of top-down, bureaucratically managed, artificial populism. Understanding musical progress to consist of technical innovation, especially couched in “scientific” terms, was a way of demonstrating artistic autonomy for Western composers. This was a way to counter the politics of Eastern bloc composition, understood to be a vehicle for state propaganda, and its accessibility, often grounded in tonality, which was considered regressive at best.

While the reality of Eastern bloc composition was far more nuanced, and varied from country to country, there was truth to the perception that post-war socialist music was intended to be populist in orientation, if not always in effect. In East Germany, for example, Laura Silverberg notes that officials “insisted that memorable melodies and tonal harmonies best conveyed a socialist message to a broad audience,” and argues that “composers and critics in the West favored abstract, supposedly ‘apolitical’ modernism in part because it lacked the mass appeal of music under fascism and communism.”\textsuperscript{17} Carl Dahlhaus has argued that Eastern European officials who argued against technical innovations such as the compositional techniques of serialism and indeterminacy were in fact misreading Marx, claiming that “what

\textsuperscript{16} Gur, 357.

\textsuperscript{17} Laura Silverberg, “Between Dissonance and Dissidence: Socialist Modernism in the German Democratic Republic,” \textit{The Journal of Musicology} 26/1 (Winter 2009), 45.
Marx had in mind was not the suppression of the complex for the sake of a mass audiences which had not as yet had the chance to cultivate aesthetic sensibilities, but the exact opposite, the attempt to make universally available those accomplishments which had been developed by a privileged few.” Nonetheless, Silverberg points out, “In the starkest terms possible, a conservative musical language signaled communist rule, whereas modernist techniques—and serialism in particular—represented political freedom and anti-communism.”

Ideas about musical progress, and musical correctness, were thus thoroughly imbricated with high politics during the Cold War, and the “broad audience” sought by official communist musical doctrine was, tacitly or explicitly, rejected by Western composers and critics. The principle of autonomy was especially important in the reception of the European musical avant-garde, where it was upheld as a value by Dahlhaus, among others, whose criticism “resembles discourse surrounding ‘freedom’ in Western societies during the Cold War.” This divide—between music ostensibly made for audiences, and music that aggressively rejected that idea—became something of a governing principle, even a music-historical “master narrative,” in a homology with the Cold War itself: that is, a relatively balanced global binary, centered on Europe and the U.S., that was used to organize music-historical perception. This was part of a larger artistic discourse of abstraction-as-freedom, familiar in art history as well as in music, in which U.S. abstraction was both understood and promoted as an antidote to the presumably top-
down artistic demands of socialist regimes. Inevitably, the end of the Cold War also spelled the collapse of this narrative, which had exerted enormous disciplining power on musical production and reception for decades. In its absence, the very concept of musical progress would have to be rethought.

The discourse of musical progress has governed a great deal of music historiography, down to the level of formal musical analysis: chords appear in “progressions,” music “develops,” etc. The expectation of development within a piece—which suggested that musical works themselves were small-scale models of the idea of progress—meant that formal elements considered dispensable to internal development did not generate the kinds of analytical tools as the elements of harmony, melody, and motive. Outside of analysis, composers’ lives have been studied as both as models of individual progress, and as occupying a particular place in a music-historical narrative. Janet Levy writes about the assumption that composers improve (progress) over time, “later versions of works are almost automatically assumed to be better than earlier ones because we want to believe in a composer’s—as in a human being’s—progress. And when an earlier version is deemed superior to a later one it is usually the case that external reasons are invoked; the crass material world has somehow interfered with the genius of the composer.”

---


24 Levy, 17.
New music in the twentieth century was often deeply in thrall to the demand for progress, as were the histories written about it. Writing about the role of musical progress in the reception of new music, Christopher A. Williams refers to a preference for

“positivistically determined, clear, and distinct ideas whose philosophical underpinnings might aptly be termed ‘techno-essentialism.’ Most English-language accounts of this century’s music stress an accrual of technical innovations along a smooth, linear course, explaining away occasional swerves, such as neoclassicism, as a matter of broad dialectics. None (to my knowledge) questions or defines the cultural contingency of the progress model itself.”25

In the music of the multicultural turn, many of these ideas were challenged. Tonality and accessibility, which had had a resurgence already in music of the 1970s classified as minimalism or neo-romanticism, were regular features of the incorporation aesthetic. The multicultural turn, with its emerging standard of diversification, offered one way to reconsider the idea of progress for the post-Cold War period. Rather than being found solely in technical innovations, progress could instead be understood in terms of expansion of access: who had access to the concert stage (that is, which composers), and what they represented there, became as or more important than what they were doing and if it was technically innovative. While I am primarily concerned with how this affected the U.S. reception of Golijov, the self-consciously “global” Passion 2000 commission itself also suggests that musical diversity, as a new millennial path, was not an exclusively American phenomenon.

In his music of the 1990s, Golijov hit many marks of the incorporation aesthetic, drawing from his personal background to write music inflected by multiple styles and traditions. Born in La Plata, Argentina, in 1960, Golijov was the grandson of Jewish immigrants from Romania and Russia—a biographical fact that was the focus of many German reviews of Pasión—and thus

could be understood as an Argentine, a Latino, or a Jewish composer, with a special link (often foregrounded in his biography) to Ashkenazic Judaism. Each of these identifications became important to his musical success. He spent two years in Jerusalem as a student of Mark Kopytman, which burnished his credentials as a “Jewish” composer, and then received his doctorate in composition from the University of Pennsylvania, where he worked with composer George Crumb, giving him impeccable new music credentials, as well. In his music of the 1990s, Golijov found particular inspiration in Ashkenazic music and tradition, with several of his works from that period reflecting what could be described as an imaginary shtetl landscape. 1992’s “Yiddishbbuk” for string quartet attempts to reconstruct the “mode of the Babylonic Lamentations,” according the program notes; it also commemorates Jewish children who died at Terezin, Isaac Bashevis Singer, and Leonard Bernstein.

“Yiddishbbuk” shared space on an EMI recording with other early Golijov works, including “The Dreams and Prayers of Isaac the Blind,” described above, whose central three movements are intended to respond to the three Eastern European Jewish languages of Hebrew, Yiddish, and Aramaic, and a piece called “Last Round,” described by one critic as “the best Piazzolla tango Piazzolla never wrote.” Reviews of a 2002 recording, excerpted on Golijov’s website, exemplify the kind of reception Golijov has routinely encountered, with critics commenting on Golijov’s influences (“Golijov was raised on classical, klezmer, and Piazzolla”); claiming he “disregards the distinctions of genre” or “defies labels,” and calls “Dreams and Prayers” an “epic distillation of Jewish musical culture from Hebrew chant to klezmer,” In “Yiddishbbuk,” whose “stark modernism” one critic commented on, Golijov also showed his

26 www.osvaldogolijov.com
ability to write abstractly, which was an important (although not essential) step in proving new music credibility.27

Thus, one thing that set Golijov and Pasion apart from the other multiculturalists in the early days of his career was that he did not straddle a line between two (musical) worlds, as many did during the 1990s; he wasn’t a “Latin” composer on the one hand, and a “classical” composer on the other; instead he claimed and occupied multiple musical and personal identities. While he remained recognizable partly because of the groundwork laid by “dual heritage” composers, Golijov also drew on music well beyond the identities he claimed, justifying it, even tacitly, by way of his own transnational, transcultural, translinguistic biography. This justification helped him avoid charges of appropriation for years, regardless of what he did musically.

**Modernism, manifestoes, and the inverted economy of new music**

Golijov entered a new music scene that had long been dominated by the discourse of progress and scientific innovation, often promoted through composers’ manifestoes and public polemics. In her 1989 article, “Terminal Prestige,” musicologist Susan McClary examined the impact of musical polemics on new music production, pointing to writings like Schoenberg’s “How One Becomes Lonely,” Roger Sessions’s “How a ‘Difficult’ Composer Gets (sic) That Way,” Babbitt’s “The Composer as Specialist,” and Boulez’s “Contemporary Music and the Public” (the last cited in the epigraph to this chapter). Each of these, in different ways, documented the composer’s thoughts on his separation from the wider listening public; on being misunderstood and unappreciated even within his own circle (Schoenberg); or being held to

---

27 All these recording reviews are excerpted from Osvaldo Golijov’s professional website and can be found at [http://www.osvaldogolijov.com/d_yiddish.htm](http://www.osvaldogolijov.com/d_yiddish.htm).
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standards incommensurate with the true meaning of the effort (Babbitt). In each of these, a separation from the public—even if lamented—was generally understood as a necessary side effect of musical progress, setting up the progressive composer as the voice of John in the wilderness, anticipating greatness and essentially making straight the way…of the composer.

Art historian Arthur Danto has described Cold War-era modernism as a product of what he calls “the age of manifestoes.” 28 In Danto’s definition, the age of manifestoes was marked above all by polemics about what it meant to make art “correctly.” This has clear implications for musical production, and while manifesto-driven art and music obviously predates the Second World War, the Cold War raised the stakes of musical correctness. These stakes were high despite—or perhaps because of—the dwindling impact of new music on the wider culture. By the 1990s, the power of the kinds of manifestos mentioned above had dwindled, perhaps in part because of the rapidly growing stylistic pluralism of new music, which had already absorbed trends like minimalism, the New Simplicity, neo-romanticism, and which was increasingly influenced by pop music and culture. 29 Not only was there an absence of new composer manifestoes, the old ones were no longer useful for setting new agendas, marking new compositional territory, or accruing the rewards of prestige, such as awards, commissions, and teaching positions.

The seeking of these rewards has a complicated history in new music. Pierre Bourdieu has described the ways that the market in the visual arts functions according to “the logic of the pre-capitalist economy…by a ‘refusal’ of the ‘commercial’ which is in fact a collective


disavowal of commercial interests and profits.” This allows for what Bourdieu calls the “accumulation of symbolic capital,” which, in his definition, has some notably paradoxical aspects: “[symbolic capital] is economic or political capital that is disavowed, mis-recognized and thereby recognized, hence legitimate, a ‘credit’ which, under certain circumstances and always in the long run, guarantees ‘economic’ profits.”  

In this inverted economy, to be seen not pursuing profit—such as the modest profit on offer by way of things like ticket and recording sales, that is, profit by way of public appreciation—was understood as likely, in the long run, to lead to economic support, if not great wealth. Babbitt’s manifesto is partly a plea for the quicker actualization of this process: in suggesting that composers withdraw from the ticket-buying public, he is not suggesting they enter a state of penury, but instead, that their social and economic autonomy be financially subsidized by colleges and universities, for which the investment would be in “research.” Babbitt’s 1958 plea for a paradoxical artistic autonomy underwritten by the university is still the best synopsis of what was a widespread position in new music composing circles:

I dare suggest that the composer would do himself and his music an immediate and eventual derive by total, resolute, and voluntary withdrawal from this public world to one of private performance and electronic media…the composer would be free to pursue a private life of professional achievement, as opposed to a public life of unprofessional compromise and exhibitionism.  

This conflation of public life with compromise, exhibitionism, and a lack of professionalism, was essential; indeed, it marked common ground between the U.S. and European avant-gardes. As

---


McClary bluntly glosses it, referring to Boulez’s similar ideas, “in Boulez’s terms, one can attain money or prestige, but not both.”

In a 1985 conversation with Michel Foucault, composer, conductor, and new music luminary Pierre Boulez addressed this economy of new music in what turns out to be Bourdieusian terms, saying, “The economy is there to remind us, in case we get lost in this bland utopia: there are musics which bring in money and exist for commercial profit; there are musics that cost something, whose very concept has nothing to do with profit. No liberalism will erase this distinction.” McClary may have personally opposed such a structure, but she articulated it clearly, saying that the twentieth century musical avant-garde consisted of a “music that has sought to secure prestige precisely by claiming to renounce all possible social functions and values.” The divide between prestige and popularity was not only theoretical; it was discussed and enacted partly in material terms. In this economy, the absence of an audience could mark a piece or composer as worthwhile, while the values that informed this position were those of musical progress understood as a series of increasingly rebarbative technical advancements.

However, if musical progress were understood as an expansion of access—again, the question of who rather than what—it would also carry with it a biographical dimension, a careful self-positioning on the composer’s part as both insider—that is, qualified to composer—and outsider, that is, someone to whom access was newly given. Under these terms, the question of technical innovation became less important, although actual audience popularity was still a questionable outcome for serious new music; as McClary wrote in 1989, anticipating the insider

---

32 McClary, 68.
34 McClary, 60.
criticism that would later accompany the success of Golijov’s Pasión, “The fact that [Philip] Glass has attracted a considerable following is regarded by some as prima facie evidence of his lack of seriousness.”

McClary dismissed this position as naked self-serving elitism, and the domination of new music culture by an ideology of difficulty was in decline by the 1990s. To measure this decline, one can compare a review of Golijov’s work from 2002, at the end of the process, with one given Mario Davidovsky in 1994, when it was just getting underway. Davidovsky, like Golijov, was (and is) a well known Jewish Argentinian composer; both of them had garnered enough professional recognition to have a program at Columbia University’s Miller Theatre, a highly regarded venue for new music, devoted to their work. The change in language used by the New York Times for each concert indexes a shift, not only in expectations of what composers should write, but in how they should represent themselves, how they might align themselves with particular cultural references, and by what musical (and other) means their prestige could accrue.

Davidovsky, like Golijov, was born in a small town in the province of Buenos Aires to an immigrant Jewish family in 1934, and immigrated to the U.S. as a young man. Reviewing the sixty-year old Davidovsky, critic Bernard Holland noted the “smallness of Mr. Davidovsky’s listenership,” and ascribing it to the fact that Davidovsky’s style was formed “when academic serialism was flourishing and at a moment when electronic music had its early flickerings….” Despite this “academic flourishing,” the music did not flourish with audiences, and Holland notes that many in the audience would be performers at the next week’s audiences, describing a highly insular musical world. The end result of this insularity was that the “public ear drifted elsewhere, leaving a coterie of composers, performers, critics and scholars to perpetuate themselves.” Much of the review is focused on the difficulties of new music culture itself, and

35 McClary, 68.
although Holland mentions Davidovsky’s nationality, no hint of ethnic, national, or linguistic identity is understood or expected to come through in the music; instead, Holland describes “a dourness of speech in the service of an ardent soul.”

The Holland review’s overall tone is slightly rueful, even elegiac toward Davidovsky’s music, understanding it within the prestige-making systems of new music, while lamenting its increasing alienation from the potential listeners. Davidovsky’s music did not attract an audience outside of other “producers,” to use Bourdieu’s term, despite (or perhaps constituting) its fairly high levels of prestige among those producers. Because Davidovsky came of age with serialism, electronic music, and other “specialist” aesthetics, the criteria by which his work is evaluated are internal: both formal analysis of individual works, and evaluation within the social institutions—universities, specialist journals, critics, patrons, and grants—that combined to provide both prestige and actual material support. The language of this review evokes an aesthetic of restraint and difficulty, in which difference and otherness are measures of the creative alienation of the individual artistic soul: “Mr. Davidovsky’s music is hard work. He speaks his language, not ours, and provides no translator.”

Golijov, on the other hand, was understood as a master translator, one whose highly communicative music evoked expansive (and inclusive) language from Allan Kozinn. Kozinn’s review invites potential listeners in, using words like “prolific,” “breadth,” “unabashed,” as well as “expansive” and “multicultural.” Like many critics, Kozinn describes Golijov’s influences, his variety of “consistent fascinations,” which include tango and Yiddish music, and informs readers about the composer’s transnational life journey. Readers were therefore encouraged to associate Golijov’s music with Golijov’s biography in a way that Davidovsky’s listeners were not.
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encouraged to do. Here, it was Golijov’s nationality that presumably drove him toward tango; his Jewishness and time in Jerusalem toward “Yiddish music;” his transnationalism toward multiculturalism; and not to be omitted, his training in the U.S. toward remaining “interestingly spiky.”

Even in this largely positive review, however, there are traces of the covert value of complexity, similar to its appearance in Pärt reception, as Kozinn seems to argue that Golijov’s music is worthwhile despite its accessibility. The phrase “still interestingly spiky” thus offsets the “unabashedness” of Golijov’s melodious accessibility, and the implication is obvious: melodic beauty an inadequate end for a serious composer. In addition, Kozinn’s reference to Golijov’s music “evolving” further suggests a critic (and possibly readership) invested in the idea of music history as an overall narrative of progress, with the commensurate expectation that every worthwhile composer will “evolve.”

While critical response to Golijov’s pre-
Pasión works was partly characterized by the tension contained in Kozinn’s review—lauding the easily translated multiculturalism on the one hand, pointing to formal complexity on the other—critics who wrote about Pasión tended to split precisely along that faultline. Those who favored Pasión did not bother at all with complexity apologetics, while those who did not favor like the piece were repelled by what they perceived as a pandering simplicity. Despite its very public success, however, few musicologists have addressed Pasión at all, although Richard Taruskin has dismissed the piece (along with John Adams’s El Niño and other works) as a “panderfest.”

---


While so many of the critics responded to the piece with great enthusiasm, one of the German critics who reviewed Passion 2000 in its entirety, Claus Spahn, did not have a favorable impression. He made some of the familiar biographical statements about Golijov, but reached far less celebratory conclusions:

His manner of composing is as colorful as his biography. South American, Jewish, Spanish flamenco, and American influences of minimalism overlap in his music, with a motley style mix. One could find his Mark Passion horrible, the naïve melodies, the flat formal structure, the mixed and blended New Age foolishness. Sour sacro-kitsch… He dances his way through the holiest portions of Christianity, as though there were nothing more between the Last Supper and Christ’s burial than a few swinging sidesteps. 39

Spahn was not impressed with any of the Passion 2000 pieces aside from Wolfgang Rihm’s, but his real issue with Golijov is clearly his sense that Pasión is inadequately complex, and that the absence of complexity spells a lack of serious or good composition.

In the U.S., the composer David Cleary also took issue with the piece’s perceived lack of complexity, juxtaposing “appeal” and depth” in a review of the Boston premieres for the journal 21st Century Music: “While undeniably a work with panache and surface appeal that doubles as an excellent outreach mechanism to Beantown’s Latino community, it possesses little musical depth.” It is true that the Boston Symphony marketed Pasión to potential audience members in the Latino community (although not only to that community). However, the reference to “outreach” relegates Golijov’s piece to the realm of children’s concerts and marketing efforts; diametrically opposed, presumably, to the realm of serious music. His reference to the Latino community is also questionable, raising uncomfortable issues about about participation and access to the concert hall, which Cleary seems to dismiss with a simple equation in which music by a Latino composer is an automatic point of entry to a potential audience that would otherwise have no interest in the concert hall.

Cleary had other criticisms of the piece, even as he conceded its attractiveness; evoking the inverted economy again, as well as Cold War-era musical politics, he described the piece’s “frankly populist appeal.” Among his many complaints were a perception that Pasión crossed a line “from lucidity to almost simple-minded rudiment,” that the score was “glitzy” but unsophisticated, that the counterpoint was inadequate, the piece was “static,” and that, “like the proverbial Chinese meal,” Pasión left one only briefly sated.

For Cleary, Pasión clearly did not offer a desirable new direction for contemporary composition. Yet for those who did see renewal in Pasión, their claims about the piece were still surprising in their music-historical dimension. Given the extent to which multicultural music in this incarnation had been a feature of new music culture for at least a decade, this critical reception raises the question: why and how was Pasión different from the diversified new music audiences had already encountered?

In Pasión and other works, Golijov combined a version of the incorporation aesthetic with the more recognizably “postmodern” approach undertaken by other composers active in the 1990s, like Michael Daugherty and the Bang on a Can collective (David Lang, Julia Wolfe, Michael Gordon). Those composers, all raised and trained in the U.S., were more concerned with the blurring of previously existing boundaries between “serious” music and vernacular musics, bringing elements of pop culture, pop music, rock, and other idioms into their work. Pasión used both, functioning simultaneously as a display of “culture” (understood to be Golijov’s culture, which had some slippage, discussed below), and a blurring of high art—the Passion genre, classical music—and vernacular art—the mambo, the samba, and other South American vernacular dances. Pasión is a setting of the Gospel of Mark, into which Golijov also interpolates texts from Isaiah and Psalms, the Kaddish, and secular poetry. The overall trajectory of the piece,
however, is based in chapters 14 and 15 of the Gospel, which describe the arrest and death of Jesus.

J.S. Bach was at the heart of the Passion 2000 commission. The project organizer wrote that Bach represented the “German language tradition of Passion writing, which Bach built on and to some extent completed.” Although it is easy to miss in Pasión’s overt distance from the German tradition, Golijov follows Bach in making dance forms the heart of the piece. Susan McClary has pointed out this structural similarity (or homage), writing that Pasión was “a dizzying mix of flamenco, medieval liturgical drama…dances based in Brazilian martial arts and Afro-Cuban chant.” She further points out that the connection to Bach is not only easy to miss from the perspective of hearing Pasión, but that Golijov “self-consciously parallels Bach’s own penchant for eclectic collage—a characteristic we rarely notice because the intervening three centuries have made his secular dances and Italian love songs all just sound like…baroque church music” (ellipsis original). In other words, what to the twentieth or twenty-first century listener has been elided into the solemn sounds of Bach-as-autonomous-composer, may have originally been understood as being multicultural itself. McClary is interested in Pasión as a “posterchild of postmodernist music,” focusing on its eclecticism. But she also raises the question of whether the piece is “opportunistic,” in that it takes a type of “world music” and transposes it to, or for, the concert stage. More recently, Timothy D. Taylor has pointed out, “The musics of the world, when noticed by the West, are still frequently viewed as raw materials that can be drawn upon to enhance or renew the musics of the West.”

---


Whether or not Golijov was opportunistic, he was acutely attuned to the possibilities his multiple identities afforded him in the concert music world. He first came to the attention of the Bachakademie Stuttgart through another commission by its then-Artistic Director, Helmhut Rilling. Golijov’s 1996 piece for Rilling, Oceana, was also a Bach-related project, part of the Oregon Bach Festival’s “Cantatas of the Americas” project, which involved four new cantatas from four composers. Golijov also claimed a “South American” dimension for both pieces. Of Oceana, he said, “My aim…was, like Bach, to transmute…the immensity of South America’s nature and pain into pure musical symbols.” Of Pasión, Golijov said “…the main thing in this Passion is to present a dark Jesus, and not a pale European Jesus. It’s going to be about Jesus’ last days on earth seen through the Latin American experience and what it implies…What I want to do…is to relate the Pasión to icons of the history of Latin America.”

Golijov, in both cases, claims to be representing Latin or South America, and while as an Argentine, he could legitimately make some claim to doing so, the way he went about it in Pasión has been called into question in recent years. Musicologist Marc Gidal’s study of contemporary Latin American composers addresses the tension between the incorporation aesthetic and the ongoing expectations of social and cultural autonomy in new music. Gidal writes, of a contemporary cohort of composers who identity themselves as “Latin American,” that they “tend to identity with and promote various Latin American cultural heritages in a classical-music market that has increasingly embraced multiculturalism, while they emphasize their idiosyncratic aesthetics in music academies and art-music circles that revere the

43 Osvaldo Golijov, quoted in Alan Rich, liner notes to Oceana, DGG B0009069-02.

autonomous creativity of composers." But while several of the composers Gidal looks at are presenting themselves in terms of specific Latin American nationalities, with regard to \textit{Pasión}, Golijov was received as “Latin,” a far less specific identity, and one whose legitimacy Gidal questions:

At first listen it might seem that Golijov has incorporated the street sounds of his early years in South America and draws on the theological perspectives he observed in Catholic Argentina and multi-religious, multi-ethnic Jerusalem. Yet Golijov never lived in Cuba, Brazil, or Spain, where the musical traditions other than Western classical used in \textit{La Pasión} originated, nor does he play these music genres himself. Instead he collaborated with musicians and dancers skilled in these traditions to compose and perform parts of \textit{La Pasión}…

Golijov’s personal claim on the musical forms he used in \textit{Pasión} was not much greater than it would have been for Tan, for example. Suggesting that an Argentine was engaged in self-representation by means of Brazilian and Afro-Cuban vernacular forms evokes the uncomfortable image of non-Western music received at a comfortable European distance, from which entire continents are understood as undifferentiated, ahistorical monoliths.

I have shown that Golijov participated in the multicultural turn and used the incorporation aesthetic over the course of a decade; and I have argued that \textit{Pasión} benefitted in reception from Golijov’s previous work and that of his colleagues in the multicultural turn. Golijov’s primary language of incorporation in \textit{Pasión} emphasized mambo, samba, and \textit{batá} and \textit{comparsa} drumming. \textit{Batá} drums, associated with \textit{regla de ocha} or Santeria, are the heart of the piece, and bring to it an existing sacred dimension. They enter in the three “annunciation”
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movements near the beginning of the piece, recur throughout (see Table 1, below), and are
crucial to performances of Pasión, which require trained, experienced batá players. In a
conversation I had with one of Pasión’s touring percussionists, I learned that most of the
percussion parts, which are minimally notated in the score, were not “composed” by Golijov in
the usual sense Instead, the percussion section leader, Mikael Ringquist, (an initiate into the rites
of regla de ocha), worked closely with Golijov, providing the rhythms and references for much
of the piece. Consequently, many of the batá portions constitute actual ritual drumming, not
filtered, transcribed or translated, not “incorporated,” but dropped untouched into the heart of the
piece.48

Other instruments include congas and bongos (Cuba), surdos and repinique (Brazil),
berimbau (Brazil), cajón (Cuba), and more. Percussion is a central part of the piece’s narrative
structure; for example, the movement, “Crucifixion,” opens with an all-percussion samba beat,
later overlaid by antiphonal choirs. In addition, the piece uses specifically Cuban musical forms,
such as the son and mambo, along with Brazilian instruments like the berimbau and the trés.
Many of Pasión’s movements make reference to music understood as Latin—that is, originating
from a range of locations in Latin or South America—or as Hispanic, that is, originating in
Spanish-speaking locations, including Spain. The table below gives the primary instances of
Latin or Hispanic influence.

Table 2.1: Allusions to Non-Western music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Number</th>
<th>Movement Title</th>
<th>Movement Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bautismo en la Cruz</td>
<td>Capoeira with berimbau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td>Annuncios</td>
<td>Ritual batá</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Genre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Poe Qué?</td>
<td>Mambo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>El Primer Diá</td>
<td>Cajon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11, 12</td>
<td>Judas y El Cordero Pascual</td>
<td>Cuban son/salsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Quisiera Yo Renegar</td>
<td>Flamenco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Demos Gracias</td>
<td>Bombos (Andean drums)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>Ritual batá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cara a Cara</td>
<td>Ritual batá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Agonía</td>
<td>Ritual batá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Arresto</td>
<td>Güiro (ritual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Soy Yo</td>
<td>Quitiplás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Samba Cubana</td>
<td>Samba, w/ago-go and cajon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Silencio</td>
<td>Flamenco and cajon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sentencia</td>
<td>Ritual batá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Road to Golgotha</td>
<td>Comparsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Crucifixión</td>
<td>Samba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given this eclecticism, and these forms and influences, *Pasión* resists some of the usual tools of musical analysis. While at least two music theorists have written theses analyzing portions of *Pasión*, their focus was, in one case, on determining the genre of each movement, and in the other, seeking semiotic evidence of satire or irony in the piece.\(^{49}\) In my own attempts to analyze *Pasión*, I have found that analysis is not an especially revealing exercise. At the same time, I am

---

aware that such a statement begs the question, in that it suggests that the existence of hidden levels of meaning, to be revealed by close reading, is inherently desirable or a fundamental feature of “good” music. The covert value of complexity—a value I find myself carrying—troubles *Pasión* once again. While those who have analyzed *Pasión* have found “unifying elements” that make the piece cohere, they tend to be at a fairly obvious level, discernable through listening; examples of such elements include the almost identical music of the opening and closing movements, or the similarities in the three “Annunciation” movements early in the piece.

As Mikael Ringquist’s involvement shows, much of the “work” in fact is the result of a collaborative compositional process. Here Golijov did do something fairly unusual, at least by the standards of classical music, which has historically and discursively relied on the image of a singular, authoritative, compositional figure who makes the decisions; or, barring that in the 20th century, a singular, authoritative figure who can explain in philosophical terms why he or she is *not* making the decisions. But the kind of collaboration by which *Pasión* was put together has rarely, if ever, been understood as “composition” on classical music terms. Thus *Pasión* upended an existing expectation of what compositional originality meant, even as it suggested (or would have suggested, had this been a more publicly discussed issue) a new, collaborative concept of originality. By working in this collaborative mode (the score also contains multiple acknowledgements of collaboration and arrangement credits), Golijov did something that set the piece apart from other incorporative music.

In addition, and perhaps getting closer to what the music critics actually heard, what Golijov brought to the stage was not the usual incorporative kind of piece, in which, again, the incorporation is that of non-Western music into fundamentally Western classical works. In
Pasión, Golijov does precisely the opposite, not, for example, asking its string players to incorporate samba rhythms. Indeed, Golijov found early in the process of writing Pasión that even orchestral percussionists and their instruments were not adequate to that task. Instead, when a samba does appear, at the moment of the Crucifixion, it is played by a self-sufficient samba ensemble of surdos, ago-go, tamborim, etc. Afro-Cuban and Brazilian instruments and forms are the foundation of the piece, only supplemented by a Western-style string section. What this means is that, for long sections of the work, it is Western music that gets incorporated into non-Western music, and not the other way around. Golijov treats Western tropes and allusions the way that other incorporative music treats non-Western allusions: like exotic materials that have the capacity to refer, that require a certain amount of description (rather than notation), and that assume an audience’s ability to get certain references. This reversal, this incorporation of the Western musical tradition, recurs throughout Pasión, and Golijov mines the music of multiple periods, as the following table shows.

**Table 2.2: Allusions to Western music**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement number</th>
<th>Movement title</th>
<th>Movement reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Eucaristía</td>
<td>Chant (score: “las melodias gregorianas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>En Getsemaní</td>
<td>Chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Agonía</td>
<td>Bach—the string “halo” effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lúa Descolorida</td>
<td>Couperin and early music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kaddish</td>
<td>Steve Reich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One example of this reversal comes in movement 14, Eucaristía, is a setting of a central moment in both the Passion story and subsequent Christian ritual. Golijov demonstrates not only
his fluency in the medium and history of Western music, but his understanding of how to deploy that fluency to illuminate the story. In this case, he sets the Eucharist with an overt allusion to Gregorian chant, one of the most recognizably “Christian” types of music. The footnote at the bottom of the page fairly gives the game away: “This movement must be phrased with the flexibility and flight of Gregorian melodies.”50 The texture is monophonic (alternating between solo and chorus), and moves either by leaps of a fourth or fifth, or by stepwise motion. In Christian tradition, the Eucharist marks the moment when a Seder, a Jewish ritual, is transformed into the Last Supper, a Christian tradition. Accordingly, Golijov places the vocal emphasis on the Christ figure, here narrated by a female solo voice, who sings her text—“take, eat, this is my body,” etc.—in a much higher range, and far more melismatically, than the more syllabic texture given to the rest of the text, which narrates the breaking of bread.

However, the place where Golijov digs most deeply into Western music as an object of incorporation is the aria Lua Descolorida, which Golijov has recycled more than one, reusing it in several contexts; it predates Pasión. Here, Golijov combines a textual interpolation—the text is by the 19th century Galician poet, Rosalia de Castro—with a sonic incorporation of “early music” performance style and practice. The beginning of the movement has several instructions, including “Infinitely tender: Couperin-Lullaby, (as in the letters of ‘Leçons de Tenebres’).” This is a reference to François Couperin’s Leçons de Tenebres, early eighteenth century settings of text from Lamentations written for Holy Week; in Christian tradition, the texts Couperin sets refer to Christ’s sorrow at being betrayed. Each verse opens with a long melisma on the first letter of the Hebrew text. Golijov’s aria, subtitled “The Aria of Peter’s Tears,” changes the subject by portraying Peter’s suffering at having betrayed Christ; nonetheless, the reference to

50 Golijov, La Pasión según San Marcos,113.
Couperin is clear from the extended opening melisma, which is echoed by the first violin several times.

**Example 2.1, Lúa Descolorida**

Following the opening melisma, the instruments enter, and Golijov makes an unusual reference to early music performance practice when he marks the cello entrance with the instruction, “a breeze, like Jordi Savall.” He indicates that the piece’s accompaniment should not only be a “slow motion ride in a cosmic horse,” whatever that means in practice, but also that it should involve “bowing as in ‘early music,’ with almost no vibrato.” This reference to Savall, an internationally known touring performer of largely “early music,” (perhaps it is also a reference to Savall’s interest in playing music from outside the West), is an unusual tactic, calling for a performer to emulate another, specific performer by means of a written (not notated) indication. Another composer might have chosen to write the music in a way that would suggest such a style to the performer; that is, to composer the desired sound into the piece, perhaps gesturing toward the sound of early music only with the marking “no vibrato,” instead of also adding, as he did, the instruction “bowing as in ‘early music.’”

But if Golijov was a great translator of non-Western music to the Western concert stage, he falls short as a translator of Western references into Western notation. Instead, Golijov essentially treated the reference to early music the same way that Western composers have often

---

treated their use of non-Western music: as a casual, even shallow, instruction, no different than a composer instructing the orchestral percussionists playing a new piece to play “like Sheila E,” or asking a cellist to play her instrument “like an erhu.” This type of performance instruction suggests a distance from, or an inability or unwillingness to handle, the tradition being loosely described. It suggests Western music as a static repository of gestures and tropes, rather than a perpetually developing, always consequent living art form, as the narrative of musical progress would suggest. In this use of its history, it simply becomes an archive. In addition, making Jordi Savall “like a breeze” could hardly be more exoticizing—of Jordi Savall, who in this construction, becomes a force of nature in a way that might be familiar to centuries of non-Western musicians who have performed for Western audiences.

On the other hand, Golijov’s reversal of the incorporation aesthetic in Pasión can also be seen as resistant, even radical. The piece eschewed the polite incorporation of a few drums here or a berimbau there, in favor of a piece that, however difficult to identify in terms of a single style, was truly not a piece of Western classical music. This is what Golijov presented to the venerable Bachakademie Stuttgart; this is the piece that famously received a twenty-minute standing ovation at its German premiere. To turn the expectations of Western music on their heads the way Pasión did marks a genuine break with tradition. In light of all these developments, it is difficult to take seriously Alex Ross’s claim about Pasión: that it “drops like a bomb on the belief that classical music is an exclusively European art.” It may, however, have dropped like a bomb on a residual belief that musical incorporation could only go one way.
The Limits of Musical Multiculturalism

If expanded access to new music culture was understood as a progressive direction during the post-Cold War period, it is worth raising the question of just how progressive, in practice, this approach to access was. Composers who succeeded by way of the incorporation aesthetic brought with them, as I argued above, institutional cultural capital that gave them access to further institutional recognition as “multicultural,” in the liberal sense that built on existing universalizing discourses. This allowed performers, presenters, and critics to expand new music’s offerings in ways that seemed to reflect the diversity of a post-Cold War, increasingly globalized world, without necessarily upending the existing musical structures. Consequently, the multicultural turn did little more than reproduce the social structures of musical power. While the geographical territory represented on stage via particular composers may have expanded, it did little to address the demands for representation being made in multicultural discourse outside of music, at least in the U.S. The great Latino composer of the millennial turn was not (for example) a second-generation Angeleno of indigenous Mexican descent; instead it was Golijov, a Jewish Argentinian of Caucasian descent. The notable new voices in the classical music world were not African-American but Dutch, Russian, Baltic, or Chinese.

This goes to a crucial fact of musical multiculturalism as manifested on the concert stage: it elides the chasm between a representation of cultural (national, ethnic, stylistic, or linguistic) difference, and a real difference in access to material resources. The institutional capital composers carried into this work, which allowed them to act as representatives of culture, can only come from pre-existing access to material and non-material resources. Thus, the multicultural turn did not result in increased representation in new music of voices from marginalized U.S. populations, which was one of the goals of political multiculturalism. Other
composers emerged in the early 2000s who were more representative of American minority groups—Daniel Bernard Roumain, among others—and yet the cultural capital required to gain the kind of access supposedly being granted was still almost impossible to gain access to without existing capital of all kinds.

Nonetheless, the shift from high Cold War modernity to a more eclectic, culturally diverse and expansive music did expand geographic representation, distributing the rewards to prestige to new accounts. As has been widely discussed, the breakdown between high and low genres that this shift also contained had been underway for some time—especially in the more experimental “downtown” New York scene, where, according to guitarist Rhys Chatham (writing in 1990), “The breakdown of hierarchical barriers during the 1970s and 80s in American between Western art music, Africa-American music, rock, and even pop has resulted in an unprecedented crisis of identity for art music in recent times…This trend has given us an aesthetic landscape with much advocacy by various interest groups for seemingly mutually exclusive methods of composition or musical procedure, but not critical theory with any collective consensus or consent.” Chatham points to a “new yearning” that had developed “among composers who had come of age on the frozen wastelands of serialism,” a yearning that resulted in, among other things, a revival of tonality in the form of minimalist music.

The resulting stylistic multiplicity has often been analyzed through the lens of postmodernism, the subject of a great many manifestos in the waning days of modernism. But it also joined a extant discourse of endings, most famously Francis Fukuyama’s widely-read argument about the “end of history,” where he posited that the end of the Cold War spelled not only the end of Soviet communism, but “the end of history as such: that is, the end point of
mankind’s ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government.”

For Danto, the dwindling power of art manifestoes in general confirms the shift into what he calls the “post-historical” period of art history. In post-historical art, practices, aesthetics, and styles deemed incorrect or forbidden in the age of manifestoes were re-enfranchised; what had once lain beyond “the pale of history,” in Danto’s Hegelian phraseology, was welcomed back into artistic practice.52 Liberation from the requirement to adhere to manifestos resulted in what Danto calls “a remarkable diversity, not only of participants, but of practices.”53 This was true of new music as well; diversity of practices was perhaps its most consistent trait in the post-Cold War period.

Observers of art and music who also saw the “end” approaching did not consider their historical questions answered; on the contrary, theories about the end of art or the end of music history saw those “ends,” not in questions resolved, but in the absence of even the possibility of resolution. This insight was not entirely new; as early as 1967, Leonard Meyer had predicted that the future of art music would be “characterized not by the linear, cumulative development of a single fundamental style, but by the existence of a multiplicity of quite different styles in a fluctuating and dynamic steady-state.”54

At the conclusion of his idiosyncratic listener’s history of twentieth century music, The Rest is Noise, Alex Ross offers a viable description of what we could call post-historical music. Having filled the final chapter of his book with subheadings such as “After Europe,” and “After
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Minimalism,“ Ross writes about music of the late 1990s and early 2000s, describing a kind of non-hierarchical eclecticism that would lead, among other things, to today’s omnivore composers:

There is little hope of giving a tidy account of composition in the second fin de siècle. Styles of every description—minimalism, post-minimalism, electronic music, laptop music, Internet music, New Complexity, Spectralism, doomy collages and mystical meditation from Eastern Europe and Russia, appropriations of rock, pop, and hip-hop, new experiments in folkloristic music in Latin America, the Far East, Africa, and the Middle East—jostle against one another, none achieving supremacy.55

By this description, anything could go, given the right support, the right networks, and the composer’s understanding of the rules of relevance. Golijov demonstrated his grasp of the rules of relevance impeccably in Pasión. Having already set himself up as a global composer, claiming legitimate access to all kinds of music beyond Argentinian, had he based his compositions solely on either klezmer or tango, he would not have had the same success. Indeed, Golijov delivered Pasión not only as a representation of a new global direction but as a global direction informed, but not restricted by, classical music history. In this sense, the idea that musical history was starting over can be understood as a case of musical history being put into the service of something entirely new; not new in a technical sense—everything on the Pasión stage has been heard before, somewhere—but new in its striving for a massive sort of synthesis, with no music necessarily off-limits, and no music obvious at the center. Golijov seemed the ideal millennial composer: cosmopolitan, virtuosic, fluid, and multilingual. Those Americans who saw the dawning of a new American century could also see in Golijov, a highly educated, highly skilled and communicative immigrant, the ideal global citizen.

The willingness to reward the incorporation aesthetic can be seen in the kinds of commissions awarded by Chamber Music America (CMA), and, during the time of individual commissioning grants, the NEA as well. Not only do Chinese composers start to appear on those lists in the mid-1990s (Chen Yi and Yong Yang in 1994, Zhou Long in 1995), but the kinds of European composers, and the ensembles for which they were writing, changed as well. Whereas in the early 1980s, many of the CMA’s grants went to known serialists or modernists such as Davidovsky, Martin Bresnick, or Charles Wuorinen, by the second half of the 1980s, a notable number of commissions went to those working in a more accessible, and sometimes neo-romantic style, like Christopher Rouse, George Tsontakis, and Stephen Hartke. Davidovsky, Bresnick and Wuorinen wrote for traditional ensembles—piano duo, string quartet, and piano trio, respectively—while Oliver Lake (1994) wrote a saxophone quartet, and Tania Leon (1996) for the *a cappella* vocal ensemble Chanticleer. Jon Jang (1996) wrote for the Kronos Quartet, but as with many of Kronos’s projects, it was string quartet *plus*, the plus, in this case, a Cantonese opera singer. There were, of course, plenty of compositions for traditional classical ensembles being written in the 1990s, but the trend toward new configurations, new influences, and new forms was emerging in the funding structures that helped produce new music.

**Resurrection?**

“Was Madonna in the house? Or at least Michael Jackson?” asked the *Stuttgarter Nachrichten* in its review of the 2000 world premiere of *Pasión*, referring to the twenty minutes of thunderous applause that greeted the world premiere of *Pasión*. Alex Ross quoted this review in his 2001 paean to Golijov after *Pasión*’s Boston premiere, adding, “Any work that
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causes hysteria in both Boston and Stuttgart is worth a close look.” And any work that causes critics to make music-hysterical pronouncements is doubly so.

Thus Golijov was lauded not just for his “accessibility”—accessibility had already been provided, in varying degrees, by composers as disparate as George Rochberg, Joan Tower, and John Adams for several decades. Nor did he play the “Great White Hope,” the new champion who could resuscitate the old progress narrative of autonomy and innovation. Instead, Golijov seemed, however temporarily, to embody the best aspects of a new conception of progress, of a new music based in “We Are the World” rather than a New World Order, one that implied that all the world’s music was available for sensitive, transformative incorporation. (The new motto might well have appeared on a T-shirt as “Think Globally, Compose Locally.”) An absence of cultural or national particularity, combined with a general sense of global influence, made Golijov especially available for the heroic omnivory that was projected onto him.

The last ten years have not been kind to Golijov, as the qualities for which he was originally praised, and which he successfully exploited, have not fulfilled the prophesy of the new, multicultural progress narrative. Still, no other piece has taken **Pasión**’s place; none has been named the next major step in a new music-historical direction. Though the old one has undergone his share of scourging in the press, no new charismatic musical leader has (yet) been anointed. This suggests, among other things, that the reception of Golijov was the product of a particular time, a confluence of discursive and historical factors that developed in the years between 1989 and 2001. It was a peculiarly millennial and post-Cold War optimism whose manner of looking forward, and whose interest in narratives of renewal, are unlikely to be repeated.
In addition, Golijov’s transposing of world music from the outside to the inside the concert hall has not continued to resonate with the growing omnivory of contemporary composition, which has relied more on popular music and displays of hipness than “world” music and displays of cultural identity, in keeping with a larger-scale shift from the political and policy orientation of multiculturalism, to a more social understanding of “diversity.” However, for such a large-scale work, especially one with such a specific instrumentation, *Pasión* remains in circulation to a surprising degree.

In the post-historical phase, Danto writes, “there are countless directions for art making to take, none more privileged, historically at least, than the rest.” Like Fukuyama, who took pains to point out that the end of history did not mean the end of human action, Danto argues that the philosophical “end of art” in the post-historical period does not mean that art will no longer be made, but instead, “Art today is produced in an art world unstructured by any master narrative at all, though of course there remains in artistic consciousness the knowledge of the narratives that no longer apply. Artists today are at the end of a history in which those narrative structures have played a role.”

Composers at the turn of the twenty-first century were operating in a moment when it seemed that two powerful structuring narratives—the socio-politics of the Cold War and its aesthetic politics of progress and reaction—might be, for quite some time, suspended, if not resolved for ever. It is worth pointing out that Fukuyama ended his 1989 thought-piece on a wistful note, saying “the end of history will be a very sad time…the worldwide ideological struggle that called forth daring, courage, imagination, and idealism, will be replaced by economic calculation…and the satisfaction of sophisticated consumer demands. In the post
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57 Danto, 136.

58 Danto, 47-48.
historical period there will be neither art nor philosophy...Perhaps this very prospect of centuries of boredom at the end of history will serve to get history started once again." Partly by definition, then, there is no sound of post-historical music. At the same time, if Fukuyama could still pine for the heroic, for "daring, courage, imagination, and idealism," seeing in their lack a symptom of history at an end, it is easier to understand why an unlikely musical hero like Golijov, whose Pasión seemed, to its dazzled first listeners, to offer those very qualities, could have easily been raised up—and then cast down—as millennial savior of classical music.
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PART II: PRE-MILLENNIUM
Chapter 3: From Passion to Apocalypse

“There is still an important difference between a general consciousness of living in the last age of history and a conviction that the last age itself is about to end.”

In the first half of this dissertation, I have focused on the high and musical politics of the Cold War and its immediate aftermath, considering impacts on the production and reception of new music by looking at the Passions of Wolfgang Rihm and Osvaldo Golijov. In this chapter, and in the second half of the dissertation, I turn to the other periodizing theme identified in my introduction: the millennial turn. Millennial ideas of renewal and redemption, or, destruction and redemption, were never entirely extricable in the West at the end of the twentieth century from the Cold War mindset; for example, Francis Fukuyama’s hypothesis of an “end of history,” in which the modern world’s dialectical progression would come to a halt, was prompted by the sudden collapse of the Soviet Union, a truly unexpected historical event which, I suggest, amplified existing or potential millennial fervors. Still, foregrounding the idea of an approaching “end time,” whether religiously or otherwise based, will be my basis for reading Sofia Gubaidulina’s overtly eschatological contribution to Passion 2000.

Gubaidulina has been explicit about the apocalyptic dimension of her Johannes-Passion. Thus, my argument is less about demonstrating that the work has such a dimension, and more about exploring its implications and placing it into dialogue with other apocalyptic, eschatological, and millennial artifacts of the period. At the heart of this chapter is a comparative reading of what I suspect Gubaidulina herself would see as the “crux” of the Passion story, Jesus’ crucifixion and what follows, in Gubaidulina’s setting and that of Bach. While the two in
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crucial ways divergent, I will suggest that they both work to juxtapose a sense of earthly time—which is historical time, in some definitions—and heavenly time.

In the second half of the 1990s, it would have been difficult to count the number of books, essays, articles, and scholarly pieces that began with one of two variations on a millennialist theme: for every “As the millennium approaches,” there was an equal and opposite, “As the millennium draws to a close.” Such themes of beginning and ending were pervasive in the West during those years, with fears and hopes for closure vying with hopes for renewal, redemption, and resurrection. The year 2000, historian Charles Strozier wrote in 1997 “reverberates with our deepest psychological dread…No one in our culture can entirely escape the millennial hysteria of the 1990s.” Strozier linked this hysteria to ideas about “the end,” or end times, which tied explicitly millennial fervor to other simultaneous conceptions of endings. “End time,” Strozier argued, “means that moment (which is at the same time a process) of moving out of human history and into God’s time. But as a cultural artifact 2000 connects as well with secular forms of the apocalyptic.”2 The apocalyptic mode, familiar from popular culture whether based in secular or religious beliefs, predicted imminent total catastrophe. This is an inversion of the renewal mode of millennialist belief, which predicts restoration or redemption, and the possible coming of a “New Age,” which, as we will see in Chapter 4, is a key subtext of Tan Dun’s Water Passion after Matthew.

The weight given to the year 2000 had Christian belief and tradition at its base, since it measured the years believed to have elapsed since Jesus’s death, and its approach gave rise to a number of millenarian cults, along with the spread of apocalyptic imagery and ideas. Among the issues that either drew from or generated apocalyptic fantasies were the AIDS epidemic, the
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dispensationalist Christian doctrine of the “Rapture,” the fiery immolation of the Branch Davidians in Waco, TX, and other millennialist cults such as Aum Shinrikyo and the Order of the Solar Temple. One of the most public artistic depictions of the AIDS crisis was Tony Kushner’s Angels in America, whose two named parts neatly acknowledged both apocalyptic and redemptive discursive dimensions of the post-Cold War period: “Millennium Approaches” and “Perestroika.” Other manifestations of millennial exuberance or anxiety included television shows with millennial themes (CBS’s “Mysteries of the Millennium” in 1995, the series Millennium), organizations like the Promise Keepers, described by scholar Lee Quinby as offering “a new form of apocalyptic masculinity,” and the popular series of books about the post-Rapture Time of Tribulation whose title alluded to evangelical Christians’ worst fear: Left Behind.

On the secular side, fears of a post-Cold War government takeover (heralded by the descent of mythic “black helicopters”), or, thanks to a passing remark by the American president, a “New World Order” that would impose socialism and redistribute wealth, stoked a paramilitary movement further inflamed in the United States by the prospect of federal gun control legislation. The FBI produced a [when] report titled “Project Megiddo,” which outlined research done in the 1990s on and action plans for contending with potential millennialist violence. The FBI identified two primary threats: religious extremists who “claim that a race war will soon begin, and have taken steps to become martyrs in their predicted battle between good and evil”; and militia groups, for who the coming millennium indicated the onset of a one-world


government takeover to be triggered by the Y2K computer crisis. Project Megiddo shows how seriously authorities took individuals or groups who “profess an apocalyptic view of the millennium or attach special significance to the year 2000.” Some religious groups preached the coming of the Messiah in 2000 based on numerology drawn from the Book of Revelation, while militia-based millennialists were concerned with harbingers of totalitarianism like the signing of the Brady Bill, which attempted to place some restrictions on the personal possession of firearms, in 1994.

While millennialism, as a belief system oriented toward “collective, earthly salvation” has never been dependent on specific dates, the approach of the actual millennium seems to have amplified such beliefs and heightened the anticipation of renewal—whether by pacific or apocalyptic means. Gubaidulina’s Johannes-Passion is musically emblematic of a certain drastic orientation toward millennial renewal, and my historical reading puts it into dialogue with various discourses of eschatology, end times, and millennialism. Tan and Gubaidulina’s Passions seem in this regard like polar opposites, with Tan offering an anodyne, Aquarian fantasy of global renewal (Chapter 4) that soars blissfully above more paranoid millennialist visions of apocalypse. While Gubaidulina’s is a terrifying and drastic take on renewal, its apocalyptic vision is ultimately that of a world remade. In this, she shares more with Tan’s New Age, and with other millennial fantasies, than at first might appear.
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6 Project Megiddo.  
The Millennial Script

Because there are many terms and concepts in circulation in scholarship on apocalyptic thinking in the West, I will begin by outlining some of the key concepts and indicating the ones I will use throughout. We begin with a necessary distinction between millennialism (my preferred term), and millenarianism. (I will use the adjective “millennial” to refer simply to events or ideas that had to do with the calendric millennium and its approach in the late 1990s.) Catherine Wessinger, drawing on Norman Cohn, defines millennialism as “belief in an imminent transition to a collective salvation, in which the faithful will experience well-being, and the unpleasant limitations of the human condition will be eliminated.”8 Such a belief can be either religious or secular, and scholars have identified millennialist strains in a wide variety of political and belief systems, ranging from National Socialism to Earth First! to New Age. While Wessinger treats the terms as synonyms, other scholars see millenarianism as implying a religious, specifically Christian, facet to the anticipation of “salvation.” Like the excitement about the year 2000, both terms are derived from Christianity, as both emphasize the millennium—the anticipated thousand-year rule of Jesus on earth. In this context, the “millennium” is not (for example), the turn of the twenty-first century, but the thousand-year reign itself.9

Millennialism is therefore a form of eschatology, the study of last things and end times, and especially “divinely revealed teachings about the final events of history.”10 In popular culture and the popular imagination, eschatology is closely bound to the apocalyptic, which
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9 Some scholars use millenarian or millenarianism consistently; I will prefer millennialism, except in direct quotations.

assumes that the end time—which is often interpreted interchangeably as the “end of history,” or the end of earthly time—will arrive in a catastrophic way. Wessinger calls this catastrophic millennialism, which requires the violent destruction of an old order to usher in the redemptive and new. She contrasts this with progressive millennialism, which assumes that renewal can come through human improvement, and reach collective salvation through social efforts (possibly guided by divine texts or forces). Each of these manifestations of eschatology and millennialism have in common their preoccupation with time and temporality, which Malcolm Bull argues have unfolded in “two more or less distinct forms: the spiritual and the historical;” these can be loosely mapped onto the religious and the secular, as well.11

“Apocalyptic” has also been separated from other, related terms. In theologian Bernard McGinn’s definition, apocalyptic resembles millennialism a great deal, but does not necessarily rely on earthly salvation. It also brings together earthly and heavenly temporal ideas, consisting of “a sense of the unity and structure of history conceived as a divinely predetermined totality…pessimism about the present and conviction of its imminent crisis…belief in the proximate judgment of evil and triumph of the good, the element of vindication.”12 In Jewish apocalyptic, the hope of individual transcendence of death—which becomes a foundational element of Christianity—is “envisaged as having both horizontal, or future, and vertical, or heavenly, dimensions…”13 As we will see, the horizontal and vertical dimensions are especially important in Gubaidulina’s Passion.


13 McGinn, 9.
Apocalyptic and eschatology are also themes that marks the beginning, ending, and aftermath of the Soviet Union—and thus of much of Gubaidulina’s life. Wessinger coined the term “progressive millennialism” to cover both religious and secular forms of a belief system guided by “an optimistic view of human nature and society, along with a strong belief in progress…Progressive millennialists dedicate themselves to self-improvement and social reform, but…there have been expressions of progressive millennialism that have killed many millions of people.”14 Building on Wessinger, W. Michael Ashcraft defines this form of millennialism as “an outlook that expects society on Earth to become increasingly purified or perfected. To achieve this ideal society, progressive millennialism teaches that humanity must cooperate with [God, or] a metahistorical system such as Nazism or socialism.”15

The perfectibility of humankind was an underlying ideal of the Soviet Union; Richard Sakwa writes that Bolshevisim, the U.S.S.R.’s founding ideology, “was the most radical fulfillment of Enlightenment ideas about the perfectibility of man.”16 Some scholarship on the Soviet Union has found in its aspirations to perfection, and its salvational ambitions, an overlap between religion and revolution, which may have influenced Gubaidulina’s own apocalyptic. In a historical study of the Soviet Union published in the early 1970s, sociologist Vatro Murvar saw multiple similarities between the “messianic doctrines” of church and state, arguing that post-Revolution Russia relied on existing religious tropes to attract true believers. Murvar argued that “Russian religious and revolutionary messianism share basic doctrines, beliefs, attitudes and behavioral expectations. The former made an impact on, and was, in part replaced by the latter.”

14 Wessinger, 5.


The three doctrines Murvar sees working in religion and revolution are millennialism, the “division of humanity into ‘children of light and darkness,’ engaged in deadly cosmic struggle,” and monism, allowing for no valid distinction between religious and political, spiritual and temporal, nor social and economicspheres.” In addition, Murvar found a number of “religious” characteristics that carried over into revolution, and which will be familiar from Western understanding of the Soviet culture, including a search for the total truth; dogmatism; exclusiveness; totalism and “immediate millennium;” moral austerity; extremism for the cause; martyrdom and readiness to suffer; and eschatological visions of a new world.

The tendency toward eschatology was also apparent among peasants at the Soviet Union’s founding and later, many of whom rebelled against coercive collectivization. Historian Lynne Viola has shown that peasants actively circulated rumors as a form of resistance, their “symbolic imaginary,” which were “most often eschatological in nature. Apocalyptic tales abounded, forecasting (in succession) the rise of Antichrist, Armageddon, and the second coming of Christ. Antichrist and the four horsemen of the apocalypse were figurative symbols in rumors portending all too accurately an end of traditional ways of peasant life.” Many of these characteristics are also at work in Gubaidulina’s music, and manifested in the ways she discusses and presents it.

If dogmatism, totalism, eschatology, etc., were partly transferred to the revolutionary cause and thereby contributed to the founding of the Soviet Union, scholars have also found that an affinity for millennialism and apocalyptic persisted through the empire’s end. In the Soviet
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18 Murvar, 284-285.
Union’s last years, lawmakers introduced a new law that made official what had long been true in practice: restrictions on the practice of religion were largely lifted, religious organizations (not just Christian) gained legal status and could own property, and freedom of worship was guaranteed.⁰²⁰ Many older organizations gained new status, and many new religious movements emerged. Among them was the “Center of the Mother of God,” founded by a “new apocalyptic prophet,” calling himself Ioann (John, born Veniamin Iakovlevich Bereslavsky), who claimed to have received a “national and eschatological narrative” from Mary herself. This narrative was anti-Communist, but also insisted that “Russia has a messianic role to play in the post-Communist world order. Especially favored by the Mother of God, Russia is at the center of an apocalyptic struggle against Communists and Satanists—a struggle that marks the beginning of a new age, the Age of Mary.”²¹

Even as the post-Soviet period grew longer, apocalyptic remained part of public culture. In 1996, the Communist Party’s candidate for President of Russia cited Revelation in referring to his opponents, Yeltsin and Gorbachev, saying of them, “The Devil sent two beasts from hell, one with a mark on his head, and the other, the Antichrist, puts a mark on people’s hands.” As these examples suggest, apocalyptic has been a powerful and consistent force in Soviet and post-Soviet culture, its persistence perhaps comprehensible by way of a tradition of “Russian intellectual
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thought [which] seems always poised to relate the reality or prospect of national misfortune to endtime prophecies.”

In approaching Gubaidulina, who came from this culture, it is Strozier’s idea of a “millennial script” that I want to follow, as it is widely applicable to other late twentieth century discourses on endings-that-are-also-beginnings, like, most notoriously, Francis Fukuyama’s “end of history.” This script is also structurally analogous to the Passion story, in which tribulation and violence precedes resurrection and redemption. Gubaidulina, more than the other three Passion 2000 composers, adheres to this aspect of the Passion story; her vision in Johannes-Passion is unequivocally catastrophic. I will thus use the phrase “millennial script” in the same way that Strozier uses it: to refer to events, narratives, and interpretations that assume a necessary order of events in which suffering and violence precede—or lead to—redemption or renewal. These scripts can be realized in multiple ways, and I look at differences between Gubaidulina’s realization of the millennialist implications of the Passion script and Bach’s, focusing especially on their setting of the crucifixion and aftermath. I will focus on Gubaidulina’s depictions of violence and redemption, in order to show that, despite their very different orientations to the millennial script, Gubaidulina’s and Bach’s Johannes-Passion settings share an idea: that historical and spiritual times—the earthly time in which the crucifixion takes place, and the heavenly time in which all things are seen—can be made to intersect.

In Passion 2000, the Passion as a genre was taken up at a historical moment—the millennial break, the end of a violent century—already rife with interpretive possibilities for millennialists of all stripes. The basic narrative (as told in the four Gospels) drives toward the
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crucifixion of Christ as denouement. Death is the necessary precursor of resurrection, which is
the condition for collective redemption, which becomes the resolution of the suffering that
precedes it, adhering to Strozier’s dictum: “Salvation requires violence.” Thus the real teleology
of the Passion story is toward Christ’s resurrection, but, in the liturgical drama of Holy Week,
that element is saved until Easter Sunday, and usually omitted from the stagings and musical
settings of the Passion that take place on Good Friday. In the meantime, congregants are asked to
fill in the absent action, to lend meaning, in hindsight, to suffering. In this sense, the Passion
narrative makes “ends meet,” to borrow Malcolm Bull’s phrase, in that it brings together
teleology—the direction of human time—with eschatology—the end of time, or divine time—and
suggests that both are necessary for redemption.

The rhyming of millennialism and the Passion narrative overdetermined the choice of the
Passion genre for the Bachakademie Stuttgart’s massive millennial project. Passion 2000 already
suggested renewal; not least, its interest in renewing Bach himself, generating a new sense of
Bach’s relevance for another century (or millennium). But Bach could have been renewed with
the commissioning of a set of masses, cantatas, or oratorios, as indeed then-Artistic Director
Helmuth Rilling had already done with the Oregon Bach Festival’s “Cantatas of the Americas”
project in 1996. A cycle of Passions was thus an unusual choice, given the tension between the
genre’s cultural and religious specificity and the project’s self-conscious effort at global, cultural
inclusivity. However, once understood as a millennial script, the Passion becomes a much more
apposite choice for a project that looked forward and backward, engaging beginnings and
endings at once.

23 A recently announced project in New York, whose organizers claim Passion 2000 as an influence, is doing
something along these lines with masses (see “Mass Reimaginings,” https://www.trinitywallstreet.org/music-
arts/season/mass-reimaginings).
Bequeathing the twenty-first century four new Passion settings gave renewed energy to a largely moribund genre. Passion writing fell out of widespread favor in the nineteenth century (John Stainer’s *The Crucifixion* (1887), intended for liturgical use, was the last such by a major composer), although in the twentieth century there were some notable revivals written for the concert hall and not for the liturgy. The first major Passion of the twentieth century was written at the height of the Cold War: Krzysztof Penderecki’s *Passio et mors Domini nostri Jesu Christi secundum Lucam* from 1961, which followed Bach’s model in using large-scale instrumental forces, having a consistent Evangelist/narrator throughout, and especially in its use of textual interpolations. The other twentieth century Passion that has had a substantial performance history is also arose behind the Iron Curtain: Arvo Pärt’s *Passio Domini Nostri Jesu Christi secundum Joannem*, from 1981 (revised in 1989). Like Penderecki’s, it is entirely in Latin; unlike Penderecki’s, it is a self-consciously austere setting consisting almost entirely of the Gospel portion for Good Friday, John 18-19, with no textual interpolations aside from a very brief *Exordium* (“The Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ According to John”). A number of other Passions date from the twentieth century, but many are not based on the Gospels, instead using the idea of a “Passion” either metaphorically, to outline another narrative, or placing a figure other than Jesus at the center of the story, and of the suffering. Mauricio Kagel’s *The Passion According to St. Bach*, written for the Bach Year 1985, is one example. Other twentieth-century Passions include Sylvano Bussotti’s *The Passion According to Sade*, from 1965 and based on a sonnet by Louise Labe; Bohuslav Martinu’s *The Greek Passion* (1959), a play-within-a-play whose subject is a village performance of a Passion; and the *Sadducean Passion* (*Kata Saddukaion Pathi*, 1981-1982) of composer Mikis Theodorakis. None of these is a “real” Passion setting comparable to the genre’s two most emulated models, those of Schütz (like Pärt’s, a
straightforward textual setting of the Passion portion of a Gospel, without interpolations), and Bach.

In the twenty-first century, the devoutly Catholic composer James MacMillan has produced both a John and Luke Passion, which set the Gospel texts; but the tendency to use the Passion allusively and metaphorically has continued with Kati Agócs’s recent Debrecen Passion (2015) and Kaija Saariaho’s La Passion selon Simone from 2006, based on the life of Simone Weil. Since the twentieth century, the Passion has become flexible, a genre through which composers (and other artists) can express or examine the depths of suffering, both human and divine.

It is somewhat surprising that this post-liturgical Passion has not seen greater use. A historically weighted genre, with a range of allusions and long standing in Western culture, can be relied on to produce a web of meanings and metaphors for audiences across multiple media. Clifford Geertz argues that what religion teaches is “…not how to avoid suffering but how to suffer, how to make of physical pain, personal loss, worldly defeat, or the helpless contemplation of others’ agony something bearable, supportable – something, as we say, sufferable.”24 I would suggest that contemporary use of the genre, removed from its liturgical setting, creates a metaphorical construct that can stand in for almost any profound physical and spiritual suffering, divorced from a particular confession. The Passion story, whether completed on stage or not (that is, whether or not the resurrection is depicted) relies on its status as a “symbolic form” for meaning, and it is in the resurrection that the story fulfills Geertz’s definition of the problem of suffering in religion: giving meaning to suffering.

As we have seen, engaging the Passion genre also meant engaging Bach, which brought both commissioners and commissionees into dialogue with the musical past. John Butt argues

24 Clifford Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures (BasicBooks, 1973), 104.
that the past (musical or otherwise) is appealing partly because it offers “an infinity of alternative worlds,” and such imaginative abundance was perhaps especially compelling around the year 2000. Ethnomusicologist Caroline Bithell has argued that music that draws explicitly on the past can be used as a form of resistance to historical teleology, that the use of “supposedly ‘old’ or ‘earlier’ styles…can represent an alternative world-view to that predicated on a linear view of history driven by progress and betterment. Music makes manifest the way in which groups of people can challenge the discourse of modernity and its claim to the present by enacting a parallel, contemporaneous present informed by different values.”

Gubaidulina’s piece, steeped in musical allusions to “Russianness” in the form of bells and a chanting Russian bass, and adhering to a rigorous millennial script, suggests such a challenge to, even a rejection of, a linear view of history, a challenge she embeds in its theology and formal structure. It is not only musical works, but musical genres, that can do the kind of challenging or recuperative work Bithell outlines.

As in the theological tradition explicated by McGinn, Gubaidulina conceptualizes the intersection of earthly and heavenly time as one between horizontality and verticality, and enacts these extra-musical concepts through her choice of texts: the Gospel represents the horizontal, the linear, and the earthly, while the Book of Revelation (in her understanding, written by the same “St. John”) represents the vertical, the timeless, the heavenly. For Gubaidulina, this apocalyptic element is what creates the space within which to understand the through-line of the Passion:

The narrative of Christ’s suffering…can…be a markedly calm report…this kind of reporting, which takes place over time, can be set in contrast to an absolutely timeless conception…Fortunately, there already exists such a text. It is the Revelation to St. John, or the Last Judgment…Even the form of the church [embodies] this design
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principle of intersection—the contrast of the temporal-horizontal and the timeless-vertical. But the entire chronology of this story can be truly seen, heard and understood only if you have the image of the enlightened vision of the end (eschatology) behind you…In my work, I also made an effort to unite these two texts in such a way that the two types of event are kept next to one another and intersect—the events on the Earth, which take place in time (the Passion story) and the events in Heaven, which unfold outside time (Apocalypse).

McGinn describes belief in “the proximate judgment of evil” as a key component of the apocalyptic imagination; Gubaidulina has articulated her own belief in God’s judgment, saying “Man must endure the wrath of God for the fact that he chooses evil and not good.” The wrath of God permeates the Johannes-Passion, developed systematically as a narrative device to make meaning from Jesus’s suffering. While she does not stage the resurrection (her 2002 Johannes-Ostern deals with that aspect of the story), Gubaidulina offers her Passion as a millennial script in which the world is violently remade en route to salvation.

**Gubaidulina between East and West**

In the Western reception of Gubaidulina, details of her biography have either been repeated to the point of mythologizing, or elided to the same end. This is more true of her life story than any of the other Passion 2000 composers, perhaps simply because she was by far the oldest at the time of the commission. She participated in a Soviet version of the incorporation aesthetic, writing works that use Russian folk instruments such as the bayan, and especially drawing on Russian Orthodox religion as both personal succor and self-representation. A political version of the incorporation aesthetic has been especially important in Gubaidulina’s life, her persona tied
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27 Irina Parfenova, Interview with Sofia Gubaidulina, *Deutsche Welle*, 21 October 2001, [http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,340677,00.html](http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,340677,00.html). Thanks to Alexandra Grabarchuk for translations of the two Russian-language articles cited in this chapter. Thanks also to Anahit Rostomyan for general help with Russian language questions, and her insights into Soviet-era musical training.
to the political oppression she faced under the Soviet regime, the details of which have seemed less important than the claim that she was oppressed. I have already discussed the mythologizing of Arvo Pärt’s life, and the way repetition of certain events or aspects of his life has concretized a narrative about him that continues to appeal to Western post-Cold War audiences eager for stories of communist oppression, resolved by “freedom.” The same has been true for Gubaidulina, and the fact that both adhere to an Orthodox faith has perhaps contributed to that politicized reception.

Her personal religiosity has also been much discussed, and the few Anglophone scholarly writings on her work have emphasized it in discussing her resistance to official Soviet musical doctrine, which called for accessible, conservative musical language, and officially approved subject matter. Composers who did not adhere to this prescription—regardless of the extent to which they did or did not suffer as a result—have been understood in the West as “dissident,” hankering for Western musical “freedom” in the guise of serialism and other formalist techniques. As an “unofficial” Soviet composer—the term Peter Schmelz uses to describe composers who came of age in the 1950s and 1960s, and who operated in a gray area between official recognition and censure—Gubaidulina’s reception in the West has been bound up with what he sees as this historiographical temptation to “cast the unofficial composers as ‘dissidents’.” Schmelz has little truck with this oversimplification of a complex set of political relationships: “Although active participants in a socially meaningful concert subculture, the unofficial composers were in no ways dissidents, or at least no more so than any other creative artists within the Soviet system. The romanticizing assumption is fueled by Western cold war
myths of artistic production in the Soviet Union that do a disservice to all artists active at the time by singling out certain ones as more heroic than the rest.”

It is precisely on those “romantic” terms that Gubaidulina has been received in the West, her experiments in religious music and atonality—but especially her musical manifestations of the sacred—seen as a mode of political resistance to the Soviet regime. A subhead introducing a 2013 interview with her in the Guardian is representative: “Even being denounced by the Soviet authorities didn’t stop Sofia Gubaidulina from writing some of the 20th century’s most sublime religious music. Over tea at her remote home, she shares stories of censorship, Shostakovich and survival.”

This is fairly typical of Western writing about Gubaidulina, including the allusion to Soviet oppression; her kinship with Shostakovich; her religiosity; and her will to “survive” the Soviet regime (although scholars and journalists alike have demonstrated that there was little actual danger to composers of her generation). All of this rhetoric goes into making Gubaidulina a mystical, almost holy figure among many Western critics and listeners (although her work is not seen as beyond criticism, including Johannes-Passion).

Casting Gubaidulina and her cohort as “resistant” allowed Western critics and musicologists essentially to Westernize them, to make them exceptions to the rule that suggested Eastern bloc composition was somehow “behind” the Western bloc, because of its different techniques. Further enhancing the image of Gubaidulina’s oppression is the tendency to link her difficulties in the former Soviet Union causally with her subsequent move to Germany, as in this


biographical blurb from the International Contemporary Ensemble’s Miller Theatre program in 2013:

Sofia Gubaidulina has earned her place among the great living composers. Her singular sound is characterized by a love of unusual sonorities and a deep-seated belief in the mystical properties of music. Quietly encouraged by Shostakovich to boldly pursue what the Soviet establishment perceived as the “wrong course” musically, she fled to Germany, where she cultivated her passion for the avant-garde.31 This program—her second Portrait at Miller—traces her evolution before and after her relocation to Hamburg, with several solo works as well as larger spiritual tours-des-forces.32

Note the emphasis on Gubaidulina’s religiosity, or “spirituality,” along with intimations of unspecified oppression; and appealing concepts like “love,” “deep-seated,” “spiritual,” and “passion.” Historically, the implication that she “fled” to Germany to escape Soviet oppression is incorrect. Gubaidulina moved of her own volition to the small town outside Hamburg where she still lives in 1991, the year generally understood as the end of the Soviet Union.

These tropes in Gubaidulina reception are not strictly a Western phenomenon; some Russian or Russianist scholars have also retailed them. In her introduction to a 1996 interview (published in 1998), the Russian musicologist Vera Lukomsky constructed Gubaidulina’s career in a similar way. While eschewing the word “dissident,” Lukomsky writes, “Together with fellow composers such as Schnittke, Denisov, Silvestrov, and Pärt [all included in Schmelz’s “unofficial” category – ed.] Gubaidulina opposed the totalitarianism of Soviet ideology. Her predilection for mysticism and metaphysics, her religious spirituality and musical fantasy that often project images of the Apocalypse and Last Judgment, her preoccupation with musical

31 The story about Shostakovich urging Gubaidulina to continue on her “mistaken course” has been repeated again and again, in sources ranging from interviews (Gubaidulina herself repeats it), biographies, and journalism. While it is probably true, or perhaps “based on a true story,” it now functions more as mythology than truth.

symbols of crucifixion, resurrection, and transfiguration, did not, of course, meet the requirements of Socialist Realism.”

Gubaidulina’s preoccupation with religious symbolism was in keeping with the output of other unofficial composers beginning in the late 1960s, although their symbolic music did not necessarily reflect their personal religious beliefs; Schmelz includes Pärt’s 1968 Credo and Schnittke’s Second Violin Concerto in this category (the latter piece also depicted a Passion in its formal structure). In the Schnittke, “Serial music signified dogma, Christ’s teachings to the twelve disciples, while aleatory techniques symbolized chaos, the opposition of the hostile secular world to the spiritual law.” With regard to Gubaidulina’s own stylistic changes, Schmelz suggests that by the 1980s, she was “searching for salvation” in her efforts to create “consonance and lucidity.” This would have followed her 1970 baptism into the Orthodox Church, and “coincided with her overt turn to religious subjects: Introitus (19178), In Croce (1979), Offertorium (1980), Seven Last Words (1982)…Religion, then played a vital role in the ongoing stylistic development of many of these composers.”

In addition, a number of these composers addressed the figure of Bach in their compositions through use of the B-A-C-H motive. Schnittke’s 1968 Quasi una Sonata included a theme and fugue on the motive; Pärt’s 1964 Collage sur Bach used it, and his Credo is built around Bach’s C Major Prelude from the WTC. Gubaidulina has often expressed her devotion to Bach, and Johannes-Passion was not her first Bach-related piece. Offertorium, the first piece to bring her work to wider Western attention through the promotion of its dedicatee, Gidon Kremer,

33 Vera Lakomsky, “My Desire is Always to Rebel, To Swim Against the Stream!” Interview with Sofia Gubaidulina, Perspectives of New Music, V. 36, No. 1 (Winter 1998), 6.

34 Schmelz, Such Freedom, If Only Musical, 246.

35 Schmelz, 268.
is based on the “King’s Theme” of Bach’s *Musical Offering*. Devotion to Bach and devotion to
God are combined in this piece: not only was the primary musical theme based on Bach, but the
extra-musical theme of *Offertorium* is that of Christ’s sacrifice. In addition to *Offertorium*,
Gubaidulina’s other Bach-related pieces (before and since) include “Meditation on the Bach
Chorale ‘Vor Deinen Thron Tret Ich Hiermit,” her string quartet, *Reflections on the Theme B-A-
C-H*, and the *Johannes-Ostern* of 2002, the companion to *Johannes-Passion*.

In some ways, Gubaidulina had been preparing for the *Johannes-Passion* for over twenty
years, combining her devotion to Bach and to religion in multiple pieces along the way, and
often combining one or the other with musical allusions to Orthodoxy or simply Christianity. Her
“Alleluja,” for choir, boy soprano, organ, and orchestra sets texts from the Russian Orthodox
liturgy (and premiered in Berlin in 1990); her double viola concerto, from 1998, (commissioned
by the New York Philharmonic), carries a dedication to the Biblical Maria and Martha in its title.
In the last movement of *Offertorium*, Gubaidulina converts Bach’s theme into something that
resembles a Russian Orthodox hymn, “Russianizing” both Bach and Christianity. In *Johannes-
Passion*, the influence of Russian Orthodox music permeates the piece even further, despite a
ban on the use of instruments in the Orthodox liturgy; Gubaidulina wrote, “I was well aware of
the difficulties of writing a ‘Passion’ in Russian. The tradition of the Russian Orthodox Church
does not allow the use of instruments—neither in church services nor in other ecclesiastical
rituals. No external, technical mediator between man and God—only your voice and a candle in
your hand.” Nonetheless, in an interview prior to the 2000 premiere, Gubaidulina told German
television, “I feel this Passion story as my personal subject—my deepest subject. But I could not
write it for…the Orthodox Church, because the use of instruments is forbidden there…To me, it

---
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seems that my work is deeply religious, but not a work for the church.” Gubaidulina also makes an argument for simply having religion: “In the world today, there are so many difficulties—moral difficulties. And it is absolutely necessary to have clarity about the meaning of life. And without religion, this is impossible! Otherwise, life loses its meaning.”

Gubaidulina’s personal religiosity has an apocalyptic dimension; she repeatedly refers to the apocalypse or related concepts like Judgment Day or the “time of redemption.” I will give a few examples of each, drawn especially from four interviews published between 1998 and 2012. The first three are with Vera Lukomsky; the last and most recent, with the composer and Russian Orthodox priest Ivan Moody. Gubaidulina also demonstrates a consistent preoccupation with temporality, which combines with her apocalyptic imagination to drive an overall interest in the eschatological. For example, of her Hommage à T. S. Eliot she says that its climax “draws on a moment of Transfiguration;” she is also taken with Eliot’s concept of time, which she describes as consisting of “four times: present, past, future, and ‘out-of-time’ (which is the time of redemption).” Her cello concerto, And: The Feasting at its Height, is based on a poem by Gennadi Aigi, whose opening couplet is “We are if as in a dream: A crowd in front of the Court Building;” Gubaidulina’s interpretation is “Clearly, we are present at Judgment Day.”

Gubaidulina further suggests that the apocalypse is a moment to be anticipated rather than avoided: “Only in the sixth movement [of her piece Alleluja], when all realize that this is the end of the world, do they nevertheless glorify the end singing ‘Alleluja! Alleluja!’ At this moment the organ part depicts a terrible cataclysm.”

---

37 Sofia Gubaidulina, Interview and premiere of Johannes-Passion, broadcast on SWR network. This is a German-language interview, and Gubaidulina’s German is limited. Available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=akk7MuJWleg.

38 Lukomsky, 31.
In the 2008 interview with Moody, the two—both Orthodox converts—have an exchange about the meaning of the Apocalypse, which I reproduce in part here:

Moody: I am very impressed by your vision of the Apocalypse in two works, And: The Feast is in Full Progress…and St. John Passion and St. John Easter, because I think that there exists a common, negative, misunderstanding of the term—people forget that the Greek word αποκάλυψη (apokalypsis) is simply ‘revelation,’ or a ‘lifting of a veil.’

Gubaidulina: I agree, yes. A new earth and a new heaven. I read many texts by the Fathers, and by Fr Aleksandr Men. He insists that people must understand that the Book of Revelation is luminous. The symbols of the new earth and the new heaven, before which people undergo many catastrophes and so on…39

Moody: I am reminded of a poem…which for me expresses this idea very well:

In most men you see
yourself ‘as in a glass darkly.’ Almost always
before you, narrow windows, cracked or blurred, stand
or pass. And I think that the presence of God
or, as they say, the Day of Judgment, shall be
nothing more
than a clear, large mirror where you shall see yourself
from head to toe, and rejoice
in the essence of your presence with crystal clarity.

I understand by this that the mirror is a process by which a person comprehends all the sin, all the negative elements of the Apocalypse, the Revelation, and arrives at the end, understanding the original purity of God’s creation.

Gubaidulina: Very good. The Apocalypse as the attainment of purity.40

Understanding of the apocalypse as the “attainment of purity” aligns Gubaidulina with the catastrophic form of millennialism. All millennialists look toward renewal, but only the apocalyptic strain aspires to “purity.” It is apocalyptic (catastrophic, in Wessinger’s terms) millennial movements that are most inclined to destroy the world in order to make it new;

39 Aleksandr Men was a Russian Orthodox priest and theologian (born Jewish) who did resist the Soviet regime, and sought to spread Christianity among the Soviet populace. He was murdered in 1990; the crime remains unsolved. His magnum opus was the seven-volume History of Religion. Gubaidulina was awarded the “Aleksandr Men Prize,” for contributing to cultural relations between Russia and Germany, in 2010.

40 Ivan Moody, “‘The Space of the Soul’: An Interview with Sofia Gubaidulina,” Tempo, 66/259 (January 2012), 32.
Gubaidulina’s casual reference to “people [undergoing] many catastrophes” would not be out of place in such a belief system.\footnote{Wessinger looks at the revolutionary tendencies of some millennial groups; such revolutionary groups are the most violent, and “believe that their violence is mandated by a divine or superhuman agent…Catastrophic revolutionaries believe themselves to be agents of the Divine, mandated to destroy the evil current order and create the new.” Wessinger, 8-9.}

This catastrophic element has troubling implications for the twentieth century, which has seen the political implementation of apocalyptic visions of purity more than once, and the Soviet Union was clearly no exception. Yet Gubaidulina, when she referred to the century’s end, did so not in political terms, but religious ones. Asked about her choice of the John Gospel, Gubaidulina had many things to say, but also linked its importance to the turn of the century: “The other evangelists put the emphasis on the relationship between the people and Jesus…But in John it is about the relationship between God and man in the person of Jesus. In the John Gospel there is such love for God from Jesus. It is the expression of existence as a whole. This seemed to me exceptionally important, especially here at the border between the millennia.”\footnote{Annette Eckerle, “Den Menschen ist der Sinn des Lebens abhanden gekommen,” \textit{Stuttgarter Nachrichten}, Section Kultur/Fernsehen/Roman, 1 September 2000.}

And asked about the other works of Passion 2000, Gubaidulina told the Russian paper \textit{Kommersant:}

The Passion project is even more urgent now than in the time of Bach or Schütz. At that time, it was taken for granted: people believed in God and confirmed their faith (by writing such pieces). In the 20$^{th}$ century, this topic became problematic. Each of us solved it in our own unexpected way…It turns out that of four composers who got this commission, only I had the concept of a purely religious composition. One doubts [Rihm], another plays [Tan], the third wants to understand everything in a new way [Golijov], and everyone—except me—thinks that the appropriate reaction to Christ’s crucifixion should be joy and well-being. This is [typical of] the end of the 20$^{th}$ and beginning of the 21$^{st}$ century. From my point of view, it’s frightening.\footnote{Olga Manulkina, “Interview with Sofia Gubaidulina,” \textit{Kommersant}, 3 November 2000, \texttt{http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/162447}.}
What is also frightening are Gubaidulina’s statements along these lines, which approach
fanatacism; and in any case, “joy and well-being” hardly sums up the complex homiletics of
Rihm and Golijov. For Gubaidulina, however, the apocalypse is to be sought, and in her
Johannes-Passion it is linked causally to the crucifixion. This linkage is the key to Gubaidulina’s
millennial script, and, unsurprisingly, in Johannes-Passion, too, she chooses “Alleluia” as the
appropriate response to world-devastating events, even if she does not see the word as truly a
joyful response.\textsuperscript{44}

\textit{Johannes-Passion}

\textit{Johannes-Passion} calls for the largest forces of any of the Passion 2000 works, including two
choruses (full and chamber), orchestra (with extensive battery), organ, and four soloists.
Gubaidulina divides the labor of narrating the earthly and heavenly “temporal modes,” as I will
call them, between the soloists: the bass and tenor are largely responsible for the Gospel
narrative, often set in a recitative-like style; the baritone and soprano deliver the texts from
Revelation, set in a more lyrical style.

A remarkable amount of \textit{Johannes-Passion} revolves around the interval of a minor
second, the particular purview of the bass soloist, who takes the role of the Evangelist in this
setting. Most often singing the Gospel and narrative portions, the bass generally moves on and
off of a single, almost chanting pitch only by small intervals. The closeness of this interval, and
its relentlessness, creates a kind of aural claustrophobia. For the listener, there is no escaping
from the bass at all, nor can the bass very often escape from this melodic enclosure; this
suggests, too, that there is no escaping the earthly temporal mode he narrates—except by way of
the heavenly temporal mode, which allows far more variety in intervallic content, rhythms, and

\textsuperscript{44} In Johannes-Ostern, the penultimate movement is titled “The Judgement: Alleluja, Alleluja, Alleluja;” the linking
of catastrophe and exaltation does not end when the world ends.
scansion. While the latter is often given to the baritone, roles are not absolute; at times the tenor briefly takes over narration, and the bass occasionally sings in the voice of Jesus. For the bulk of the piece, however, the bass drives the earthly action, and the baritone the heavenly. The full choir is somewhat flexible, usually delivering the Gospel, but sometimes text from Revelation; for example, in the second movement, as Jesus prepares for the Last Supper, the choir sings segments from the preparation for the Wedding of the Lamb (Revelation 19:6-9).

While Gubaidulina is one of the few composers to set such a significant amount of Revelation text, other composers have not completely ignored it, though they tend to skip over the catastrophic passages in favor of its sonorous praise of God’s might and power. In one of the most famous instances of a juxtaposition of praise (Alleluja) with Revelation, Handel’s “Hallelujah Chorus” sets the line “And he shall reign for ever and ever,” from Revelation 11:15—the seventh angel blowing the trumpet. Other parts of the “Hallelujah Chorus” are also drawn from Revelation: “for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth,” (“Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth,” Rev. 19:6) and “King of Kings and Lord of Lords” (Rev. 19:16) all come from the apocalyptic text. Bach, too, set Revelation in an early cantata, BWV 50, “Nun ist das Heil und die Kraft und das Reich” (Rev. 12:10)—a text that likely evokes a fair amount of discomfort in contemporary Germany, especially given Bach’s martial setting with trumpets and timpani.

Thus, while Gubaidulina appealed only to painting (Giotto and Michelangelo) and church architecture as precedent for her combination of earthly and heavenly time, there is also some musical precedent. In addition, musicologist Anja Städtler finds visual precedent in Russian iconography, including in the icons of the Cathedral of the Assumption at the Kremlin, from the end of the 15th century, and frescoes from the Cathedral of the Annunciation from the early 16th century.

century. Städtler also finds precedent in 17th century church murals painted during the time of internal schism.\footnote{Anja Städtler, \textit{Der Zyklus “Passion und Auferstehung Jesu Christi nach Johannes” von Sofia Gubaidulina. Werk und kultureller Kontext}, (Berlin: Verlag Ernst Kuhn, 2012), 191.}

Gubaidulina’s theology in this piece is complex, and offers several points of comparison with the theology of Bach’s \textit{Johannes-Passion}. In his study of Bach’s \textit{John Passion}, Michael Marissen describes three “Christian views of God’s reconciliation with humanity” that he finds at work in the piece. These are useful not only for understanding the Bach, but for deciphering the vision of reconciliation expressed in \textit{Johannes-Passion}. The first is “Christus Victor,” a theology that outlines a now-familiar millennial script, in which “divine glory” is realized through “deepest abasement.” In this view, God is revealed to humanity “only ‘hidden’ in the lowliness of the crucifixion,” through which he nonetheless triumphs. Marissen sees this especially at work in the Bach aria that immediately follows the crucifixion, “Es ist vollbracht.” In that movement, the lament-evoking chromatic descent that comprises the A section gives way in the B section to a major key and an air of martial triumph. Here Bach sets the text, “The hero from Judea wins through strength.” It is this view of reconciliation that posits “one’s suffering is to be taken as a sign not of God’s abandonment but of his presence.”\footnote{Michael Marissen, \textit{Lutheranism, Anti-Judaism, and Bach’s St. John Passion} (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 18.}

The second kind of reconciliation Marissen discusses is the “Latin” or “satisfaction” theory, in which the crucifixion is taken as a “perfect sacrifice” which allows humankind to eschew the extremes of God’s wrath and mercy, since reparation for sinfulness has already been made on the cross. Marissen gives as an example of this reconciliation the aria, “Mein Teurer Heiland,” which follows on the heels of “Es ist vollbracht,” and likewise offers commentary on the final moment of Jesus’s life. It is this aria in particular that I will compare to what follows the
crucifixion in Gubaidulina’s work; they are similar in that they bring together two temporal modes, but dissimilar in their view of reconciliation. Gubaidulina adheres toughly to her apocalyptic vision, in which destruction of much more than Jesus’s physical body is necessary, and the full measure of God’s wrath, as written in the Book with Seven Seals described by John the Revelator, must be poured out. Bach, by contrast, employs “explicitly sacrificial language” in this aria with chorale, which combined with the chorale’s message of eternal life, suggests that one man’s sacrifice has sufficed for all of humanity to be spared. 48

The third view is the “ethical theory,” which posits that incarnation itself is an expression of God’s love, and that it gives humankind the freedom to “love one another.” Marissen’s example of this is the chorale, “Er nahm alles wohl in acht,” which is a commentary on the moment when Jesus, looking down from the cross, sees his mother, Mary wife of Cleophas, Mary Magdalene, and John (the “disciple whom he loved”), and presents his mother and John to one another as mother and son.

Marissen’s examples are all settings of narrative moments in the John Gospel that Gubaidulina sets as well. But if Bach’s music projects religious sentiments that cover all three of these views of reconciliation, Gubaidulina largely stays focused on the first, “Christus Victor,” and in a fairly stringent form that puts Jesus through the “deepest abasement.” With regard to other forms of reconciliation, there is nothing in her setting to suggest that Jesus’s sacrifice has allowed humankind to avoid God’s wrath. On the contrary, and far from the Johannine view that “victory is secured already at the cross,” Gubaidulina’s victory is not assured until the world itself is destroyed. It may not be assured at all until the final movement of the Johannes-Passion’s companion piece, the Johannes-Ostern, whose final two movements are “The Judgement: Alleluia,” and “Jesus is Risen From the Dead.”

48 Marissen, 10.
In analyzing Gubaidulina’s Passion I will focus on three aspects of the musical setting: first, the cyclical device that Gubaidulina embeds in her setting, which arrests the forward drive of earthly time and comments on the heavenly time; second, the structure of the central movement, “Road to Golgotha,” where the temporal modes come together, and where disbelief is converted to belief; here, Gubaidulina offers a form of musical evangelism. Third, I will consider how the Johannes-Passion compares in its setting of the crucifixion with Bach’s setting of the same scenes and verses, and what that says about their approach to the idea of reconciliation. Despite Gubaidulina’s emphasis on the crucifixion and apocalypse, she creates a cyclical component to the piece by periodically returning to the opening of the Gospel of John, and using this text as disruption and commentary: “Im Anfang war das Wort, und das Wort war bei Gott, und das Wort war Gott.” The first movement, after a series of dissonant blasts from the organ and percussion, is completely filled up by this single statement from John 1. Gubaidulina presents this text as a declaration of collective belief, having both choruses sing it more or less in unison, despite the relative difficulty of the rhythms. This difficulty may or may not be a residue of the translation from the Russian, where it is also challenging rhythmically; either way, Gubaidulina is known for her rhythmic complexity and for having sought to develop that aspect of her writing.⁴⁹ Only once the collective statement of belief is made are questions of disbelief raised and parceled out among the vocal forces.

This text next appears at the end of the fifth movement, “Hope.” Here it glosses the movement’s overall emphasis on the word of God, which brings to the foreground the logocentric essence of the Gospel of John. Gubaidulina’s biographer, Michael Kurtz, attributes her choice of John to this logocentrism, saying “the gospel of John, with its central concept of the *logos* and its emphasis on pity and love, is closer than the other three Gospels to the heart of the Orthodox Church.” And when asked about the meaning of this repetition, Gubaidulina acknowledged a personal connection to this aspect of John, saying, “I used this text because in my opinion, the Word is God…the Word, personified in the Son of God, is one meaning. But our word, as a

---


work, is also something crucified. We idealize something with our thoughts, and then project it into a space with fewer dimensions—this is something every artist does. That is why this text is so important for my Passion.”52 (This is not the only time that Gubaidulina compares artistic creation to crucifixion; in an undated interview with Kurtz, she said, “Each time it feels like a crucifixion when I commit a composition to paper one piece at a time, because the essential musical experience takes place within me.”)53

While Gubaidulina’s musical language is not much concerned here with pity and love, she does work to emphasize the logocentrism of John’s Gospel. Movement Five includes the final prayer Jesus directs to God before the traditional Passion portion of the Gospel begins. The bass sings the role of Jesus, with large leaps and longer rhythms, while the chorus sings in small intervals and jagged, syncopated rhythms. Both the soloist and the chorus reiterate the importance of the divine logos, with phrases including “I have revealed your name to the people and they have held fast to your word,” and “Your word is truth.” “Im Anfang war das Wort” returns at the end of this movement in a far more subdued statement, sung by the male voices only.

Thus we are offered a complex gloss on Jesus’s divinity. If Jesus is divine, as he says here (“you have given him authority over all people that he might give eternal life”), then it is also his word that is the truth. And if that is the case, then “In the beginning was the Word” also enhances Jesus’s divinity—and makes him both alpha and omega, whose end is coming, but who is called back to the beginning by the restatement of the opening text. Jesus is therefore not only approaching the end of both human and heavenly time; he is also present for the beginning of both. That “alpha and omega” is a name for Jesus or God in the Revelation of John (22:13) only

53 Kurtz, 176.
underscores the importance of this interpolation here. As in most Passions, Gubaidulina’s bass narrator gives the piece an aurally unmistakable through-line, but her unique innovation, the recurrence of “Im Anfang war das Wort” also creates another temporal layer, by creating a structure of recurrence and recollection in the piece.

The “Im Anfang” verse recurs three more times, each in relation to a Revelation text: in the Road to Golgotha movement, in “A Woman Clothed With the Sun,” which follows the crucifixion, and in the final movement, “The Seven Bowls of Wrath.” This appearance in the movement “Hope” is thus the only place where it is associated primarily with earthly time, commenting on the prayer Jesus offers immediately before crossing the river Kidron.

**Encounter at Golgotha**

Of the central movement of the Johannes-Passion, “The Way to Golgotha,” Gubaidulina has written, “No. 8…[is] the center in which the events of the Passion and the Apocalypse intersect polyphonically. In view of the Cross, the entire process unfurls further as a double helix—the Way and the Conflict of the People. The ‘Way to Golgotha’ leads to the most important moment of the form, ‘the death of Jesus,’ ‘A Woman Clothed with the Sun.’”54 “The Way to Golgotha” is indeed a meeting of earthly and heavenly time; the narrative of Jesus’s path to the crucifixion (John 19) is interspersed with terrifying heavenly events (primarily from Revelation 9).

There are therefore several narratives arcs in the movement. First is the narration of Jesus on the road to Golgotha and the crucifixion, along with other crucial events of the John Gospel: the soldiers gambling for Jesus’s clothes, the communication with his mother and John from the cross, concluding with the final declaration: “Es ist vollbracht.” Simultaneously, the two choruses argue about Jesus’s divinity. Second is the apocalyptic text, largely from Revelation 8,

---

describing a series of trumpet-blowing angelic catastrophes with drastic consequences: the burning of the earth, hail and fire, the sea turning to blood, light turning to darkness. Finally, there is the recurrence of “Im Anfang.” (See Table 3.1).

The intersection of the temporal zones begins almost immediately, with the bass representing earthly time, and the baritone representing heaven via texts from Revelation. The two primary voices and their texts are constructed differently, although they overlap very closely. Earthly time begins with, and is repeatedly marked by, a slow, march-like progression in the Wagner tuba. The bass remains fixated on the interval of a minor second, which has been a kind of reciting tone throughout the piece in its narration of the gospel portions. By contrast, heavenly time takes place in registers that are literally much higher (although not necessarily always high), with thicker orchestration, and much more active and agitated rhythms (compare examples 2.2 and 2.3).

Ex. 3.2: Sie übernahmen Jesus, Bass entrance
From the opening, the intersection of the temporal modes is produced musically by a very close juxtaposition of the two styles and narratives, which enter into a dialogue in which it is sometimes difficult to tell one from the other. The bass’s first line, “Sie übernahmen Jesus,” sparsely accompanied, from the John Gospel, is “answered” by the baritone, who excitedly reports, “Der erste Engel blies die Posaune,” from Revelation, accompanied by organ and bass trombone leaping between registers. In addition to their closely staggered entrances, Gubaidulina further blends their music by having the baritone also partly bound to the interval of the minor second; the difference is that his lines explode outward to include leaps of a minor ninth, often anticipated or mimicked in the bass trombone. Still, there is enough similarity between the two voices that they are not immediately delineated at the beginning of the movement.
The action of this movement builds by way of the heavenly dimension, which increases all of its materials as the movement builds toward its climax: the register gets slowly higher, the chorus gets more active and agitated, and the baritone’s portion takes over the bass. The climax of the piece arrives as the Hebrew crowd’s realistic debate over what to do with Jesus overlaps with the baritone’s hallucinatory image of two hundred million horses and riders from Revelation 9:

**Baritone:** Then the sixth angel blew his trumpet and I saw troops of cavalry numbering two hundred million horses and on the horses were riders.

**Chorus I:** If this man were not from God, he could do nothing.

**Chorus II:** He must die because he has claimed to be the Son of God. This man is not from God. He does not observe the Sabbath. This man is a sinner. Surely the Messiah does not come from Galilee. He must die.

If the crowd in Rihm’s Passion carried with it the “incipient violence of the approaching mob,” as I argued in chapter 1, Gubaidulina’s mob has arrived. She makes full use of both choruses, sometimes dividing them internally and sometimes setting them against each other. While Chorus I is given pitches throughout, Chorus II sings in *Sprechstimme*. Both make personal and theological claims about Jesus, with Chorus I his advocate and Chorus II his denier, often in turn or in dialogue: “He has opened my eyes;” “This man is not from God;” “This man is a sinner;” “Can a demon open the eyes of the blind?” The setting of these debates places them in the musical background, largely unintelligible, punctuating the larger actions taking place. Chorus I arrives at its conclusion early: “Dieser ist Christus!,” from which is hardly wavers; the second chorus is still not convinced, responding, “Er nannte Gott sein Vater, machte sich dadurch Gott gleich (“He called God his father, and thereby made himself like God”). (Table 3.1)
Ex. 3.4: Chorus I and II dispute

This dialogue, which takes place behind the two primary action zones of crucifixion and Revelation, makes for some uncomfortable moments, especially as all these different actions and narratives start to come much closer together. When the High Priest (“the high priest of the Jews,” in Gubaidulina’s libretto) says, “Do not write, ‘King of the Jews;’ write instead ‘He said, I am King of the Jews’” he is overlapping with Chorus II, the Jews themselves, who are declaring, “He has earned death, because he has claimed to be the Son of God!” The second chorus is especially characterized by legalistic wrangling over the question of Jesus’s divinity. This characterization plays into old Christian (especially Paulist) stereotypes about Jewish legalism, and is a longstanding anti-Judaic trope that easily elides into anti-Semitism. I will return to the issue of the John Passion’s anti-Semitism, but these kinds of scenes, in which it is explicitly “the Jews” who call for and incite the death of Jesus, are precisely the ones that Rihm and Golijov sought to avoid.
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Also disturbingly, Gubaidulina seems to resolve this dispute partly by extending an offer of salvation to Chorus II salvation in musical form. In a context where the Pharisees are already depicted as legalistic wranglers, moving from *Sprechstimme* to pitch can be understood as a (Christian’s) desire to see the Jews converted. Here, they are shown throwing out pieces of “evidence” in an ongoing argument against Jesus’s divinity and for his death, such as “no prophet is to arise from Galilee,” and “He called God his own Father, thereby making himself equal to God,” and “He does not observe the sabbath.” Not only are they denying the return of the messiah (in the terms of the piece), but they are missing the real, eschatological drama playing out before their eyes. As the chorus begins to question its own doubt, it gradually moves to more specific pitches, thus emulating Chorus I and its consistent declarations of belief. Chorus II thus gains musicality by becoming believers. That Gubaidulina abruptly “converts” them to singing, and that they thereafter fully abandon their arguments in favor of ecstatic declarations of “This is the messiah!” is more than a little disturbing.

Near the end of the movement (the longest of the piece), Gubaidulina depicts the actions familiar from Bach’s Passion, including the declaration of thirst, the giving of vinegar, the commendation of Mary to John as a mother to her son. Immediately after the soldiers have offered Jesus vinegar, the basses of both choruses unite for a statement of “Im Anfang war das Wort.” The voicings, which were quite wide at the piece’s opening, spread across SATB, are very narrow, even claustrophobic, now —in the terms set up by the solo bass, they are bound to earthly time, which at this point in the piece has almost run its course in Jesus’s life.
Example 3.5, Im Anfang war das Wort, II

The only action that remains in the movement is Jesus’s death, whose text Gubaidulina translated into German in a way almost identical to Bach’s.

Gubaidulina
Als Jesus von dem Essig genommen hatte, sprach er: Es ist vollbracht!
Und er neigte das Haupt und gab seinen Geist auf.

Bach
Da nun Jesus den Essig genommen hatte, sprach er: Es ist vollbracht!
Und neiget das Haupt und verschied.

Gubaidulina follows Jesus’s death on the cross with even more apocalyptic in the form of “A Woman Clothed With the Sun,” a truly daunting text that paints Jesus as conquering hero (“Now have come the salvation and the power and the kingdom of our God…The accuser of our comrades has been thrown down…They have conquered him by the blood of the Lamb and by his testimony”). However martial and destructive, Gubaidulina is offering a strange kind of hope, as the earth itself shifts irrevocably over to heavenly time: “The Kingdom of the world has become the Kingdom of our Lord, and of his Messiah, and he will reign for ever and ever.” The music is fortissimo sempre, with the soloists using microphones, and strings and brass glissandi that sound almost like quotes from Mussorgsky’s Night on Bald Mountain; Gubaidulina appears to be reaching for musical tropes that convey a particularly Russian form of supernatural terror. In the midst of this, the chorus gives another statement of “Im Anfang war das Wort,” which, in
fragments, pervades the movement and then ends it. The beginning has been brought about once more by the end.

**Bach’s Passion as Reconciliation**

What Bach does after the crucifixion is quite different. Although like Gubaidulina, Bach works in multiple temporal modes simultaneously, mixing present and past tenses with gestures toward the infinite, he does not abandon earthly time altogether. Where Gubaidulina unites the Passion’s millennial script with an actual apocalypse, Bach backs away from the destruction in order to offer another version of a world remade.

The place where Bach most clearly juxtaposes earthly and heavenly time is in the post-crucifixion aria, “Mein Teurer Heiland.” In Bach’s setting, the crucifixion is largely set in recitative and sung by the Evangelist; Jesus speaks only twice during number 29 (Und von Stund an nahm sie der Jünger): “I thirst,” and “It is finished.” The next movement is the highly dissonant aria, “Es ist Vollbracht.” This aria could hardly be further from “Woman Clothed With the Sun,” at least in the opening lament, which resolves to a major cadence. However, the aria’s B section offers a parallel with Gubaidulina in its mood of martial victory, with a faster tempo and triadic writing that evokes the “warlike” music of the *stile concitato*. The text also speaks directly of victory: “The hero from Judea wins through strength.”

This aria, like several in Bach’s John Passion, is separated from the next only by a fragment of recitative, in this case, the true conclusion of Jesus’s journey to death: “Und neiget das Haupt und verschied,” which is glossed by “Mein Teurer Heiland.” It is this aria that Michael Marissen sees as an example of the “satisfaction” theory of reconciliation between God and humanity. Here, like Gubaidulina, Bach superimposes the earthly, physical death of Jesus with
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the promise or depiction of heavenly eternity. But Bach situates this post-crucifixion aria non-diagonetically, outside of the immediate action, commenting on it rather than participating in it. This is something that Gubaidulina never does—her voices are either in earthly pain or in heavenly wrath, or both; they are never at a distance, and this contributes to the sense of claustrophobic suspense the piece consistently produces.

In “Mein Teurer Heiland,” Bach addresses the aria directly to Jesus, rather than narrating his actions. The primary voice in the aria is the baritone, who sings to Jesus both in, and about, the present and what has just occurred: “Now that you have been crucified, and said yourself: ‘It is finished.’” In the line “it is finished,” the time elapsing within the piece itself becomes a reference, as the soloist refers to the two previous statements of that phrase: Jesus himself in the recitative, and the aria, “Es ist vollbracht.” The address to recent events, along with the textual reference to what has just occurred, anchor the soloist in the present, earthly time. But Bach brings in eternal, heavenly time by way of the chorus, which enters in the middle of the word “geschlagen,”—crucified—with the text “Now you live without end.” The chorus glosses the soloist’s words; as the narrator asks, “Am I made free from death?” the chorus sings, “I will turn nowhere else but to you, who has absolved me.” This is the “satisfaction” theory to which Marissen refers: Jesus’s death absolves the world, and allows humanity to eschew the full wrath of God. In other words, in Bach’s Passion—and opposed to Gubaidulina’s—the end of Jesus and the end of the world are not the same, nor do they have to be; Jesus’s death leads to absolution, not destruction.

Bach’s depiction still works on the terms of the Passion’s millennial script; Jesus’s death is required to reach the absolution. But the catastrophe is taken on by a single figure, allowing the rest of humanity to escape the violence. Gubaidulina offers no such hope: the catastrophe of
the crucifixion is inextricable from the literal catastrophe of the end time. The only hope she offers is the hope of renewal, in her constant cycling back to the Beginning. Bach, too, by returning to a style of direct address to Jesus, evokes his opening movement, “Herr, unser Herrscher.” But where Gubaidulina repeatedly implements violence and starts again, only to encounter more violence, Bach repeatedly takes a step back, allowing the believing observer to speak outside the time of the action.

The John Passion and “the Jews”

Gubaidulina’s highly dramatic tableau at Golgotha, in which the Jews of Jerusalem fail to recognize the Messiah even against the backdrop of his triumphant return, and during which Gubaidulina manipulates musical process to dramatize their possible coming to belief, also brings me to a last question: what are the obligations of writing a John Passion after the Holocaust? And can an apocalyptic work based in scripture, at the end of the twentieth century, avoid the political?

Aside from those of Pärt and Gubaidulina, the most high-profile recent John Passion is by the Scottish composer James MacMillan, from 2007. The depiction of the Jews in the Gospel of John, and Bach’s setting of that depiction, has been controversial, especially in the United States, since the mid-twentieth century. Two of the four Passion 2000 composers explicitly stated that they avoided the John Passion because of its reputation for anti-Semitism. Rihm felt that as a German composer, he had “no other choice” than to choose the relatively benign Gospel of Luke; Golijov, who cheerfully admitted he had never read the Christian bible before receiving
this commission, nonetheless knew that the Mark gospel was “safe,” and that the John gospel was “terrible for Jews.”

Each of three composers of contemporary John Passions places Christian belief at the center of their identity: both Pärt and Gubaidulina foreground their Eastern Orthodoxy, while MacMillan is a notably conservative Catholic. This might explain their choice: none of them is likely to either alter the text, the way it has been altered in some American performances, or to let claims of anti-Semitism deter them from the opportunity to set the gospel most associated with the liturgical calendar’s celebration of Holy Week.

And those claims persist. In a review of MacMillan’s Passion in *The Forward*, Benjamin Ivry wrote, “MacMillan’s ‘St. John Passion’ is full of hatred, the classical equivalent of Mel Gibson’s ‘Passion of the Christ.’” Interestingly, Ivry lets Gubaidulina off the same hook, because she does not include the Good Friday Reproaches, as MacMillan does, in which Jesus rebukes the Jews. Ivry alludes to MacMillan’s “oft-stated claims of victimhood as a Scottish Catholic,” quoting MacMillan’s claim at the Edinburgh Festival that anti-Catholicism was the “anti-Semitism of liberal intellectuals.” MacMillan is also quoted as rejecting calls to censor or alter works on the basis of their alleged anti-Semitism, taking controversy over *The Death of Klinghoffer* as an example, he argued, “To in any way inhibit the production because of political grievances would be culturally immature.”

MacMillan wrote a response to the editor of *The Forward*, in which he flatly denied that the Passion narrative could ever be anti-Semitic: “Ivry’s implication that the Gospel of John is
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anti-Semitic is offensive to Christians.” This is a startling counterattack, which to my knowledge has no precedent in previous discussions of musical Passion settings. MacMillan adds Vatican II, “which addressed the relationship of the church to our elder brothers in faith, the Jewish people,” and argues that the Good Friday Reproaches “are a liturgical tool to remind those Catholics, present at Good Friday services, of their own sinfulness.” In addition, MacMillan points to his status as a “staunch friend of Israel” and participation in “joint Jewish-Christian ecumenical dialogue,” rejecting charges of musical or personal anti-Semitism. He did not, however, shy away from Islamophobia, concluding his letter by saying, “The real antisemitic threat today is to be found in the mosques of London and Birmingham, and certainly not in concert halls.”

Like Gubaidulina and Pärt, MacMillan does not hesitate to name “the Jews” as the perpetrators of Jesus’s crucifixion; that is, he retains the conventional text, which rather than referring to a “crowd” or “people,” refers to the Jews specifically. In MacMillan’s Passion, when Pilate speaks to the crowd, the text reads, “The Jews said to him, ‘It is not lawful for us to put any man to death.’” Jesus ruminates on the possibility that under different circumstances he would not be “handed over to the Jews” (texts from the Reproaches). There is also a brief but vivid taunting scene, in which both choruses sing “Hail, hail, King of the Jews!” This is different from Gubaidulina’s setting, which narrates this moment, but does not set it dramatically. Yet she has her chorus of Jews “come to Jesus,” essentially. Can this be overlooked, and if so, how?

This might have been a largely theological issue, relegated to an obscure musicological debate about textual fidelity in Bach, were it not for the Holocaust and the subsequently (rightly)
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heightened sensitivity to and awareness of manifestations of anti-Semitism. The initial debate over the Bach setting of the John Passion had to do with the question of whether Bach himself could be said to have been anti-Semitic, or whether his setting of the Gospel text had other meaning. The consensus has been that Bach was unlikely to have known any or many Jews, as they were prohibited from living in Leipzig during his time there; that he was following Luther’s translation of the Gospel; and that any anti-Semitic message that a contemporary listener might pick up could more accurately be described as a theological “anti-Judaism,” such as that Gubaidulina picks up in her legalistic depiction of the Jews. In the twentieth century United States, however, a more recent debate has been about whether or not to change the text for performances. The conductor Lukas Foss, engaged by the New York Philharmonic to conduct the John Passion in 1966, requested that the text not be printed in the program, ostensibly to avoid the sound of thousands of pages being turned simultaneously, but as Foss put it in a memo to artistic coordinator Carlos Mosely, “also important that we don’t get all that dated anti-Semitism into print. Whenever it is done, it produces a flurry of letters.”

While there is no documentation on the decision to actually change the wording, a letter from a Rabbi Morrison Bial documents one person’s response: “I just want to tell you that I for one am very appreciative of the changes in wording that you made in the Bach Passion. It is not only that I have writhed during a performance because of the cruelty of the text. Far more, it is because it fosters anti-Semitism, and leads to cruelty just where there should be harmony and brotherhood.” Rabbi Bial followed this with a letter to the New York Times, whose critic, Harold Schonberg, had written, in a largely negative review, “Another thing, the New Testament was rewritten for the occasion. The Gospel According to St. John has a good deal to say about the part of the Jews in the crucifixion. But the Philharmonic was not going to offend anybody’s

feelings. Every time the word ‘Jew’ came up in Bach’s text, another word was substituted—‘Leute,’ or ‘Volke,’ or the equivalent…How silly can you get?”63 To which Rabbi Bial responded, “In your review of the recent St. Matthew Passion (sic)…you spoke of the change of the wording of the text as inane and unnecessary…I can tell you from many years of such experience [of working with interfaith groups] of how grateful I am for such changes. It is not only that sensitive ears like mine are grated by the cruel repetitions, untrue historically and totally unrelated to a grandiose musical experience. Far more, such charges – even in the context of a great musical work – have fostered anti-Semitism and have made ‘Holy Week’ a period of pogrom and hatred….”64

It is difficult, from a late twentieth-century perspective, to overlook the textual issues in the John Gospel, whether one proceeds with a setting or not. Marissen’s suggestion that any textually unaltered performance of the Bach include a discussion about the history and meaning of the text would seem to apply doubly to a contemporary setting of the same Gospel. And yet, Gubaidulina, who is quoted as saying “I love Jesus as he is seen by John,” does not offer any explanation or even acknowledge the possibility that her decisions might be looked at askance.65 If Jesus’s suffering in her Passion takes place in earthly time, where does modern Jewish suffering take place?

Or is this an inescapably contemporary question? Historian Tony Judt has argued that the key to accessing European modernity at the turn of the twenty-first century—that is, the key to accessing the European community (not only its economic community)—is acknowledgement of
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the Holocaust. This requirement to remember stands in stark contrast to the kind of deliberate Holocaust forgetting that Judt describes as a widespread phenomenon throughout Europe after the war, where the specifics of genocide were erased in memorial culture, as each “sacrifice” was inscribed as part of the national body. By choosing to disregard a music-specific debate around anti-Semitism, does Gubaidulina (and do Pärt and MacMillan) take a position of anti-modernity, or of anti- or non-Europeanness? Going back to Caroline Bithell’s arguments, is setting the rigorous, logocentric, controversial John Gospel another way of claiming an “alternative worldview to that predicated on a linear view of history driven by progress and betterment?”

For many Westerners, the end of the Cold War justified such a progressive view. Gubaidulina and Pärt, began their musical lives in places whose war and post-war histories formed a kind of mirror image to the dominant Western narratives. And yet, by the millennial turn, the Soviet Union and its satellites had collapsed and it seemed that the way forward was that of the postnational European Union; whose price of access, again, was a reckoning with Europe’s anti-Semitic past. But if Bach—the Ur-composer of Passions—could be taken to task for setting an anti-Semitic text, why would a contemporary composer feel justified in using the same text, telling the same story, without explanation or any attempt at justification?

Perhaps the answer lies in the millennial turn itself, and the apocalyptic mindsets it seemed to foster. Gubaidulina referred to it more than once in talking about this piece. Rather than looking back at the Holocaust for a reason to reject the writing of a new John Passion that does not critique, or at least avoid, the more controversial aspects of the Gospel, we can look back at millennium’s approach, and the terrible hope that so many people—ranging from the American militias to the religious orthodox of many kinds—had for the end, and therefore the purification, of the world. I have shown that Gubaidulina sees in apocalyptic a purification, and
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therefore cause for rejoicing, whatever “catastrophes” might befall people along the way. In “Road to Golgotha,” Gubaidulina gives the Jews a Christian conversion: salvation. But in much of Christian endtime doctrine, the unconverted Jew is there only to hasten the end. Strozier does not distinguish among denominations when he writes, “for all contemporary [Christian] fundamentalists the great prophetic moment of the twentieth century was the founding of the Israeli state in 1948 because it seemed to realize their own predictions about the ‘ingathering’ of the Jews. The more agitated talk portentously of 1948 as starting the end time clock ticking and await with ambivalence the appearance of Antichrist. In such a rendition the climactic moment of the end time narrative must be the year 2000 as the inevitable moment for the rapture of the faithful and the beginning of the tribulation.” If 2000 was going to be the end of the end, and bring about the Rapture, then a millennial, millennialist musical work could perhaps be expected to participate in the process.

**Conclusion**

Gubaidulina’s *Johannes-Passion* has had around fifteen performances on its own, and perhaps another six as part of the cycle, *The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus According to John*. It seems unlikely to enter the repertory. Critics did not rush to praise Gubaidulina’s work, although they have generally (not always) couched their rejection in respectful tones. Reviewing the Rilling recording, Andrew Clements found it “rather empty and bombastic.” Stephen Johnson wrote, ambiguously, “It’s hard to believe that anyone could make so much from so little” before commenting on Gubaidulina’s “textures of immense complexity,” evoking Ligeti and
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Shostakovich, and declaring that the piece “haunts the mind”; however, he concludes, “I’ll think long and hard before taking it out again.”

Mark Swed, who admired the piece, saw in it a “terrible warning for Russia,” adding however, that it “ultimately overwhelms,” and that “the apocalypse appears to be just around the corner.”

He may have been right about that. In *Johannes-Passion*, God’s wrath is the inevitable conclusion of the crucifixion, and has the effect of ushering in the end time. Richard Landes, a scholar of millennialism, reminds us that the arrival of the kingdom of heaven—which in Gubaidulina follows immediately on the crucifixion—promises “an imminent and public release from all the pain and suffering that the righteous suffer…the day of the Lord was, for the true believer, not one of fear but one of hope, not one of terror but one of vindication.”

Consequently, in many millennial scripts fear and hope, terror and vindication intermingle, rather than negate one another. This is true in Gubaidulina’s Passion; both the music and text are terrifying, but the terror is meant to provide at least some hope, in that it will lead to the world remade. Again, however, the purification Gubaidulina seeks can only come at a dreadful cost, no matter how anodyne she and Ivan Moody want to make the “unveiling” sound.

And is it possible, at the end of the twentieth century, to conceive of apocalypse apolitically? Charles Strozier acknowledges that cultural anxieties about end times are both pervasive and long-standing, but he rejects the argument that to experience the end of the twentieth century with particular anxiety was grandiose, for the simple reason that apocalyptic fantasies at the end of the twentieth century are “historically unique: they occur in the context of


real, scientific possibilities of ultimate destruction.” But it is not only the science of ultimate, or total, destruction that had to be grasped at the end of the twentieth century; it is also the less total, but terrifying, smaller-scale destructions that had to be grappled with. In extolling the apocalypse as “purity” to be glorified, Gubaidulina disregards the terrible precedents set by other millennial scripts—familiar in the Soviet Union, as I have shown—whose visions of purity transferred suffering onto other people, usually in the name of a greater good. In other words, to conceive of the Apocalypse as a form of renewal, whatever hope the conception is intended to bring vies with the violence it promises. And while all apocalyptic visions “traffic in the currency of transformation,” not all transformative visions, as Wessinger argues in distinguishing catastrophic and progressive millennialism, are apocalyptic.

The through-line of Gubaidulina’s Passion is therefore not only the millennial script, which, like other apocalyptic texts, here “gives value to endurance and patience under suffering,” but also the theme of judgment: the wrath of God attendant on the crucifixion, and the possibility (or hope) that apocalyptic time is already underway. McGinn warns, “There is still an important difference between a general consciousness of living in the last age of history and a conviction that the last age itself is about to end.” This is not a distinction that Gubaidulina’s vision of the millennium seems to acknowledge. In her construction, the millennium was cause for terrible hope, for the possibility that by means of the apocalypse, purity would be attained. The apocalyptic time had already come; those listening to the piece could only hope—and maybe pray—to be purified in the process.
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Table 3.1—Temporal Modes in “Gang Nach Golgotha”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earthly Time I (John 19)</th>
<th>Earthly Time II (John 4, 9, 10)</th>
<th>Heavenly Time (Revelation)</th>
<th>Cyclical Time (John 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bass</strong></td>
<td><strong>Choruses I &amp; II</strong></td>
<td><strong>Baritone</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male voices I &amp; II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers take Jesus (Ex. 3.2)</td>
<td>This man is a sinner; how can he be?</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; angel blows trumpet (Ex. 3.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He carries cross to Golgotha</td>
<td>He is out of his mind/ if he were not from God, he could do nothing. This is the Messiah/ he is deceiving the crowd. No prophet will arise from Galilee/ he opened my eyes.</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; angel blows trumpet; a third of the sea became blood; 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; angel blows trumpet; a third of the waters become bitter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crucified with 2 others</td>
<td>This is the Messiah/ He called God his father, making himself equal to God. This is truly the savior/ better one man die than to have the whole nation destroyed.</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; angel blows trumpet; a third of sun and moon are struck.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilate inscribes, “Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews”</td>
<td>(II): He called God his father, making himself equal; he must die because he has claimed to be Son of God.</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; angel blows trumpet; star falls from heaven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief priest of Jews objects (write “He said, ‘I am King,’ etc.”)</td>
<td>He must die because he claimed to be Son of God.</td>
<td>He was given the key to the shaft of the bottomless pit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilate: “What I have written, I have written”</td>
<td>(I/II)This is the Messiah!/He called God his father, making himself equal to God. Truly the savior/ prophet shall not come from Galilee.</td>
<td>He opened the shaft of the bottomless pit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldiers divide clothes</td>
<td>(II) Is this not Jesus, son of Joseph, whose</td>
<td>From smoke came locusts, with scales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents we know? When Messiah comes, no one will know where he is from. (I) If this man were not from God, he could do nothing.</td>
<td>like iron breastplates. Their tails were like scorpions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soldiers gamble for clothes, fulfilling Scripture</strong></td>
<td>(II) This man is a sinner. He does not observe the Sabbath. Surely the Messiah does not come from Galilee? (I) If this man were not from God, he could do nothing. (II) He must die. (I) Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. (II) This is the Messiah!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th angel blows trumpet; 200 million troops, horses, and on the horses were riders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jesus sees mother, Magdalene, John</strong></td>
<td>(I/II) This is the Messiah!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commends mother and John to one another</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“I thirst”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is given vinegar</strong></td>
<td>In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the word was with God, and the Word was God. (Ex. 3.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinks wine. “It is finished”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bows head and dies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4—Art-Religion for a Global New Age

One of the animating questions behind Passion 2000, directly articulated in the program booklet for the original festival performances, was world-historical: “what meaning does Bach’s work have for today’s composers, and how do they think about questions of religion, Christianity, Passion and resurrection?” If Wolfgang Rihm had grappled with Bach as a figure of Germanness in Deus Passus, engaging one dimension of Bach historiography, Tan Dun embraced another dimension, one with an equally rich discursive history: Bach as a figure of musical universalism. In this construction, and by this definition of Bach, his universalism is tied to both musical and religious discourses; his music is understood to have emotional relevance to all people, at least potentially, with an easy elision between being emotionally affective and spiritually nourishing the world. The organizers of Passion 2000, extending this universalizing historiographical tradition into the twenty-first century also asked what relevance the figure of Bach had outside the West. For Tan, Bach’s music appears to have been relevant to an ongoing universalizing project on behalf of his own music, in which he has staked a claim for its global relevance by way of his words, the commissions and projects in which he has participated, and his compositional choices. Tan’s contribution to Passion 2000, the Water Passion After St. Matthew, placed this pursuit of the musically universal before the widest and most receptive audience possible.

Figuring Bach as musical universal complicates the relationship of Passion 2000 to Bach’s own Passions, whose original purpose was “the relatively local purpose of furnishing the Leipzig liturgical year.” The Bach Passions were contained within the church and the liturgy,
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aligned with a “pre-modern attitude” that “would see human experience as subordinate to and dependent on a greater reality beyond the world.” After Bach’s lifetime, however, his *Matthew Passion* in particular remained neither a local nor a liturgical phenomenon. The 1829 performances led by Mendelssohn, put the work to quite different uses, placing it before an emerging non-liturgical and public audience. While the *Matthew Passion* itself hadn’t changed in that time (notwithstanding Mendelssohn’s cuts and truncations), its uses and associations began to shift as its performance circles expanded beyond the church.

This move outside the church contributed, paradoxically, to the *Matthew Passion*’s construction as a symbol of both musical Germanness and musical universalism. Celia Applegate, for example, has found that the 1829 Mendelssohn program was deeply embedded in the process of producing the German nation, a process initiated in cultural and artistic terms and, ultimately, completed in political terms by German unification. Moreover, moving Bach’s sacred works into the concert hall was significant not only for his renewed reputation in the nineteenth century, but for the general process of sacralizing a newly-defined repertoire of “classical music.” Applegate does not feel that the shift of venue necessarily indicated growing secularization in European society. Instead, she suggests that existing religious feeling needed to find a more expansive place outside of the overtly ecclesiastical and liturgical: “the appearance in a concert hall of a piece of patently religious music, indeed of a Passion oratorio enacting the very core of Christian belief, may reflect the free-floating of piety to places outside traditional sacred spaces just as much as the decline of religious belief.”
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3 Butt, p. 7.

4 Butt, 25.

A new “free-floating” piety found in art music, and increasingly in old music, an object worth attaching to. The ongoing separation of music on sacred subjects from liturgy, essential to Passion 2000, built on fairly radical changes in the cultural valuation of music that were already underway by the 1829 Matthew Passion performance: “To regard sacred music as worthy of performance and preservation, indifferent to the needs of a worship service, required a shift in cultural meaning just as jarring as the idea of regarding purely instrumental music as valuable.”

Similarly, William Weber has shown a shift in musical preference from new music to old music in concert programming from the mid-18th to the late 19th centuries. The change in perspective that accompanied sacred music’s new status as “worthy of preservation” might be understood as part of the same cultural shift that drove a preference for older works.

The religiosity attached to concert hall culture in the wake of these cultural shifts is also related to a more general Kunstreligion—“religion of art”—which had taken hold in German musical aesthetics near the turn of the nineteenth century. Kunstreligion constituted a belief system in which “art is thought to enunciate divine ideas and feelings, artistic experience is compared to religious ritual, and artistic works are seen as divine presences on earth.” It further involved “the sacralization of the listener, concert, composer, and musical work,” and while Kunstreligion has been most widely applied to the idea of absolute music, it extended to church music as well. Bach’s passage from the church to the concert hall can be understood partly as indicative of the extent to which Kunstreligion had found in music a new object of worship, and

---


9 Kramer, 1-2.
the extent, as Applegate argues, to which it offered an alternative to traditional, church-based religiosity.

Elizabeth A. Kramer has explored the effects of *Kunstreligion* on concert life, writing that the *Gottesdienst* (Divine Service) was taken in many places as a model for concerts. She identifies a pivotal role for the *Matthew Passion* in this shift, arguing that the “sacralization of the concert as a musical and dramatic *Gottesdienst* came to a head in the response to revivals of Johann Sebastian Bach’s *St. Matthew Passion* around 1830.”¹⁰ The catechism of *Kunstreligion* drew heavily on ideas of Friedrich Schleiermacher, whose 1799 lectures on religion had both privileged and universalized intimations of transcendence and tied them to the contemplation of art and (especially) music: “Music is one great whole; it is a special, a self-contained revelation of the world. Yet the music of each people is a whole by itself, which again is divided…till we come to the genius and style of the individual… In the same way…religion is, in its individual manifestations…from nothing farther removed than from all semblance of compulsion or limitation.”¹¹

The incipient universalism of *Kunstreligion* informed the reception of other post-Bach German composers, gradually helping generate a discourse of musical universalism that operates as I described above, in which a specific repertoire of (“classical”) music was understood as having emotional and spiritual relevance for everyone. In this sense (manifested in the kinds of “outreach” efforts that continue in classical music culture), musical universalism is loosely akin to characteristic Western religious practices; most notably, to Christian evangelism. *Kunstreligion* itself was a post-Bach phenomenon, moving away from the seventeenth century

¹⁰ Kramer, 134-135.

emphasis on “national style,” especially the styles of French, Italian and German music, which Bach was often credited with synthesizing (a historiographical trope that also persists today). In addition to Bach, Beethoven has benefitted most obviously from Kunstreligion; as Kramer notes, “Beethoven reception reflected the central tenet of Kunstreligion, the belief that music simultaneously reveals the divine and is divine.”

Kunstreligion offered both an alternative to church-bound religiosity, and a place within art-music culture to anchor a “free-floating piety.” In this chapter, I suggest that Tan Dun’s Water Passion After St. Matthew is “after” Bach’s Matthew Passion in precisely this way, transposing the pre-modern Bach (the local church musician), and the high modern Bach (the increasingly universalized avatar of a spreading Kunstreligion) into the postmodern era. Tan’s mode of Kunstreligion is drawn equally from nineteenth century origins and from a postmodern transformation of “free floating piety,” that is, the spiritual seeking of the New Age, whose principles pervade Tan’s words and music. At a time when it seemed that classical music had “lost even its symbolic or ritualistic power to define hierarchies of taste within the larger culture,” it is the residue of that ritualistic power that Tan has drawn on throughout his career, including in the Water Passion. I will show how Tan has drawn together classical music Kunstreligion and New Age principles over the course of his career, and how he deploys them in and around the Water Passion in support of his claim to universal musical relevance. One purpose of this study is to put musical practices into dialogue with the post-1989 discourse of political universalism, largely dominated by ideas about post-Cold War globalization. Tan’s work seems precisely calibrated for a globalizing era: updating Schleiermacher, Tan speaks

12 Kramer, 251.
about music as a “limitless” or “boundaryless” endeavor, and has increasingly put himself into
costically physical, global circulation as a conductor-composer-impresario. (Composers,
though they travel to premieres, are still imagined as monastic, not missionary figures.)

In *Water Passion*, Tan tapped equally into the religious underpinning of classical music
ideology, and into audience desires for experiences that were “spiritual” without necessarily
being religious. The appeal of such experiences for Western listeners in the 1990s was truly
global, widespread across multiple market genres, and was especially robust in the so-called
World Music and World Beat markets, as Steven Feld and Timothy Taylor have shown.¹⁴ The
typical move was to attach the desire for non-spectrally “spiritual” content to non-Western
musicians; Taylor’s critique is apt: “Mostly, listeners’ demands for authentic spirituality apply
to Others, whose perceived enigmatic qualities are often interpreted as spiritual.”¹⁵ This
exoticizing universalism worked to Tan’s advantage, both in the *Water Passion* and in other
works of the 1990s. Back in Greater Europe, classical and new music also saw a late twentieth-
century surge in what Richard Taruskin dismissed as “sacred entertainments,” an implicitly
kitschy category including the other Passion 2000 works, John Adams’s *El Niño*, works by
James MacMillan, Arvo Pärt, and the like.

The interest turn-of-this-century listeners showed in musical-spiritual content rhymes
with the free-floating piety that Applegate first describes in the early nineteenth century,
suggesting the strong tropism of universalizing claims for music and a reservoir of religiously
unchallenged or unaffiliated religious feelings. Tan has re-anchored the desire for spiritual music
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¹⁴ Feld, “The Poetics and Politics of Pygmy Pop,” in *Western Music and its Others,* Georgina Born and David

to the residue of Western Kunstreligion, often in a straightforward way: he simply makes obvious references to figures and works of the Western musical canon, especially Bach and Beethoven, its most worshipped saints. He has banked successfully not only on the historical associations of classical music with religiosity, accrued over time, but the practice of using classical music in lieu of religious music for historical or ceremonial occasions, where it becomes a substitute for sectarian religious music or ritual. All of these associations between music and religion and ritual have been produced through channels as seemingly innocuous as marketing materials (which can be insidious in their own right), and as overtly insidious as the inclusion of classical music in various “civilizing missions.”

The universalizing claims made for classical music are repeatedly renewed, and thereby enhanced. Musicologist Peter Tregear, for example, has recently looked at public events that commemorated the 9/11 attacks, and the ways classical music was associated with them, demonstrating the still-extant power of the musical canon to create a unified public space. For public events that celebrate occasions, especially though not exclusively national occasions, Beethoven has been an especially common choice, in particular (as David Dennis and especially Esteban Buch have shown), the Ninth. While the symphony in its entirety remains a concert-hall staple, the “Ode to Joy” has become—note the adverb—“universally adaptable,” as Nicholas Cook, Slavoj Žižek and others have pointed out, sanctioned and put to political use by states with universalized, even totalitarian ideologies as diverse as Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union, white-supremacist Rhodesia, and communist China, this last even at a time when almost all other


Western music was banned.\footnote{Esteban Buch, \textit{Beethoven’s Ninth: A Political History} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).} In the “free world,” Beethoven and other classical music has often been used to stand in for obsolescent liturgical music, solemnizing the occasion while avoiding the political risks of seeming to “officially” elevate one religion over another; classical music has also been useful for communist states precisely because of its non-religious status, which has allowed it to stand in for a different kind of (state) worship. In short, much of the so-called canon has been regularly and effectively universalized at multiple social levels.

Tan has associated himself with the ceremonial uses of classical music. Over the course of his career, he has had the opportunity to write for several high-profile state occasions, including the festivities surrounding the 1997 handover of Hong Kong to China, for which he wrote \textit{Heaven Earth Mankind (Symphony 1997)}. A few years later, the BBC commissioned him to write the music for its turn-of-the-millennium broadcast, \textit{2000 Today}, for which Tan wrote \textit{2000 Today: A World Symphony for the Millennium}. More recently, he was commissioned to write the theme for the 2008 Beijing Olympics, and has been named a UNESCO Goodwill Ambassador. All of these commissions and honors have provided Tan with ways to develop his ideas about universal, boundaryless music.

Beethoven has been a particular lodestar, and the symphony \textit{Heaven Earth Mankind} can stand in for numerous works of this type. \textit{Heaven Earth Mankind} shared a bill at the 1997 Hong Kong handover gala with, among many other entertainments, a performance of the “Ode to Joy.” In his own piece for the gala, Tan both quoted and alluded to Beethoven. First, in the movement “Jubilation,” the horns play an almost perfect rendition of the D major theme itself, which is altered only slightly, and at the final moment, by Tan’s elision of the cadence into the next phrase. More subtly, but still clearly, in the final movement, “Song of Peace,” the chorus’s high voices arrive at a D major sonority with a melody that briefly outlines the opening pitches of the
“Ode to Joy.” This second allusion is based not only on pitch, but timbre and voice type as well, and specifically evokes the massive choral climax that follows the extended Turkish march and fugue episodes in Beethoven’s finale.

Tan thus created a number of associations of his work with Beethoven’s, not only through the music, but through the creation of a political “echo” as well. In the decade preceding *Heaven Earth Mankind*, one of the most public and widely viewed performances of Beethoven’s Ninth was the one that celebrated the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989, when Leonard Bernstein famously conducted the symphony at the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin. The Hong Kong handover, also marked at least the beginning of political unification for a country riven in two by Cold War tensions, and it is no accident that Tan’s allusions to Beethoven evoke the German occasion, perhaps in hope of also evoking the sense of historical *peripetie* that had greeted the fall of the Wall. Tan name checks Beethoven in discussing the unification of what he calls “East and West,” saying of his own process, “Every artist searches, everyday, to discover the unity of the eternal and external….Our ancestors thought true concordance was the perfect unification of heaven, earth, and mankind. I believe Li Po and Mahler thought so, and Beethoven and Schiller too.”19 A simple, even simplistic, statement, but it elegantly yokes Tan’s Chinese particularity to Western universalism. This rhetoric has been an effective tool of self-promotion, making Tan a booster for the “multiculturalism” of the incorporation aesthetic while giving him a springboard for larger universalist aspirations.

Excerpting the Ode to Joy from the Ninth and performing it outside of its concert hall context are means by which it became, over time, “a symbol that can stand for anything,” as
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Žižek puts it. This is similar to the “excerpting” of religious music from religious services and its decontextualization; both create new and wider arenas for the music, and with that, new attachments and meanings. Such a separation of works from their original context or use, and a successful conversion to new uses, can bolster, rather than compromise, claims of their universal relevance; Tan understands this well. For example, he has taken the “Song of Peace” from *Heaven Earth Mankind* and now offers it as a standalone work. Its world premiere in this configuration was at a New Year’s Eve celebration in Shanghai December 31, 2000 (the actual millennial turn) with Tan on the podium and the highly regarded Peking Opera singer, Shi Min, as a soloist. The Song thereby added layers of meaning to *Heaven Earth Mankind*, which could now be associated with the secular, universal celebration of (European) New Year’s Eve; it could also remind listeners (or readers of program notes, in any case) of the song’s origins in a commission with high political aspirations, and of Tan’s personal involvement in the occasion for which it was written. Finally, through the D-major “Joy” music in “Song of Peace,” it could associate both of those uses with the already “universalized” Beethoven. The free-floating religiosity associated with classical music thus allowed for its continued use as an aestheticized substitute for actual religious ritual, benediction, or blessing of an event or occasion.

Despite the ongoing use of classical music in this way overseas, the Western aura of *Kunstreligion* has been fading for years, especially in the U.S., as art of all kinds falls increasingly under the influence of unmediated market forces in a neoliberal era. (The museum-as-temple has been replaced by the commercial gallery, the auction house, and the art fair; most contemporary orchestras, straining to be more “accessible,” would be horrified to hear that their concerts still give off a whiff of the church service.) Other modes of pietistic expression have
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arisen that directly offer substitutes for organized religion. One such substitute, in the later twentieth century, was the far less organized religion, or religion-like phenomenon, known as New Age spirituality. As a cultural movement and a theme for music, New Age was also highly adaptable to the post-Cold War’s socio-economic and political formations.\textsuperscript{21} I will lay out some of the parameters of New Age thought, and demonstrate Tan’s connections to it in terms of his music, rhetoric, and reception.

For many composers of the late twentieth century, the idea that their music “sounded New Age” was a mortal insult, but Tan has never spoken out against use of this term to describe his music, although it is a regular part of critics’ response, and scholars have remarked on it as well. In Mina Yang’s study of \textit{Water Passion} she does note a connection with the New Age; but it is clear that she intends this as grounds for dismissal, writing that the result is “a piece less than transcendentally sublime and rather more suggestive of New Age music...[creating] a generalized spiritual ambience.”\textsuperscript{22} In Yang’s analysis, insofar as he sounds New Age and “spiritual,” Tan falls short of his quasi-religious universalizing goal. By contrast, I propose that Tan attempts to universalize his music through a uniquely potent combination of skillful references to Western classical music and a synthetic “new” musical style that evokes globalized, post-Cold War New Age systems of belief.

Philosopher Wouter J. Hanegraaff identifies in general New Age thinking several pervasive features, manifestations of which can be found in Tan’s works and words. Above all, there is an objection to dualisms (mind/body, God/human, human/nature etc.), and their replacement with thinking that creates continua (God and humans are “one in their deepest

\textsuperscript{21}Multiple scholarly sources use “New Age” as a noun and an adjective; I will follow suit.

\textsuperscript{22}Mina Yang, \textit{Planet Beethoven: Classical Music at the Turn of the Millennium} (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2014), 107.
New Age also assumes that reductionist, dualistic thought is the legacy of Christianity on the one hand, and scientism on the other. But New Agers “assume the existence of a third current…marginalized and suppressed by the other two. This…is referred to by various terms, such as ‘esotericism’ or ‘gnosis’….In the latter instance, New Agers do not primarily mean the largely dualist metaphysical systems known as gnosticism, but a supposedly universal spirituality based upon the primacy of personal inner experience.”\textsuperscript{23} It is this type of “personal” spirituality that Tan addresses in \textit{Water Passion}, even as he retains the outlines of the Passion story.

Sociologist Paul Heelas’s widely-cited 1996 book on New Age notes consistency among many disparate definitions of New Age, finding “the same (or very similar) lingua franca to do with the human (and planetary) condition and how it can be transformed. This is the language of what shall henceforth be called “Self-spirituality…the monistic assumption that the Self itself is sacred.”\textsuperscript{24} This elevation of the individual Self to a quasi-divine status is not entirely removed from the cult of genius in classical music. The emphasis on individual authorship, inspiration, and genius springs partly from this elevation, which itself would not exist without the phenomenon of \textit{Kunstreligion}. Mina Yang sees the emphasis on the quasi-divine working in Tan’s desire to inhabit these musical values, arguing that while he eschews the word ‘genius,’ Tan “has absorbed enough of the discourses surrounding classical music to understand that the work of an exceptional (genius) artist must transcend particularities of place and time….\textsuperscript{25} At the same time, the connections in Tan’s work to New Age allows him to approach the “universal” not only through the classical music discourse, but also through an association with


\textsuperscript{25} Mina Yang, \textit{Planet Beethoven}, 106.
Nature, itself a kind of eternal, while also appealing to a globalized consumerism that helps sustain “the mask of cultural diversity.”

Musically, Tan has certainly participated in the expectations of New Age music, to the extent it has been analyzed. Dennis Hall laid out five generic attributes of New Age music in a 1994 article, interpreting each of them as manifestations of “postmodernity.” Most of these turn out to be applicable to Tan’s music of the 1990s, including the Water Passion. They are: a constantly shifting character; a deliberate blurring of boundaries between genres, especially “between classical music and mood music;” playfulness, irony, and a “penchant for quotation;” aggressive multiculturalism; and a sense that the music is “anti-intellectual in its stance yet devoted to learning.” For Hall, New Age music’s dominant quality—implied, of course, by the name—is that it is presented as an agent of either transition or transformation. The ethos of renewal is especially important for the last movement of Tan’s Passion, “Water and Resurrection.”

Susan Grove Hall has surveyed the sonic landscape of New Age: “Perceptions of the natural environment dominate titles of the music. Sounds of ocean surf, bird song, crickets whirring, often introduce or interweave within the music.” This, too, is true of Tan’s work, which often calls for performers to splash water, hit stones together, and do other things that are both aurally and visually associated with nature; his titles often make such references as well. Helfried Zrzavy also identifies “the incorporation of environmental sounds”—another take on the incorporation aesthetic, perhaps, one tied to “nature” as a whole—as “one of the hallmarks of
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26 Žižek, In These Times, 16 November 2015.


the New Age sound.” Zrzavy’s stylistic catalog includes: improvisation; subtly cyclic structures; absence of vocals; and the “infusion of ethnic stylings from a wide variety of cultures.”

While *Water Passion* and other Tan works do include vocals, Zrzavy’s list fits his music quite well. Taken together, these descriptions circumscribe a genre based in sounds of nature, cyclic in construction, generically omnivorous, making claims to “spirituality,” and drawing from multiple “world” musics without any imperative to scholarship, experience, or informed performance practice. It is largely by these musical means that I see Tan aligned with the ideas and practices of New Age, although he is further aligned with some analyses of its practices by his consumer-friendliness: his own statements tend to further the perception that Tan is an ally of New Age thought, music, and practices. (Or, perhaps, it is the other way around.)

As a classical composer, Tan has consistently been savvy in how he presents himself to audiences. In the months preceding the Passion 2000 premieres, several German newspapers ran previews and other promotional pieces. Claus Spahn, who was ultimately unimpressed with all of the Passions except that of Rihm, conducted an interview with Tan in the newspaper *Die Zeit* under the acidulous but perceptive headline “Buddha Bach.” The primary focus of the interview was Tan’s relationship to Bach’s music, and its role in his own musical life and output. In it, Tan displays a well-honed ability to address an audience with the language of classical music as free-floating spirituality, drawing on the long-standing image of Bach as healer and contrasting the emotional and spiritual effect of Bach’s music with Beethoven’s. Even while appealing to this insider’s discourse, however, he also polished his own image as a musical outsider and innocent—an enigmatic Other whose late discovery of Bach after a childhood disrupted by the Chinese Cultural Revolution is an example of the universal dimensions of great German music.

---

In their exchange, Spahn seems frustrated by Tan’s classical music nostrums, and Tan talks past Spahn to articulate what his “multi-culti” readers want to hear. Comparing his first experience of hearing the first two “B”s around 1977, Tan said, “Beethoven struck me at the time as a kind of cleansing material, like a strong coffee. But Bach was medicine…[I understood that] it was about hope and deep faith…The structure, the form, the order—it is sounding architecture.” Spahn responded, “What you’re saying speaks directly to the cliché image of Bach as the artist for all living conditions, from whose music a universal strength flows, which can bring comfort even to the furthest corners of the earth.” Tan responded, “Isn’t it so? His music doesn’t just speak to the Western art tradition. It also speaks to the humane.” Tan identifies the use of water in his Passion as “the most important element, standing not only for baptism, but also for renewal, rebirth, the cyclical…the sound of water in my composition is like a passacaglia theme, it is always present.” Spahn challenges Tan’s easy ecumenicism, saying “None of this really sounds like the Christian meaning of the gospel,” to which Tan responds pragmatically: “But I come from another culture…sometimes I go to the (Buddhist) temple and sometimes to church. My past is the East, my present the West. From these two life-worlds, a very special faith has developed for me….”

30 Here, in a nutshell, is New Age syncretism as artistic program.

The Water Passion was not Tan’s first musical engagement with Bach. One of his earliest Western successes was 1994’s Ghost Opera, for string quartet and pipa, written for the Kronos Quartet and Wu Man, who had been a classmate at the Beijing Central Conservatory in the 1970s. Ghost Opera is one of the earliest of Tan’s works to both utilize the emerging incorporation aesthetic and make a universalizing move specifically via the Western canon, juxtaposing musical quotations from canonic Westerners with quotations from Chinese folk song.

(the song “Little Cabbage”), and the sounds of the pipa. Bach represents the universalism of the West through an excerpt from Book II of Well-Tempered Clavier, along with short quotations (shouted by the string players) from Shakespeare’s The Tempest. The composer’s notes position the Bach excerpt as “a seed from which grows a new counterpoint of different ages, different sound worlds and different cultures.”

Tan has claimed to have been “in dialogue” with Bach in writing the *Water Passion*, and while that dialogue is not one of the piece’s most obvious aspects, there are dimensions of Tan’s *Passion* that suggest it. The recurring use of a line, or image, “a sound is heard,” which changes across the piece, evokes Bach’s resetting of the same chorale over the course of his *Matthew Passion*. Tan’s choral writing does often take on the thick texture of a Bach chorale, and he follows Bach in including a musical depiction of the earthquake that follows Jesus’s death; also like Bach, Tan sets the quake “in the time zone of the story,”31 engaging the full ensemble in an improvisation described as “fears, winds, rains, earthquake sounds.”32 While he does not quote Bach directly in this piece, he retains his penchant for allusion, evoking the sound (but not the specific pitches) of the B-A-C-H motive at significant transition in the first movement, when the solo chimes play very similar intervallic content: A-G#-B flat-A.33

**Ex. 4.1, Allusion to B-A-C-H**

31 Butt, 116.


Given his penchant for quotation and allusion, Tan benefitted a great deal from the increasing pluralism of the music of the 1990s, a pluralism that drew on styles, genres, and aesthetics from around the world. The search for global sources of inspiration was mirrored in spiritual life, and most scholars agree that one of New Age’s consistent traits is the appropriation of spiritual practices from around the world. In the same way that musical pluralism, both in “new music” (new classical music) and world music, served Tan and others in their negotiation of the musical market, the New Age approach to world religions is, according to Michael York, “modeled upon, and is an outgrowth of, liberal Western capitalism…Rather than a rejection of free market principles, New Age endorses a spiritualized counterpart of capitalism—one which seeks ever extended markets, new sources of marketable goods, and expanding profits.”

As for which practices and religions are most likely to be absorbed, historian Richard Kyle writes that the “New Age is a meeting of three cultural forces: the Judeo and Christian traditions, Western occult-mysticism, and Eastern religions.” These three “cultural forces” are also combined in Tan’s Water Passion; Tan’s own descriptions bear this out, as does the score itself, which includes references to Tibetan chant, mystifies the symbol of the cross and the idea of the trinity, and of course addresses the Passion story.

Richard Taruskin’s critique of spiritual music at millennium’s end focuses on and new classical music productions that addressed that niche, Passion 2000 among them. Also included was John Adams’s Christmas oratorio, El Niño, “one of a number of works of flamboyant ‘spiritual content’ commissioned and performed under prestigious auspices to solemnize the new
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millennium.” Many of these pieces had conspicuously “multicultural” content. Differentiation between “spiritual” and “religious” is especially important to Taruskin; the “sacred entertainments” of his title appealed specifically to a religiously uncommitted public’s desire for spiritual reassurance, while also fulfilling the “pressing need for personal autonomy and unlimited choice.” Desire for a non-religious spirituality was apparent in “low” culture as well; one notorious example, the craze for elaborate typologies of angelic protectors, was described by Harold Bloom as part of a widespread “endlessly entertaining saturnalia of ill-defined yearnings,” a description with which Taruskin would almost certainly agree. In her study of the angel craze, Emily Bauman identifies two postwar “flurries of interest” in pseudo-Christian angelic lore: the first begins immediately after the world war; the second “begins around the time of the collapse of the Berlin Wall….Angels usher in the Cold War and usher it out again, presenting before us the threshold of an unknown order.”

The “unknown order” which the post-Cold War period would bring contributed to listeners’ desire for music with a spiritual dimension. Taruskin writes, “In the super-affluent, triumphant post-Cold War decade audiences sought through art the monumentalization of their own experience,” adding that during this period of “gross materialism and commercialism…classical music…was being marketed for its powers of ‘uplift’ to a guiltily affluent audience.” Outside of classical music, there were the “crossover” successes of the

37 Taruskin, 115.
40 Taruskin, 112.
1990s, many of which had spiritual content as well, such as 1994’s “Chant,” a recording of Gregorian chant, and a heavily promoted recording, Vision: The Music of Hildegard von Bingen, whose marketing, as Jennifer Bain has shown, used language that aligned it with the genre of New Age.41 Water Passion was “spiritual” without being religious, evoking the sounds of Tibet and China, using the “natural” sounds of water and stones, all the while claiming a dialogue with Bach, thereby synthesizing at least three highly marketable genres: world beat, New Age, and classical.

Water Passion calls for two vocal soloists, soprano and bass, SATB choir, violin and cello, and three percussionists. Both vocal soloists sing multiple roles: the bass sings Peter, Judas, Jesus, John, and occasionally narrates, while the soprano sings God, the devil, Peter, Peter’s interlocutor, and the narrator. The SATB chorus, calling for a minimum of six of each voice type, also changes roles, singing as the disciples, narrating the action, and playing Judas, as well as taking on the traditional turba role in calling for Jesus’s execution. It is the chorus that largely sings what Ara Guzelimian has called the “Passion chorale,” a term I will borrow to describe a text and melodic line that recur throughout the piece.42 In addition, the chorus plays water bowls, stones, and “Tibetan finger bells” (finger cymbals). In keeping with the New Age character of the piece, Tan calls for the chorus members and percussionists to come “pre-prepared (their own responsibility) with a pair of smooth-contoured stones, preferably from the sea or river.” Tan creates a sense of ritual in Water Passion, and a sense of spectacle as well. The stage is designed as a cross, traced out by seventeen transparent bowls of water (described in the
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42 Guzelimian is drawing on a long tradition of labeling the chorale “O Haupt voll Blut und Wunder” in the Bach Matthew Passion the “Passion chorale,” as it recurs several times throughout the piece with variations in key and text. See Malcolm Boyd, ed., J.S. Bach (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 361.
score as “hemispherical transparent water basins”) illuminated from below. Tan’s soloists, who never join the chorus, are required to have large ranges at the upper and lower end—bass to low C and soprano to E in altissimo—and to sing multiphonics.

Multiphonic or “overtone” singing is part of several musical traditions; it also became unexpectedly popular among Western audiences in the 1990s. Timothy D. Taylor has shown that audiences for “world music” and world beat, market genres through which overtone singing was marketed, often sought in it a quasi-spiritual emotional experience. This was easier to project onto “non-Western” sounds, a tendency which Taylor illustrates through an analysis of the Tibetan Gyuto monks’ success in the world music market.43 In Taylor’s argument, the music of the Gyuto monks, as packaged for Western listeners, left the sounds of the music “so decontextualized and deritualized that they are evacuated of the meanings of their own surroundings, and of little interest to a western listener as music. But these sounds are made interesting in the way they are packaged for consumption as the essence of ancient, eastern spirituality….”44 Overtone singing of other traditions was also popular among Western listeners of the 1990s, as Carol Silverman has shown in her work on Bulgarian women’s choruses.45

Tan makes use of a “Tibetan monk” sample in Water Passion, periodically interjecting a low vocal drone into the piece. Between these samples and the multiphonic soloists, overtone singing is a recurring feature of Water Passion, and shows a canny awareness on Tan’s part of what the international audience for art music was responding to, both musically and spiritually. Tibetan chanting figures in Tan’s 2000 Today: A World Symphony for the Millennium, especially
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in the movement titled “At Sunrise.” Philip Glass also used it in his score for the 1997 Martin Scorsese film, *Kundun*—but he, unlike Tan, was a practicing Buddhist who hews exclusively to the Tibetan tradition in his own life. For Tan, the samples seem designed to evoke some “essence of ancient, eastern spirituality,” thus reminding listeners that Tan, though raised in an anti-Buddhist materialist culture, is, like the monks he samples, “Asian.” The gesture may have been intended as supra-national pan-Asian solidarity; but whether cynical or sincere, given the harsh struggles over Tibet’s future within the Han Chinese empire, a composer from mainland China incorporating the sounds of this contested province into his music—in a Christian context, no less—has a political dimension, even (or especially) if a claim is made that it is *not* political, or if, as in this case, the political implications are deliberately ignored.46 (*Kundun*, a literal hagiography of the 14th Dalai Lama, is quite openly partisan, and thus Glass’s use of Tibetan chanting represents a forthright identification with one side of the conflict.)

Tan, however, is not given to addressing state politics publicly. What politics he does acknowledge tend to be centered on borderlessness, another point of connection between Tan and New Age:

The liberation I feel as an artist is granted to myself from myself. I must treat everything—all of music history and culture—as having no boundaries. No matter what the era, culture or language, everything can inspire you to think outside of limitations and boundaries. Given this freedom, tremendous things can happen in your musical imagination. The only questions are: how and when will you create it? These are my challenges for the new millennium.47

Here Tan is certainly presenting himself as wholly autonomous, at the least, and possibly “sacred,” in Heelas’s formulation of the New Age self. The “self-liberating” individual is a
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fundamental Western idea whose appeal spans Romanticism to neoliberalism. “Accepting no boundaries” is a theme of Tan reception; a review of Water Passion in the Times of London can stand in for an entire genre: “Like its model, Bach’s St. Matthew Passion, it transcends language, cultural and religious divides.” This easy universalism uncritically echoes two of Tan’s regular tropes, juxtaposing a great composer with New Age transcendence. A 2003 review from a Dutch newspaper spoke the marketing subtext aloud: “What Tan Dun composes is ‘world music,’ music that brings together everything that you had always wanted to hear. The composer Tan Dun is therefore a citizen of the world, a man who can blend all styles.” Championing “citizen(s) of the world,” and Tan’s interest in eliminating borders, have interesting resonances with both New Age principles and political theories that circulated in the post-Cold War period, to which I will return below.

Water Passion and Heaven Earth Mankind are not Tan’s only excursions into New Age music. BBC’s 2000 Today project, for example, followed the turn from 1999 to 2000 across the world’s time zones, lasting twenty-eight hours. Tan’s contribution was a symphony called 2000 Today: A World Symphony for the Millennium, which concatenates a dizzying array of “world” music references (many of which recur in Water Passion), the pounding rhythms that would be highlighted in the soundtrack to Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon, and “exotic” instruments and timbres, like overtone singing, steel drums, stones, and trumpet fanfares. The broadcast included a performances by Jean-Michel Jarre at the Egyptian pyramids, by Björk in Iceland, and the “official 2000 Today anthem…a new version of the Bob Marley hit, “‘One Love.’” This “new anthem,” actually an arrangement of the song by Tan, was sung by a world beat supergroup


consisting of Marley’s son, Ziggy, the Gipsy Kings, and the Boys’ Choir of Harlem. In keeping with the global theme, the symphony itself included tracks with names like “The East” and “Africa, Africa,” and one called “2000 Passions.” The whole piece fully embraced the animating principle of “global unity,” and the idea that it could be achieved musically through syncretism.

It may go without saying, given the preceding, that these pieces, whatever their universalist pretensions, are “anti-intellectual” in the way Dennis Hall described New Age music, placing accessibility above compositional systems or polemics. It is largely this kind of musical anti-intellectualism that has made “New Age” an epithet for (too easily) accessible new music, particularly given the twentieth century’s emphasis on intellectual complexity as a musical value. A fear of promoting music that “sounds” New Age makes critics hasten to describe relatively accessible music as possessing hidden complexities, as we saw in the previous chapter with respect to Pärt and Golijov. However, Tan’s boundarylessness has defeated even the most ingenious complexity apologists. Instead, he and his music are described as “exuberant,” “naive,” “happy,” “open-hearted,” etc.50 For a multicultural sacred entertainment like Passion 2000, musical naïveté was not entirely out of place, and may have fulfilled the Stuttgart audience’s liberal expectations, including a hope that as a non-Western composer, Tan could provide music appropriate for serious music listeners with “spiritual” needs.

What kind of musical techniques does Tan use to bring together all the world’s music?

The synopsis of World Symphony on Tan’s website includes the following description:

Serving as the centerpiece of the symphony’s mosaic form, and heard in every movement, is an easily recognizable ‘chant’: the gently lush, ascending theme first heard

in the string at the beginning of the piece. It has the flavor of an ancient scale, an Indian raga, a gamelan melody-to which counterpointed musical material is added to capture the poetic spirit of the world’s regions. In the work’s finale, Tan blends the chant and all its counterpoints into a ‘Unity.’ Here, with a sense of inevitability, the chant musically unifies the earth’s culture as one.

Listening to World Symphony, it is difficult to discern precisely how its motivic “chant” is raga-like, or ancient, or taken from gamelan, but it is easy enough to hear how a casual listener, reading that description, could accept it at face value; after all, only “flavor” is being claimed, not expertise. Tan is well-versed in the compositional tricks of easy recognition; Water Passion is full of spotlighted recurring themes and motives, many of which also come together in its final evocation of resurrection.

Capturing the spirit of the world’s regions—or, more ambitiously, uniting the earth—also has both spiritual and political ambitions. New Age political discourse has such unification as a basic goal. Kyle writes, “Global unity is central to New Age political thought…New Agers believe that there is to be a new world order characterized by internationalism—nations are to be united politically and economically…If god, humanity, and nature are all one, it follows that there should be no boundaries between nations.”51 This belief also animates Tan’s music, as he demonstrates repeatedly in his writings and interviews, and intersects with other political ideas about the construction of universality in a post-Cold War world. When Tan identifies a musical device as a global “unity” theme, he suggests his music as an apt soundtrack to such beliefs and ambitions.

There was also a powerful analogy to be made between the range of musical materials available to the late twentieth-century composer, and the range of spiritual materials confronting the late twentieth-century spiritual seeker. If the Western musical seeker could choose from ancient scales, ragas, talas, gamelan, reggae, and more, the Western spiritual seeker likewise had
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“religious options on an unprecedented scale... Through gaining multiple perspectives, the religious consumer can now more easily than ever choose to become de-conditioned from the prevailing acculturation of his/her society and, in some cases even, re-conditioned into a new spiritual practice of his/her own choosing.”

*Water Passion After St. Matthew*

To see how these “reconditioned” musical styles and New Age principles are used in *Water Passion*, I turn again to the piece itself, considering its construction and the ways that Tan deploys references, texts, and symbols in the service of New Age musical universalism. *Water Passion* is set in eight movements of varying lengths. While the bulk of Tan’s text comes from the Gospel of Matthew, it is supplemented by original interpolations and untexted vocalizations. Tan also draws on portions of the Gospel outside the Passion narrative, including the opening movement, “Baptism;” the second movement, “Temptations,” a dramatic and effective depiction of Jesus’s temptation by the Devil; and especially the final movement, “Water and Resurrection.” *Water Passion* places heavy emphasis on its eponymous element, as a repeated word, a concept, and a generator of sound; water becomes both an aural and moral center for the piece. Tan has spoken a great deal about his compositional use of water, positioning it as a “metaphor for the unity of the eternal and the external, as well as a symbol of baptism, renewal, recreation and resurrection... a key role in the conception of my *Water Passion After St. Matthew*.” Tan says, “The sound of water is in my composition like a passacaglia theme—it is
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always present.” The performance instructions make clear that the visual is paramount, the symbolic use of water on stage creating a sense of ritual. In this aspect, the opening of Tan’s Passion is not wholly dissimilar to Golijov’s, although their musical language is quite different. Both begin with an extended instrumental prelude that relies on the physical performativity of musicians and/as dancers.

Golijov used *capoeiristas* for visual and dramatic effect; in the *Water Passion*, three carefully lit percussionists take the task of giving visual and aural interest to the opening, with a ritualized entrance that has them beginning in the audience and walking to the stage while playing waterphones. Once arrived on stage, they form three points of a triangle, taking places downstage right, upstage center, and downstage left—a trinity. The process of abstraction through which Tan puts the Passion story begins here, with one of Christianity’s basic symbols converted into a stylistic and visual element, evoking the trinity while stripping religious, liturgical, and doctrinal meaning from it. Tan does this kind of abstracting throughout the piece, compressing texts and musical gestures so that they become less closely linked to the specific narrative at hand. This abstraction results in a piece that simultaneously outlines the expected parameters of a Passion, while universalizing its elements and narrative as much as possible.

The first page of the score is reminiscent of George Crumb’s scores from the early 1970s, with the chorus’s instructions notated in a circle. They are directed to enter freely: “There is no beginning, no ending, only continuing: fade in one by one on any note and for any phrasing.”

This instruction does two things: it directs the performers to make choices about certain parameters, choices very familiar to performers of new music with experience in indeterminacy; and it also makes a very New Age statement about time. From the very start, then, Tan yokes the
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two dimensions working most powerfully in *Water Passion*: a steeping in the ritual aspects of Western art music, and a quasi-spiritual dimension divorced from Christianity or other religion.

This example shows the entire first page, in order to give a sense of its visual elements and the way Tan uses indeterminacy, a classic technique of the post-war avant-garde which he appears to deploy here as a kind of “historical” reference.

**Ex. 4.2, Opening of *Water Passion***
In the commercial recording, these first two pages take approximately five minutes to realize. Tan’s string *glissandi*, which begin early in the piece, have been described elsewhere as “sliding string lines that approximate Chinese tuning systems and timbres,” and this is largely their role in *Water Passion*.\(^{56}\) The strings also establish some recurring gestures, including the emulation of Chinese instruments, especially a series of double-stops that oscillate between the notes of a dyad (usually a fifth). This gesture, which begins slowly and picks up in tempo, recurs throughout the piece, sometimes in the chorus as well.

**Example 4.3, Oscillating fifths**

At the end of the largely improvised opening section, which features vocalization but not a lot of words, the text begins in earnest, together with cues that call for the lights under some of the water bowls to fade in. The female chorus’s first texted line—“a sound is heard in water”—becomes the through-line for the entire piece, what Guzelimian calls the “passion chorale.” The intervallic content of this ascending line will recur, with slight variations, throughout the piece. Its voicing is varied, shifting among voices and vocal groups; it changes mode (the diminished triad in the middle, on “is heard in” below, is sometimes cast as a major triad), and the text itself—although it remains recognizable—varies across movements. At its first entrance, in the example below, the lights underneath the water bowls are brought up, and remain illuminated throughout the first half.
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The string players’ improvising and their oscillating fifths; the passion chorale; the sounds of water; all of these function like a “unity chant” in *Water Passion*, anchoring a listener with familiar structures and the easy exoticism of their sound. Tan here approaches the “incorporation aesthetic” I theorized in the previous chapter, in which composers from outside the West, or from its margins, succeeded in the new music market by means of displaying their national or ethnic identities in their work. The Chinese composers of Tan’s generation made use of Chinese elements, which contributed to their success, but, as Frederick Lau writes, “Tan, [Bright] Sheng, Chen [Yi] and others make constant reference to Chineseness in their music, yet how they want to be perceived and marketed as globalized transnational composers does not quite match up to the Chinese elements in their music.”  

Mina Yang agrees: “Tan has built a worldwide reputation…on a signature style that incorporates elements of Chinese and Asian vintages that
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are recognized as expressive of an Oriental essence. Yet he seems to understand that the very exoticism that appeals to the mass market may keep him out of the pantheon of great composers extending back to Bach.  

Tan’s approach to composition attempts to bridge ethnic particularity and universal relevance, at the same time that he relies on his easily accessible “brand” as a Chinese composer to gain access to the post-1989 world’s new music market. Negotiating cultural tensions in the (partial) service of commercial success, Tan embodies anthropologist Aihwa Ong’s notion of “flexible citizenship,” developed around professional-class Chinese migrants in the 1990s. Ong suggests that this professional class, of which Tan can be considered part, embraced cultural and political flexibility, taking a greater role in defining “Chinese-ness” in the U.S., and creating a form of citizenship that was responsive to the global market while also being regulated by often multiple nation-states. This allowed them to act as mediators between East Asia and the West, and created something of a middle ground between particular identities.

While Ong is especially concerned with mediation, and its meaning within global markets, other scholars have foregrounded the tension between particularism and universalism in different ways across multiple disciplines, historical formations, and discourses. In his three-volume study of what he calls the “age of information,” Manuel Castells sees “a bipolar opposition…between abstract, universal instrumentalism, and historically rooted, particularistic identities.” Immanuel Wallerstein sees the tension between a particularistic orientation and a universalizing one as two sides of the same universalizing coin, defining the first as “Orientalism…its universal quality is not a unique set of values but the permanence of a set of
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essential particularisms,” and the second as “scientific universalism,” which after 1945 “became the unquestionably strongest form of European universalism, virtually uncontested.”

“Scientific” universalism, as I have shown in Chapter 2, dominated both the production and reception of new music in the post-war years, and has especially affected the historical reception of more overtly accessible music like Tan’s and Golijov’s, which eschew demands for the “scientific” orientation toward musical experimentation.

The New Age notion of a borderless politics resonates with Tan’s self-branding and his reception as a “citizen of the world.” Does Tan’s output, then, fit within the contemporary discourse of cosmopolitanism? If the eighteenth century ideal of cosmopolitanism, as articulated by Kant, was well-suited to an era of absolutist empires, it was easily revived in the post-Cold War years of rapid economic globalization, when the weakening of the nation-state’s ability to provide for and protect its citizens led to speculations about the advent of a “postnational” era. Sociologist Ulrich Beck argues that cosmopolitanization has been especially rapid since the 1990s, “stimulated by the postmodern mix of boundaries between cultures and identities, accelerated by the dynamics of capital and consumption, empowered by capitalism undermining national borders, excited by the global audience of transnational social movements, and guided and encouraged by the evidence of world-wide communication…on central themes such as science, law, art, fashion, entertainment, and not least, politics.”

Martha Nussbaum, an advocate of postnational cosmopolitanism who sees patriotism as a “moral danger,” prefers “the very old ideal of the cosmopolitan, the person whose primary
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allegiance is to the community of human beings in the entire world.” ⁶⁴ Among music scholars, Dana Gooley, summarizing Cheah and Robbins, has noted how “new forms of communication, migration, and the radical hybridization of cultures have altered people’s sense of attachment to nations and to nation-states,” adding that “the weakening force of the nation-idea in a globalized or globalizing world” has given rise to “alternate, non-national identity formations that appear to reanimate the concept of ‘world citizenship.’” ⁶⁵ This could certainly describe Tan Dun, and he has written multiple pieces whose titles speak to such an allegiance, including “Unity,” “Song of Peace,” and “For the World.”

At stake in Tan’s effort to produce universal music is not only the duality of classical music and New Age discourses; those are simply the means by which he works out a more essential tension between the local and non-local, seeking a path to relevance that attenuates differences, a one-world kind of musical unity that goes beyond local particularism—despite the Chinese brand—while remaining partly dependent on it. Tension between the local (or national) and the global (or universal) is also a theme in the 1990s discourse of post-Cold War globalization, which formulated metaphorical objects to stand in for the local and global worldviews. Political scientist Benjamin R. Barber’s article (later a book), “Jihad vs. McWorld,” made the paradigmatic claim that “the tendencies of…the forces of Jihad [local] and the forces of McWorld [global] operate with equal strength in opposite directions, the one driven by parochial hatreds, the other by universalizing markets, the one re-creating ancient subnational and ethnic borders from within, the other making national borders porous from without.” ⁶⁶
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Thomas Friedman, echoing Barber, took a similarly binary approach with his metaphor of *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*: “Olive trees…represent everything that roots us, anchors us, identifies us and locates us in this world—whether it be belonging to a family, a community, a tribe, a nation, a religion…one reason that the nation-state will never disappear, even if it does weaken, is because it is the ultimate olive tree….” By contrast, the Lexus “represents all the burgeoning global markets, financial institutions and computer technologies with which we pursue higher living standards today.” In the post-Cold War period, Friedman writes, “the most likely threat to your olive tree is likely to come from the Lexus—from all the anonymous, transnational, homogenizing, standardizing market forces and technologies that make up today’s globalizing economic system.” Under the terms of the Passion 2000 commission, which called for a form of representation based in local identity or origin, *Water Passion* should have been like Bach’s Passions: as a musical olive tree, retelling for a purely local audience a story set among the very olive groves of Friedman’s Middle East. But Tan’s decision to defy the commissioners and write in English immediately made his work more akin to a Lexus—that is, an multinational commodity appropriate to the global market forces of its time whose assembly assumes a long, globe-circling supply chain of exoticized musical references as “raw material.”

William Weber has argued that concert institutions that mixed repertoire from different European countries were “usually making a bid for cultural authority on a European scale, as opposed to that of region and nation.” Extending his thesis to turn of the twenty-first century Europe, it seems that the Bachakademie Stuttgart, long part of a national German musical project, was also making a bid for larger cultural authority, only now on a *global* scale. Many of its official sponsors referred to this global or universal dimension in their encomia at the
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beginning of the Passion 2000 official program book. Erwin Teufel, Premier of the state of Baden-Württemberg, identified as the European Music Festival Stuttgart’s Schirmherr (patron), knew the drill: “Of all the arts, music understands best how to move our deepest selves, open our spirits and souls,” because “the language of music is understood everywhere.” The business consortium that supported it, which included, among other regional corporations, (not Lexus but) DaimlerChrysler, highlighted both a local and global presence: “We, the five sponsors of Passion 2000…are all rooted in Stuttgart…but we are all also active internationally.” After the fall of the Berlin Wall, it appeared that the language of European money could now be “understood everywhere.” Global trade was destabilizing to poorly managed nation-states; nonetheless, it was also widely promoted (in countries that benefitted) as the harbinger of global peace. As Barber had written at the beginning of the post-Cold War period, “All national economies are now vulnerable to the inroads of larger, transnational markets within which trade is free, currencies are convertible, access to banking is open, and contracts are enforceable under law;” more hopefully, he added, “Markets are enemies of parochialism, isolation, fractiousness, war.” Barber’s argument that the “market imperative has reinforced the quest for international peace and stability” suggests that global economics had the potential to displace the more local politics of the nation-state and its security guarantees.

English was increasingly the language of 1990s globalization; as Friedman describes an imaginary country (think Singapore) poised to “win” in a globalized world, it would have a “multicultural, multiethnic, multilingual population that had natural connections to all continents, but was, at the same time, bound together by a single language—English—which would also be
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the dominant language of the Internet.” Tan’s choice of English for the piece was therefore apt for his universalist aspirations.

Tan’s use of English is highly abstract, even non-idiomatic, and sometimes borders on the obscure. The passion chorale’s Ur-phrase, “A sound is heard in water,” serves as one of the piece’s unifying devices and a theme for variations, but Tan’s poetic sensibilities allow the phrase to float free of particular meaning. Who hears the sound? Is the listener “in water,” or is the sound? Is it the sound of water? And above all—though the first movement does eventually get to the baptism of Jesus by John—what does any of this have to do with the gospel of Matthew? Abstraction gives Tan’s text a remarkable openness, which works against the Euro-specificity of the commission, and suggests the poetic effusions of certain New Age writers.

Other ambiguous phrases are scattered through the Passion. Movement 4, “In the Garden of Gethsemane,” is the last movement before an intermission, and the way it builds to a climax is especially ritualistic in effect. Its text strikes a balance between the tendency toward textual abstraction, and the need for narrative progress. The opening phrase, “Trees want to rest wind never stops,” barely associates to “garden,” doing next to nothing to articulate location, time, or narrative. (Are these olive trees? We hardly know.) It is unclear what anthropomorphized nature, imbued with agency and desire, has to do with Jesus’s suffering before his arrest. Yet, still, an abstract scene, of trees and wind and a restless night, is set. The rest of the movement outlines the events in the Garden (Matthew 26:36-56), including the sleeping company, Judas’s betrayal, and the flight of the disciples.

These kinds of textual reductions largely eschew the pathos of the biblical text, which emphasizes feelings of grief and fear (“My soul is overwhelmed with sorrow to the point of
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death,” Matthew 26:38). When Jesus laments in Bach’s setting, it is to the text, “My Father, if possible, allow this cup to pass from me; but not as I will, rather as thou wilt.” When he laments in Tan’s setting, there is no mention of God, nor of submission to another’s will; instead, Jesus says, “Sorrow, bitter sorrow/Take this cup of suffering from me!” Tan also omits all violence from the scene (such as a disciple cutting off the ear of a guard), and of course there is no aria of anguished onlookers, no “Open your fiery pit, O hell,” as in Bach’s setting.

Instead, as the first half of Water Passion draws to an end, Tan amplifies the abstract ritual element: the chorus, whispering, takes up the Tibetan finger bells again, striking them to the accompaniment of water sounds, sampled xun, and string glissandi. A long crescendo peaks and then stops abruptly; only the finger bells and the water sounds remain. The water bowls, which have been illuminated since the first entrance of the passion chorale in “Baptism,” begin to darken, as the strings give out another statement of the passion chorale. It is all very effective, but only minimally related to the Passion story. By comparison, the first part of Bach’s Matthew Passion also ends in the darkened Garden of Gethsemane, but Bach’s text interpolates meditative glosses on the specific events of the Passion and on tenets of Christian belief: “Of a Virgin pure and gentle/he was born here for our sake…To the dead he gave life and conquered all sickness/Until the time came that he should be sacrificed for us/To carry the heavy burden of our sins upon the cross itself.” The only reference Tan makes to the cross is in the stage setup, which, though visually striking, even beautiful, is not sectarian in any overt way.

As stage elements are abstracted into symbols, the text of Matthew 26-27, the majority of the Passion story itself, is stripped down and spread out across the Water Passion, without much in the way of commentary. The Last Supper and Jesus’s anguish in Gethsemane both come before intermission, Peter’s denial after (movement 5, “Stone Song”). In movement 6, “Give Us
Barabbas,” Tan elides the events between Jesus’s appearance before Pilate and the crucifixion itself with a simple repeat—the first statement of material includes the taunting as Jesus is beaten (“if you are the son of God, tell us who hits you”); the second, the taunting on the cross (“if you come down, we will believe”). Not only are the details omitted, but with them, much of the violence of the story. This “flash-forward” is then “rewound” to the choice of Barabbas or Jesus, and, even further, to the question from Pilate: are you the son of God? The familiar narrative is made strange by the shuffling and conflating of its events, and by the selection process itself; what Tan keeps and omits is not predictable. In combination with the piece’s syncretism and its sense of abstract spectacle, this bowdlerization strips the Passion story of all specificity.

Resurrection

Philip Bohlman writes, “As the ends of centuries and millennia have approached, music was increasingly employed to narrate the various histories that might converge and collapse as the end of history…Rather than sustaining history through its narrative potential, music at the critical moments of radical transformation arrests time, heightening the fear of loss and the anxiety that the end of history is near.” The final movements of the four Passion 2000 works each engage with past and present, choosing among various takes on history that converged in the last decade of the twentieth century. The statements they make are legible through the texts they set; like the Bach Passions they model, each of the four concludes with a non-Gospel interpolation.

In Stuttgart, the Passion story was taken up at a place and time (the millennial turn) already rife with interpretive possibilities for eschatologists and theodists. As developed in the
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four Gospels, the Passion narrative has a telos: it drives toward Jesus’s crucifixion, without which there could be no resurrection (and thus no world-redemption to come). While the resurrection is therefore the actual denouement of the Passion, in dramatic and especially musical-dramatic presentations, the resurrection is generally omitted. Whether enacted in church or as a performance, the traditional Passion story relies on its audience to fill in that absent action, to lend meaning, in hindsight, to the suffering and death of Christ. But this absence also suggests to the composer of a Passion setting that its final movement or movements should offer some form of resolution, even if actual redemption is premature. Given the Christian underpinnings of these pieces, it is reasonable to ask what take on resurrection and renewal they offer.

Golijov’s final movement concludes with a partial setting of the Mourner’s Kaddish, a Jewish prayer for the dead that requires the bereaved to nonetheless praise God and rejoice. The Kaddish is therefore a prayer of deep affirmation, and in the context of a Passion, offers some resolution to the violence that precedes it. But it does not imply resurrection. If anything, Golijov’s placement of Kaddish can be read as a re-affirmation of Judeo-non-Christian identity, a subliminal commentary on the closing millennium and a reminder of the culminating Holocaust of its final century. (It is one of the most interesting aspects of Pasión, little remarked by critics, that Golijov, whose Jewishness was much remarked, presented in the heart of German Lutheran territory a partial staging of the state-ordered execution of a Jew.) Wolfgang Rihm’s final movement addresses the Holocaust directly, through a setting of Paul Celan’s poem “Tenebrae,” the statement of an angry, guilty people’s outrage against God. In keeping with the rest of the piece, Rihm refuses any absolution or benediction at the end, let alone a hint of resurrection; the burden of the past remains. Gubaidulina’s John Passion ends even more bitterly, with an
interpolation from Revelation 16, “the seven bowls of wrath,” in which God’s anger is poured out onto the earth in the form of seven plagues. Gubaidulina does offer formal resolution by having the piece come full circle, ending where she, and the Gospel itself, began: “In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God” (John 1:1). Her companion piece, Johannes-Ostern (2002), addresses the resurrection and, while the two have only rarely been performed together, she understands them as a cycle.

Within this range of conclusions, from the tribal to the apocalyptic, Tan’s piece stands out for its inspirational final movement, “Water and Resurrection,” a wholly New Age take on resurrection that smooths over the specifically Christian aspects of the myth, predicated on sin, guilt, and sacrifice, in favor of a spiritually optimistic, non-doctrinal conclusion.

Tan has already introduced much of the material out of which “Water and Resurrection” is built, including the Western passion chorale and the “oriental” oscillating fifth. In the sixth movement, “Give Us Barabbas,” he introduced a sequence of falling second and rising third, which I will call the “resurrection motive.” A transformation of the B-A-C-H motive from the first movement, it becomes the basis for the vocal portions of the final movement.

Ex. 4.6, Resurrection Motive

Its first iteration came at a crucial moment in the narrative, when Jesus seemed to acknowledge his own divinity—asked whether he was the son of God, Jesus replied, “you have said so.” By linking this particular moment to the final movement, Tan produces an idea of resurrection based in the acknowledgement of personal, not theistic, divinity.
Tan pulls out all the stops in this first sequence, the basis for Jesus’s soliloquy: “for this I was born/for this reason I came into the world/to give witness to the truth.” The solo executes a long ascent and crescendo, drawing on centuries of musical practice that equates rising pitch with rising emotion, including (as John Butt has shown) the gradual ascent of the opening of Bach’s *Matthew Passion*. Immediately after, the chorus and ensemble demand Jesus’s death, and the resurrection motive recurs to set the line “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” Much of this movement alternates between quieter, more soloistic narrative sections and explosive disruptions; for example, Jesus concludes his soliloquy by droning the words, “To give witness to the truth” on a low C, which is immediately followed by an outburst from the chorus and ensemble, demanding his death.

The associations of the resurrection motive change across its iterations. In movement 7, “Death and Earthquake,” it returns for the moment of Jesus’s death. The movement has a long instrumental introduction, near the end of which the strings play a version of the resurrection motive in a much higher register than it was heard in the previous movement. At the end of this introduction, Jesus makes his dramatic outcry to God, “Eli, Eli, lama sabacthani.” This is perhaps the moment of greatest agony in the Passion story, a point at which Jesus’s physical suffering is matched by his spiritual anguish. (Of the four Passions under consideration, only Golijov’s also sets this line; however, he gives it the bulk of the penultimate movement.) In his setting, Tan does appear to take a cue from Bach, as he sets the line first in the original Aramaic, and then immediately has another voice sing the same text in the vernacular. But where Bach gives the translation to the Evangelist, who ups the ante with an impassioned arioso style, Tan gives it to
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74 Butt, 102.

75 In Bach as follows: Jesus: “Eli, eli, lama asabthani?” The Evangelist: “Das ist, mein Gott, mein Gott, warum hast du mich verlassen?”
an ethereal and detached soprano, and sets it to the resurrection motive. Thus, Jesus’s “moment of doubt and pain” is—perhaps too easily—transformed into a moment that anticipates resurrection. The bloody denouement of his sacrifice is reduced to three text fragments compressed into a single measure: “I thirst; they gave him vinegar; it is finished.”

Jesus’s suffering, like most of the violence of the gospel narrative in this setting, is minimized, indeed, entirely eliminated from the final movement. Instead, Tan focuses on affirmation, using the resurrection motive to set a text with a simple, familiar message of New Age acceptance, utterly unrelated to the Passion: that to everything there is “a season.” Tan’s text here is based on a verse from Ecclesiastes known to millions through the Pete Seeger song that the Byrds made famous, “Turn! Turn! Turn! (To Everything There Is A Season).” Tan’s movement begins with the passion chorale, expanded this time to include a vague reference (“three days”) to the period between crucifixion and resurrection:

**Movement 1**
A sound is heard in water,  
in darkness  
the tears are crying  
for rebirth

**Movement 8**
A sound is heard in water  
the sound of innocence  
in darkness  
in three days  
the everlasting waters  
tears  
are crying for rebirth

a time to love, a time of peace  
a time to dance, a time of silence

Presumably the first section is “water” and the second “resurrection.” That last couplet, set to the resurrection motive, is repeated in its entirety four times, passed from bass to soprano, to the female chorus, and finally to the male chorus. From its first utterance in “Give us Barabbas,” then, the resurrection motive is associated with the figure of Jesus; with Jesus’s divinity and mission; with Jesus’s request for forgiveness for his tormentors. Although the
listener does not know at its first entrance that this music will accompany the resurrection, the association is nonetheless fairly doctrinal: Jesus’s divinity and sacrifice create the conditions for (everyone’s) resurrection. It is in this last movement that the text moves away from Christian doctrine, and becomes more aligned with New Age self-divinity, at the moment when it becomes the theme for a non-doctrinal vision of resurrection that has nothing to do with Jesus’s divinity. Instead, Tan effectively transfers divinity to everyone, literally giving the motive to all the voices in turn, thus imbuing them with the capacity to produce their own resurrection.

This last vocal section of the piece also brings together its most familiar elements. The passion chorale appears as a vocalise; the percussionists are splashing, and the strings are playing the oscillating fifths. These musical materials are underscored by “plucked” sounds from the sampler, and overlaid by the three percussionists, who move from the water tubes they have been playing, to playing the basins of water themselves (that is, playing rhythms with their hands on the surface of the water). A more “New Age” way to represent the resurrection musically is difficult to imagine. Tan hits almost all the marks of New Age music as laid out by Hall, Hall, and Zrzavy. His setting is at least partly wordless. It is cyclic; it uses the sounds of “nature” (after the texted portion is complete, the singers also move to the water basins and make sounds); it combines “classical” with non-classical sounds; it uses, if not direct quotation, an textual allusion that is both biblical and popular.

I have argued that Tan is engaged in a form of latter-day universalism, attempting both musically and rhetorically to present his work as, potentially, universally relevant and meaningful. I want to be clear that, while his music and rhetoric are both sometimes overly credulous, I believe Tan himself is basically sincere, rather than cynical. While I am skeptical about Tan’s claims that he works without “limits,” or that he breaks down “cultural
boundaries”—they sound like marketing to me—I believe that he may indeed be pursuing universal syncretism not as a marketing strategy, but as a genuine aesthetic and ethical goal. But I also think that this ambition is an especially interesting object of analysis—and critique.

The New Age’s emphasis on individuality, on the individual experience as paramount to the experience of the divine, also aligns easily with the idea of individual genius, which has underpinned much of classical music reception since at least the middle nineteenth century. In addition, New Age appropriation of spiritual beliefs and practices from around the world “translates into the rationale and justification for appropriating whatever third-world institution has appeal to the individual religious consumer along with the ‘freedom’ to market what one allocates to others.”

This is very much in keeping with the musical pluralism of the post-Cold War period, which in many ways Tan exemplifies. The whole world is available for individual’s musical use; the composer, as always both a consumer and producer of music, can freely market what s/he consumes, translating it into musical goods across multiple occasions and settings.

In Passion 2000, Tan, a Chinese national who had no hesitation in presenting himself as such (part of the incorporation aesthetic), was selected to represent North America, despite the fact that his Chineseness had been a key to his success in the U.S. In the terms of the commission, which used the language of the “four heavenly directions,” Tan, the Easterner, was now, paradoxically, the representative of the West. This reversal is interesting not only for upending expectations, but in the way that it reflects Tan’s career, the ways he has talked about his work, the kinds of projects for which he has been commissioned. Tan’s “boundary-less” identity (musical, linguistic, political, personal) extends so far that his music can attach or be attached to almost any kind of occasion: political, national, international, or “absolute.” It also
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suggests again Tan as a “flexible citizen,” in Aihwa Ong’s terms, as when she argues, “Among transnational Chinese subjects, those most able to benefit from their participation in global capitalism celebrate flexibility and mobility…flexibility, migration, and relocations, instead of being coerced or resisted, have become practices to strive for rather than stability.”

Flexibility, migrations, and relocations have all been key to Tan’s success for many years. In musical terms, the kind of flexibility Tan was working with in the 1990s anticipated a compositional trend I call “omnivore composition,” in which composers demonstrate status by means of their ability to draw on countless musical styles and histories. Tan’s straddling of lines such as avant-garde and traditional, acoustic and electronic, Chinese and American, Chinese and international, demonstrated his adaptability. Tan has always showed an ability to please audiences and critics alike (though sometimes with different pieces), to accommodate, to adapt to diverse musical situations with compositions as well-received as the opera *Marco Polo*, and as critically dismissed as *2000 Today*. Furthermore, Tan himself has become a global figure, accepting commissions from all over the world, and through his work as a conductor, keeping not only in musical but in personal circulation. He conducted the world premiere of *Water Passion* in Stuttgart, and has conducted it many times since; of the 36 performances or performance runs included in the complete performance history as of April 2015, Tan has conducted half of them, in places including Leipzig, Rome, Seoul, and St. Petersburg. This is a musical world citizenship in concrete action, not just in the scores.

Maria O’Loughlin writes, “Cultural borders fluctuate as the flow of global information accelerates and definitions of personal and institutional identity lose their hermetic seal. As the spiritual expression of this phenomenon, the New Age is a global fugue of migrant magic and cultural exchange. Pre-modern, eastern and esoteric spiritualities mingle in a challenge to static
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religious identities.” All these phrases might well show up in a review of Tan’s music, and it is easy to imagine them finding their way to his elaborate website and acting as headlines and pull quotes. There might be better descriptions of his music, but there can hardly be a description more likely to meet his approval than O’Loughlin’s contrapuntal trope for New Age multiplicity, the “global fugue of migrant magic.”

A short 2013 interview with Tan, released as part of the announcement of his appointment to UNESCO, included a discussion of water as a resource, most of which rehashed things he has said for years. As part of his position, he will be working to “promote intercultural dialogue and water preservation.” Even as he hints at a political involvement, Tan brings the attention back to his personal mythology: “[Water is] related to my childhood memories…the sounds of the water have…claimed a big part of my artistic activities.” And he continues in this role to incorporate Chinese music into other kinds of work, including plans to study bird songs in Australia and New Zealand, and “then combine them with Chinese traditional music and the development of future music.” Tan will not be diverted from his boundary-dissolving path; unswayed by bad reviews, he is willing to be somewhat ridiculous, and judging by his output and his schedule, he remains energetic. Whatever boundaries remain at this point, Tan remains committed to their eradication. Like the New Age philosophy his musical career seems to epitomize, he remains stubbornly optimistic: “I feel that I live for the future. But to look for answers about the future necessitates a search for traces of the past. The traces of the past will

---

provide a lot of answers about the future. It’s same for the sound, for the color, for the form, for all kinds of art.”

Conclusion: (Musical) Capital in the Twenty-First Century

Observed from 2016, Passion 2000, the years leading up to it, and the ideas that inform it, seems far more distant than the fifteen or twenty years that have actually elapsed. Things that lay ahead in 1989—the euro and Schengen Agreement, globalization, an open Russia—are in crisis in 2016; overall, it seems the twenty-first century has to date been the graveyard of a lot of late twentieth century hopes.

The optimistic, global unity theme that drove not only Passion 2000, but projects like the Silk Road Ensemble, was manifested politically in 1990s dreams of a unified Europe; the unexpected booming of once-emerging economies (Tigers Celtic and Asian); the dismantling of apartheid; the Oslo Accords. In popular culture, the global unity idea was perhaps most aptly represented by a phenomenon like the clothing company Benneton’s “United Colors of Benetton” ad campaign, which began in the 1980s with the “All Are United” campaign, and featured multicultural, multiethnic, multinational models.\(^1\) The critic Claus Spahn, quoted several times in this dissertation, ran a review of Passion 2000 under the heading “United Colours of Bach,” neatly summing up the global aspirations of the commission. The idea of “united colours,” especially as a branding device for a multinational company, captures the optimistic side of the post-Cold War, millennial image of a world united—and largely under the sway of the United States.

Despite the many regional wars of the 1990s—the Balkans, Rwanda, Afghanistan’s civil war—the first globally resonant blow to the image of a united world was 9/11, which marked the beginning of the end of the cultural, political, and economic dominance the U.S. had enjoyed throughout the decade. But that was only the beginning of a series of political reversals, which

\(^1\) In later years, the ad campaign—often controversial—also featured people who were HIV positive, interracial families, etc.
also include the U.S. invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, Russia’s slide back into autocracy, the
global emergence of radical Islam, and the rise of the European nationalist right. Each of these
suggests that for the time being, the tension between global flows and local identities, which
Passion 2000 played on and which informed so many analyses of globalization, has not been
resolved.

What would Passion 2000, which in its ambitions, reach, and frank naiveté, seems remote
from here, look like today? It might look like New York’s Trinity Wall Street Church’s “Mass
Imaginings” project, a far more modest undertaking that is commissioning and premiering six
new Masses between 2015 and 2017. It is “curated”—a word that would never have been applied
to Passion 2000’s organizers—by the composer Daniel Felsenfeld, who is also contributing a
Mass; among the others are the Juilliard and Boston University-trained Jonathan Newman; Paola
Prestini, another Juilliard graduate with a great deal of influence on New York’s new music
scene; Sarah Kirkland Snyder, a Yale-trained composer and one of three directors of the New
Amsterdam record label and projects; and composer and conductor Julian Wachner, who directs
the Trinity Wall Street chorus.

While the press materials claim that Mass Reimaginings “draws inspiration from ‘Passion
2000,’ by which German conductor Helmuth Rilling commissioned new passion settings from a
quartet of composers representing the four corners of the globe,” the differences between the
projects are great.² The composers for Mass Reimaginings are described as “six of today’s most
diverse and compelling composers,” but despite an attempt to pass the Italian-American Prestini
off as diverse, five of the six are in fact white, Anglophone, New York-based composers who
have spent their professional lives accruing institutionalized cultural capital. This is hardly an

ingathering of far-flung, unexpected musical talent (though that is not to dismiss the project itself). Through newly written textual interpolations to go with the Ordinary, Mass Reimaginings claims it will further expand “the potential universality of these ageless and ancient texts by contextualizing them within current intellectual struggles on the issues of economic equality, ecology, gender, race, and sexuality, as well as 21st-century developments in multiculturalism, ecumenism, and tolerance among the world's systems of spirituality and faith.”

In the barely concealed appeal to music’s “universalism,” the “spirit” of Passion 2000 is there; likewise, Mass Reimaginings evokes Passion 2000’s suggestion that music can unite people of different faiths: perhaps an even more appealing suggestion in the 2010s than in 2000. Whether a group of composers from New York—and one Zimbabwean—are the right musicians to do it is still unknowable. If Passion 2000 truly sought global musical representation, in effort if not outcome, Mass Reimaginings refocuses its effort away from the music, opting instead to take on global issues.

The sixth composer, singer-songwriter Netsayi, is the exception to the New York rule. A native of Zimbabwe partly based in London, Netsayi has written for Ladysmith Black Mambazo, and was “discovered” by Prestini (who runs the New York venue National Sawdust) while touring with her Harare-based band Black Pressure. Since then, Netsayi has had a string of performances resembling that of any new music group, including dates at the Brooklyn Academy of Music, MASS MoCA, and a residency at National Sawdust.

As Netsayi’s inclusion in Mass Reimaginings suggests, new music networks are expanding geographically, attempting to stake a claim on multiple musical styles, aesthetics, and
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3 https://www.trinitywallstreet.org/music-arts/season/mass-reimaginings.

4 The Bachakademie Stuttgart commissioned a sculpture to mark Passion 2000, which is permanently installed on the outside of its offices in the center of Stuttgart. See Appendix A for image.
forms. In the process, those pushing such expansion are making clear, if tacit, statements about what “counts” as new music, which increasingly is “music that is new.” It is difficult to imagine that the Bachakademie Stuttgart would have commissioned a composer from any African nation for Passion 2000, largely because the search for composers involved mostly those who had taken a recognizable path or had a recognizable lineage or existing reputation. That meant seeking composers from places where Western classical music had an existing institutional presence: Argentina more than Guyana, for example; China more than Thailand. That classical music’s old disciplining expectations and boundaries still exerted a great deal of power in the 1990s, I have argued, helps explain why the Golijov, which inverted some of them, was such a phenomenon.

It seems safe to say that those boundaries, based in institutional cultural capital and limiting access new music culture, have changed, and with them, the question of what constitutes and produces prestige. What seems important now is to be the “curator,” that inescapable term designating the person who defines, or helps define, what new boundaries might be, what directions music will take in concert culture; to have a pulpit for making public statements about the blurring, rather than upholding, of generic or other boundaries. This may be a new variation for the incorporation aesthetic—rather than relying on a profession of identity, relying on a profession of boundarylessness, which can include identity (in which case the whiteness of the Mass Reimaginings composers matters less), subject matter, musical aesthetic, and other parameters. This would make Tan an early adopter, which he would probably enjoy; it is also interesting for the ways it mimics the claims to boundarylessness that have been made on behalf of globalization. This question of boundaries, and especially of is a direction I plan to explore in my next project, which focuses on new music in the U.S. and the politics of labor, with a portion devoted to the contemporary idea of “curation” as it appears in concert culture.
Just as new music, and classical music culture more broadly, tends to follow the aesthetic and moral desires of the economically and politically dominant class—the patron class, essentially—the incorporation aesthetic has done the same. In the immediate post-communist period, which I have focused on here, composers from former socialist countries gained cachet, built their reputations, and accordingly increased their material success and prosperity partly through their stories of personal resistance to political oppression. For the Cold War triumphalists of the U.S., this fit a desirable story, in which, in the words of neoconservative Richard Perle, “The collapse of the Soviet Empire in Eastern Europe [was] in large measure a result of the postwar strength and determination of the alliance of Western democracies.” Composers who narrated their life stories and musical biographies on similar terms validated and justified the “strength and determination” of those—including regular audience members—who saw the Cold War as a moral struggle and victory.

At the other end of my periodizing, and hanging, in hindsight, over millennial exuberance, is 9/11, a national catastrophe for the U.S. that did not remain national for very long (and in which Cold War triumphalist Richard Perle was also closely involved). The justificatory discourses used to bring the U.S. to war, and large portions of the world with it, were often moralistic and based around a rhetoric of “freedom,” in ways honed by the Cold War, which after 9/11 were simply attached to new issues: the “liberation” of Muslim women, for example. The overall use of the idea of freedom to justify foreign policy spelled continuity with the Cold War more than rupture. After the initial shock, 9/11 seemed to many an opportunity to reclaim and possibly extend the American hegemony of the post-Cold War period into the twenty-first

century, gaining control of a great deal of oil, and possibly creating new consumer markets, in
the process. It is safe at this point to say that this reclamation has not gone as intended.

Yet it is hardly surprising that the last few years, with the increase in violence in the
Middle East, and the conflicting views over the U.S.’s role in causing (or creating the conditions
for) that violence, has resulted in a new voice and identity making use of incorporation aesthetic,
with the emergence onto the U.S. concert stage of the composer Mohammed Fairouz. Fairouz,
who identifies as “Arab-American,” writes pieces, many in traditional forms like operas and
symphonies, which often take a position of Arab-Jewish reconciliation. He follows the outline
of the incorporation aesthetic to some extent, although he veers more toward the boundaryless
than the nationally specific; his biography describes his “cosmopolitan outlook [which] reflects
his transatlantic upbringing and extensive travels.” Fairouz’s Third Symphony includes texts by
Arab and Israeli poets, as well as a setting of the Mourner’s Kaddish; his fourth symphony is
based on Art Spiegelman’s graphic novel about post-9/11 New York. Given the current state of
U.S.-Arab relations, and the almost 15 years of war in Central Asia and the Middle East, a
flexible, cosmopolitan, politically sensitive composer who combines Arab and Jewish poetry is
precisely the Arab composer the political moment demands. Like Tan, Fairouz is also in pursuit
of a “universal” meaning and relevance, a trope that has persisted in projects that nonetheless
remain tied to geographic or national specificity; the Silk Road Ensemble, for example, launched
in 2000, is still going strong.

The four works of Passion 2000 have had reasonably active performance histories.
Golijov’s work, despite the difficulties of performing it, has almost moved into the choral
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6 In 2013, UCLA hosted Fairouz, along with others, for a residency called “Listening to the Other: Mideast Musical
Dialogues.”

repertoire, with a 2013 performance in New York as part of a high school choir festival (the instrumentalists were still drawn from the usual touring group). Gubaidulina’s Passion has been performed multiple times in Germany, as well as in France, at the Warsaw Autumn Festival, and elsewhere, sometimes as the cycle *The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ According to John*. Rihm’s piece, as with much of his work, is most performed in Germany, and *Deus Passus* has been played all over the country, as well as in the Netherlands and elsewhere in Europe—never in the U.S. In keeping with Tan’s peripatetic career, and his tireless desire to be everywhere—in person or musically—*Water Passion* has toured the most and the furthest. Its first performance after Stuttgart was at the Barbican Festival in London; it has also been in Tokyo, Macau, Seoul, Los Angeles, New York, Leipzig, and Rome; as well as in smaller cities in the U.S., the Netherlands, Italy, Spain, and Germany.

Passion 2000 did lead to four (or five, counting the Gubaidulina sequel) new works that have entered a circulating repertoire, which is more than many contemporary commissions are able to do. It got an amount of publicity that is scarcely imaginable now; when I was at the Bachakademie Stuttgart, I collected from their press books at least 300 pieces, mostly German, but also from other European, American, and Asian papers and journals. I cannot think of a comparable reception for another commission since then, nor is it likely that, for example, Mass Reimaginings will be received as marking a new music-historical direction, or broadcast live around the country.

That the world seems to have shrunk since 2000 is both a truism and something many of us experience on a regular basis; it is certainly true of the new music world, as a cursory look even at my Facebook page would show—and I am on the periphery of that world. Yet with that shrinkage seems to have come a commensurate diminishing of collective possibility, of doing
something that makes the kind of impact that Passion 2000 did. This is an interesting problem, or question, and one that I speculate is partly tied to questions about music as labor. The downsizing and elimination of musical institutions means many new music initiatives are run on smaller budgets, perhaps spearheaded by a single person. Success in today’s new music market requires constant activity, networking, curating, performing, and promoting; while individual musicians are busy doing that, the space for large-scale creation, for a venture that costs millions of dollars and unfolds over several years, is all but negated by the ceaseless activity, whose ceaselessness does not create a great deal of material wealth or income.

There is little doubt that “project”-based music-making seems to be the primary path to musical work and professionalizing in new music in the U.S. In this, it mirrors trends from outside the musical sector. Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello might be describing Mass Reimaginings when they describe the concept of the “project as “a mass of active connections apt to create forms—that is to say, bring objects and subjects into existence—by stabilizing certain connections and making them irreversible. It is thus a temporary pocket of accumulation which, creating value, provides a base for the requirement of extending the network by furthering connections.” But the pressing need to undertake multiple projects at once, and the dearth of large-scale institutional support (in the form of funding, among other things) means it is very difficult to put together something like Passion 2000, which captured the imagination of, at the least, much of German musical culture.

---

8 In their book, The New Spirit of Capitalism, Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello name “activity” as the measure of status in what they call the “projective city;” that is, a project-based structure of justification for participating in capitalism. “Activity” is understood to “surmount the oppositions between work and non-work, the stable and the unstable, wage-earning class and non-wage-earning class, paid work and voluntary work, that which may be assessed in terms of productivity and that which, not being measurable, eludes calculable assessment.” Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello, The New Spirit of Capitalism, Gregory Elliot, trans. (London and New York: Verso, 2005),109.

9 Boltanski and Chiapello, 105.
The incorporation aesthetic, the question of musical universalism, the tension between the global and the local; all of these persist in concert music life. Musicians are more free than ever to travel, and more likely to have a network that will allow them to arrange professional reasons—“projects”—in multiple locations. The musician in circulation, the musician as laborer, the musician in a constant state of activity—in Passion 2000, these are all emerging themes, while in 2016 they have become the core of professional classical music life. It is these changes I will look at in the work ahead, and it is through them, perhaps, that we can shed the most light on how musical life—and with it, the music being written—has changed in what continues to seem a remarkably short period of time.
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