

★创新音乐研究文丛★

# Art of Words: Introduction to Theory of Musical Narrative

## 言说的艺术： 音乐叙事理论导论

王旭青著



人民音乐出版社  
PEOPLE'S MUSIC PUBLISHING HOUSE

★创新音乐研究文丛★

教育部人文社科研究“音乐叙事理论研究”（10YJC760075）项目资助

Art of  
Words: Introduction  
to Theory of Musical  
Narrative

言说的艺术：  
音乐叙事理论导论

王旭青著

人民音乐出版社 · 北京

YANSHUO DE YISHU

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

言说的艺术：音乐叙事理论导论 / 王旭青著. —北京：人民音乐出版社，2013. 8

ISBN 978-7-103-04676-0

I. ①言… II. ①王… III. ①音乐理论-叙述学-西方国家 IV. ①J60

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2013)第081976号

责任编辑：许亮

责任校对：于雪菲

人民音乐出版社出版发行

(北京市东城区朝阳门内大街甲55号 邮政编码：100010)

Http://www.rymusic.com.cn

E-mail:rmyy@rymusic.com.cn

新华书店北京发行所经销

北京隆昌伟业印刷有限公司印刷

787×1092毫米 特16开 2插页 17.5印张

2013年8月北京第1版 2013年8月北京第1次印刷

印数：1-1,000册 定价：62.00元

**版权所有 翻版必究**

凡购买本社图书，请与读者服务部联系。电话：(010) 58110591

网上售书电话：(010) 58110650 或(010) 58110654

如有缺页、倒装等质量问题，请与本社出版部联系调换。电话：(010) 58110533

音乐是一种语言。就算这样的描述还不能确定,但至少也已是含蓄地假设性的存在了,正像很多人都在如此说、如此记述那样。音乐是在传达:做出陈述、传递信息、表达情感。音乐有自己的语法和修辞,甚至有自己的语义。我们知道音乐是有意义的,但这意义究竟是什么,似乎没有任何两个权威可以达成一致性的意见。于是便有了大量关于音乐讲述了什么、怎样讲述的讨论——的确,音乐能“讲述”任何事情。

——爱德华·科恩《作曲家的人格声音》

Edward T. Cone, *The Composer's Voice*

## Preface

As instrumental music evolved in the West over many centuries, its composers developed the capability of generating progressively longer and more complicated individual works. What enabled this impressive growth was, on the one hand, their gradual creation of the generic conventions of musical form—especially sonata form and its variants; and on the other, their growing powers of sustaining musical interest by means of sharply differentiated themes, new techniques of musical development, increased sources of sound production, and the like, even without the orientation provided by standard forms. As we all know, by the mid-to-late nineteenth century, a war in musical aesthetics broke out over the question of whether it was purely musical principles that made possible such extensive statements in instrumental music, or whether composers and listeners had to resort to stories and symbols from outside the music to make it cohere. In the central Germanic musical tradition this conflict pitted the conservatives (Brahms and Joseph Joachim and their followers, as championed by the Viennese critic Eduard Hanslick) against the New German School (Berlioz, Liszt, and Wagner, as championed by the critic and historian Franz Brendel). In Russia, the same two positions, more or less, were taken by Anton Rubinstein and his colleagues at the St. Petersburg Conservatory, on the one hand; and the *moguchaya kuchka* (the “Mighty Handful” of Balakirev, Borodin, Musorgsky, Cui, and Rimsky-Korsakov, as championed by the critic Vladimir Stasov), on the other. The conflict was never really resolved, and so it has lived on into and through the twentieth century. It—or something very much like it—still thrives today, both in the day-to-day world of “Classical Music” in performance and criticism, and in musical scholarship.

Modern theories of musical narrative—that is, the theories with which Doctor Wang’s book deal—have their foundation in precisely these issues of what is intrinsic, and what is extrinsic, to music. What language do we need in order to make sense of Beethoven

sonatas, or Chopin Ballades, or Liszt tone poems, or Brahms symphonies? For us, as musicians, will the language of music theory and analysis suffice? Or do we need something else? And what about the many listeners who have no background in music theory? Does it enlighten them, or increase their understanding, if we interpret extended pieces of instrumental music as telling a story, or at least as unfolding in parallel with a story? And if so, do such stories help us also, as musicians, to achieve understanding? Given our natural need to tell stories, or to invent stories to explain phenomena that we cannot successfully explain otherwise, might we use narrative as a means to musical understanding, whether as musicians or non-musicians? This is the question that the musical theory of narrative asks; and that narrative musical analyses strive to answer in the affirmative; and that Doctor Wang addresses in her book. I do not need to review and evaluate the various approaches to the topic that have developed in North American music theory and musicology over the past few decades; she does that perfectly well. What I can provide, however, is some historical context to explain the growth of the narrative approach to instrumental music over the past thirty years in Anglophone music theory, from the point of view of someone who participated in it in its early stages.

To understand the history of narrative approaches to music in the US, it is essential to realize that American music scholarship is divided between music theorists and musicologists (or music historians). Since the founding of the American Society for Music Theory in 1977, as a separate organization from the much older American Musicological Society, the two branches have been in many respects quite separate—with different histories, and with different traditions, interests, values, and professional language. In accordance with this division, although narrative approaches to musical analysis and interpretation appeared in both the music-theoretical and music-historical communities, they sprouted more or less independently, beginning in the late 1980's. Why the late 1980's, and why in both theory and musicology? As it turns out, the theorists and musicologists who began to take a narrative approach were responding to problems that they perceived in their separate disciplines, but the problems themselves were quite different.

American music theory in the 1980's was dominated by Schenkerian analysis as the principal means to understanding tonal music, and pitch-class set theory and twelve

-tone theory as the principal means to understanding post-tonal and twentieth-century music. These theoretical systems, valuable and productive as they were, nonetheless imposed rather strict limits on what could be said, theoretically—and analytically—speaking. And in practice they imposed limits on what music could be dealt with. In tonal music, the music considered to be of interest was primarily that of the canonic German composers, from Bach to Brahms, plus Scarlatti and Chopin (and thus little or no French, Italian, or Russian music, and no music of the New German School), as exemplified particularly in Schenker's work. In post-tonal and twentieth-century music, the repertoire of choice was the music of high modernism—that of the composers of the Second Viennese School, plus Stravinsky, Bartók, and a selection of post-1945 composers, plus perhaps Ives and Ruggles (and thus little or no Prokofiev or Shostakovich, or Hindemith, Barber, Britten, or other midcentury neo-tonal composers). Although I will be here concerned only with tonal music of the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, as is most narrative-based music-theoretical work, it is worth noting that Doctor Wang extends her approach to Ives, Scriabin, Shostakovich, and Corigliano. Similarly, a quite recent collection of essays edited by Michael Klein and Nicholas Reyland, *Music and Narrative Since 1900* (see bibliography), deals exclusively with twentieth-(and twenty-first-) century music.

My own work in musical narrative was borne out of frustration with these limitations. Although I was grateful for the analytical power that Schenker's ideas provided, I kept noticing aspects of tonal music that his system did not capture, or did not capture very well. In the mid-1980's I developed a strong interest in the semiology and literary criticism of Roland Barthes, and as I was reading his classic *S/Z*, it occurred to me that he was articulating the same sorts of connections that interested me in some tonal music, but that seemed somehow "off-limits" in the music theory of that time. I had the good fortune of finding two colleagues also interested in narrative approaches to music—Fred Maus and David Schwarz—and having a session on the topic accepted at the national meeting of the Society for Music Theory in 1987. Professor Maus and I were able to publish our papers the very next year (his "Music as Drama" in *Music Theory Spectrum*, my "Roland Barthes's *S/Z* from a Musical Point of View" in *In Theory Only*). By coincidence, both Maus and I drew our musical examples from middle-period Beethoven: he

the Quartet in F Minor, Op. 95; I the Piano Trio (“Ghost”) in D Major, Op. 70, and the Fourth Symphony, Op. 60. Our choices were in a way prescient: since that time, most of the work on musical narrative in the music–theoretical community has focused on Beethoven’s middle period and later. I discovered later that our work in musical narrative had been preceded by two wonderful essays of Edward T. Cone: “Three Ways to Read a Detective Story or a Brahms Intermezzo” (1977), and “Schubert’s Promissory Note: An Exercise in Musical Hermeneutics” (1982). And it has been followed by much more excellent work by Professor Maus, along with many valuable contributions by Kofi Agawu, Marion A. Guck, Gregory Karl, Robert Hatten, and especially Byron Almén, whose insightful book on musical narrative is the first monograph to focus exclusively on musical narrative.

On the historical side of musical scholarship, problems within the discipline also gave rise to an interest in narrative approaches. Although these problems were different from those in music theory, they had the similarity of involving both limitations of point of view and limitations of repertory. The limitation of point of view was that musicology tended to concentrate on projects that involved positivistic scholarship: work on autograph manuscripts, transmission and publication of older music, composer biography, and the like. The limitation of repertoire was that the discipline more or less passed over the nineteenth century—at least after the death of Schubert, and with the exception of Brahms. That these constrictions were very real problems became progressively clearer in the late 1970’s, and they were dramatically articulated by the appearance, in 1977, of a new journal, *Nineteenth-Century Music*. This new periodical militated for serious scholarship on the music of the nineteenth century, and for critical approaches to complement manuscript study and other sorts of positivistic research. And so there was suddenly a flowering of work on the very music which at the time was politely passed over and ignored—Italian opera, French grand opera, Wagner, program music, Russian music, and much more. One branch of this new work, beginning around 1990, involved musical narrative, and it featured scholars such as Lawrence Kramer, Carolyn Abbate, Anthony Newcomb, and Vera Micznik. This work was of a quite different cast from that in music theory, in that it was founded, on the one hand, on a tradition of historical scholarship and criticism rather than on musical analysis; and on the other, on traditions



of literary scholarship. Such scholars tended to denigrate musical analysis—even musical analysis that sought to learn from narrative theory—as formalist, anti-historical, and insufficiently critical. And so they developed different ways of approaching music as narrative, and they spawned a tradition of dealing with the topic that is quite different from that practiced in music theory.

That such is the case is unfortunate. It might overstate the point to claim that for a long time young theorists interested in musical narrative would read Maus, Agawu, Guck, and Hatten, etc., but not Kramer, Abbate, Newcomb, and Micznik; while young music historians would read Kramer, Abbate, Newcomb, and Micznik, but not Maus, Agawu, Guck, and Hatten. But there is nonetheless truth in the assertion. Favorable signs are now appearing, though. Byron Almén, in his 2008 book, takes into account both the music-theoretical and music-historical sides of narrative an analysis and criticism, along with that of a non-anglophone tradition that I have not yet mentioned: that of semiotics (or, in French sources, *sémiologie*), as seen in the work of Eero Tarasti, Jean-Jacques Nattiez, and Márta Grabócz. It is also good news that Doctor Wang's book appropriates work from all these scholarly traditions, and it is *especially* good that she is doing so in China—both because she will give Chinese musicians and music scholars a through and balanced view of musical narrative theory in the West for the past 30 years or so, and because she has developed her own independent ideas, which serve as the basis of her interpretation of works from Chopin to John Corigliano. She is to be congratulated on her accomplishment, and I look forward to reading her book—though I regrettably will have to wait until it is translated into English to do so!



Patrick McCreless

Professor of Music, Yale University

February 10, 2013, New Haven

# 序 言

(中译)

在西方,随着器乐音乐几百年的演进,作曲家们创作更庞大更复杂的个性化音乐作品的的能力得到发展。之所以有如此显著的变化,一方面是由于器乐音乐逐渐确立了音乐结构的基本范型,特别是奏鸣曲式及其变体,另一方面是由于借助鲜明对比的主题、音乐展开的新技巧、愈趋丰富的声响资源等手段,使得即使在缺失标准形式结构框架的情况下,器乐音乐维持音乐趣味的能力依然在逐步增长。众所周知,19世纪中后期音乐美学界掀起了一场争论,所涉及的问题是:纯音乐的原则是否更有利于器乐音乐的铺叙延展?抑或作曲家与听众必须要诉诸音乐之外的故事和符号才能让音乐聚合连贯?在德国主流音乐传统中,这种争论表现为保守派(勃拉姆斯、约瑟夫·约阿希姆及其追随者,并得到维也纳批评家爱德华·汉斯立克的支持)与新德国学派(柏辽兹、李斯特和瓦格纳,并得到批评家和历史学家弗朗兹·布伦德尔的支持)的对立。在俄罗斯也有类似的两大阵营:一方是安东·鲁宾斯坦及其圣彼得堡音乐学院的同仁们,另一方则是“强力集团”(巴拉基耶夫、鲍罗丁、穆索尔斯基、居伊、里姆斯基-克萨科夫等人,并得到批评家弗拉蒂米尔·斯塔索夫的支持)。这一争论从未真正解决,并一直延续到20世纪。直至今日,这一争论或相关问题的争论,无论是在“古典音乐”的表演与批评领域中,还是在音乐学术研究中,仍然十分激烈。

当代音乐叙事理论,如王博士书中所论,对音乐的本质及非本质问题有着明确的依据。我们需要用什么样的语言来解读贝多芬的奏鸣曲,肖邦的叙事曲,李斯特的音诗,或者勃拉姆斯的交响曲呢?对音乐家来说,音乐理论和分析的语言就足够了吗?我们是否还需要其他解读方式?对许多没有音乐理论背景的听众来说,如果我们将器乐作品解读为讲述了某个故事,或至少说它像讲故事那样在展衍呈现,那么这是否会对他们有所启迪或增进理解?假若是肯定的,那么这些故事也会帮助我们这些音乐家来理解音乐吗?就算我们生来爱讲故事,或者说喜欢虚构故事来解释那些若非如此便难以理解的事物,那么我们(无论音乐家还是非音乐家)就

能够把叙事理论当做理解音乐的一种途径吗？这正是音乐叙事理论所追问的。叙事音乐分析力求肯定回答这一问题。这也是王博士在她的专著中所要解决的问题。我不必对过去几十年中北美音乐理论和音乐学界有关这一问题的探讨做一番回顾和评论，因为王博士已经梳理得相当完善了。然而我想基于叙事理论早期的一些学者的观点，提供一些有关过去 30 年来用叙事理论（以英文为母语）诠释器乐音乐的历史背景。

要了解在美国用叙事理论来诠释音乐的历史，需先知道美国音乐学术研究群体分为音乐理论家和音乐学家（或音乐史学家）两大类。自 1977 年美国音乐理论学会——作为从较老的美国音乐学协会分离出来的组织——成立以来，这两个群体在很多方面都是完全分离的：不同的历史，不同的传统、兴趣、价值观以及专业用语。与这种分化相应的是，尽管音乐理论界和音乐史学界都将叙事理论运用到音乐分析和作品的诠释中，但在 20 世纪 80 年代末期，双方也或多或少地开始趋向于彼此独立。为什么会在 20 世纪 80 年代末出现？为什么同时会出现在理论研究和音乐学（两大学科）中呢？究其原因是由于那些开始运用叙事理论方法的音乐理论家和音乐学家是以各自不同的视角去回答那些（他们）所意识到的问题，而它们（各自）所关注的问题是完全不同的。

20 世纪 80 年代美国音乐理论是以申克分析体系作为理解调性音乐的主要方法，以音级集合理论和十二音理论作为分析后调性和 20 世纪音乐的主要方法。从理论和分析的层面上看，这些理论体系尽管富有价值和成效，但其运用却有严格的限制，即在分析实践中，何种音乐能够纳入到各自的分析体系中是有限定的。在调性音乐中，被认为有趣的主要是那些德国作曲家的经典作品，从巴赫到勃拉姆斯，再加上斯卡拉蒂和肖邦等（很少甚至不会关注法国、意大利或俄国的音乐，当然也不会关注新德国学派的音乐），如同在申克著述中所列举的例子。在后调性和 20 世纪音乐中，所选作品都是极为现代派的音乐作品——如第二维也纳乐派的作品，再加上斯特拉文斯基、巴托克以及 1945 年以后作曲家的一些作品，或许会加上艾夫斯和罗杰斯等（很少甚至不会关注普罗科菲耶夫、肖斯塔科维奇、兴德米特、巴伯、布里顿以及其他 20 世纪中叶新调性作曲家）。我的研究与大多数的音乐叙事理论研究一样，主要关注 18 世纪晚期和 19 世纪的调性音乐，因此值得注意的是，王博士将她的研究对象拓展到了艾夫斯、斯克里亚宾、肖斯塔科维奇以及科里利亚诺的音乐作品。与此相同，米歇尔·克雷恩和尼古拉斯·雷伊兰德在近期编著的论文集《1900 年以来的音乐与叙事》中也专门研究了 20 世纪（以及 21 世纪）的音

乐作品。

我自己有关音乐叙事的研究也在努力打破这种局限性。尽管申克分析理论的分析效力令人满意,但我一直以为这种分析理论不能或者说不完全地捕捉到调性音乐的各个方面。20世纪80年代中期,我对罗兰·巴特的符号学与文学批评产生了浓厚兴趣。当我阅读巴特的经典论著《S/Z》时,发现他清晰地论述了我曾在某些调性音乐中发现的饶有趣味并与之相似的关系类型。这一研究在当时的音乐理论界显得有些“突破界限”了。我很幸运,我的两位同事——弗雷德·莫斯和大卫·斯瓦兹——都对音乐叙事研究有着浓厚的兴趣,而且我参加了1987年美国音乐理论学会举办的关于音乐与叙事的专题会议。第二年,莫斯教授和我分别发表了论文(他的《作为戏剧的音乐》发表于 *Music Theory Spectrum*,我的《音乐视域下的罗兰·巴尔特之〈S/Z〉》发表于 *In Theory Only*)。我们凑巧都选取了贝多芬的中期作品作为音乐分析例证:他以 *f* 小调四重奏(Op. 95)为例,我以 *D* 大调钢琴三重奏(“鬼魂”, Op. 70)和《第四交响曲》(Op. 60)为例。从某种程度上讲,我们的作品选择是有先见之明的,因为从那以后,音乐理论界中有关音乐叙事研究的对象大多集中于贝多芬的中后期作品。后来我发现,在我们所做的音乐叙事研究之前,爱德华·科恩已发表了两篇极为精彩的文章——《阅读侦探故事或勃拉姆斯间奏曲的三种方法》(1977)和《舒伯特的“约定音”:音乐诠释学的一种运用》(1982)。之后,莫斯教授还发表了更为杰出的论著。此外,科菲·阿迦伍、玛丽恩·古克、格雷戈里·卡尔、罗伯特·海特等学者也都在此领域做出了有价值的贡献,尤其拜伦·阿莱门的那本有关音乐叙事的富有深刻见地的论著是第一本专门探讨音乐叙事的专著。

在音乐史学研究领域,学科自身的某些问题也诱发了学者们对音乐叙事的兴趣。尽管这一学科所关注的问题完全不同于音乐理论学科,但同样在观念和作品的选择上都有一定的局限性。观念的局限在于音乐学家倾向于采用实证主义的学术方法:研究手稿、传播、较早版本以及作曲家生平等等。作品选择的局限在于该学科或多或少忽略了19世纪音乐——至少忽略了舒伯特之后的作品(勃拉姆斯的音乐除外)。在20世纪70年代末,这些限制是实际存在的问题,且日渐明显。而1977年新期刊《19世纪音乐》的问世更是戏剧性地表明了这一反差。这本新期刊对19世纪音乐的学术研究、手稿补遗研究及其他实证研究的分析批评都产生了影响。此后,突然有大量的研究转向了那些曾被忽视了的音乐作品,如意大利歌剧、法国大歌剧、瓦格纳、标题音乐以及俄罗斯音乐等等。在这些新研究中,有些学者

从1990年开始专注于音乐叙事研究,有代表性的是劳伦斯·克雷默、卡罗琳·埃贝特、安东尼·纽康、维拉·米克兹内克等。这些研究视角与过去在音乐理论界所见的研究路数非常不同,过去的研究一方面是立足于历史学和批评学传统(而非音乐分析的传统),另一方面也是立足于文学研究的传统。这些研究与音乐理论学科的同类研究有着完全不同的特点。这些学者往往贬低音乐分析(哪怕音乐分析试图学习叙事理论),并视其为形式主义、反史学和不充分的评论等。他们发展了音乐作为叙事这一研究视角的不同(研究)方法,形成了在论题上全然不同于音乐理论学科实践的新传统。

如果说,在很长一段时期内,对音乐叙事理论感兴趣的青年理论家只阅读莫斯、阿迦伍、古克、海特等人的论著,而不关心克雷默、埃贝特、纽康和米克兹内克的著作,或者反过来说,对音乐叙事理论感兴趣的青年音乐史学家只阅读克雷默、埃贝特、纽康和米克兹内克的论著,而不关心莫斯、阿迦伍、古克、海特等人的文论,那么这种论调尽管有些言过其实,却也所言不虚。这是令人遗憾的不幸。不过一些令人赞许的迹象正在出现,如拜伦·阿莱门在其2008年出版的论著中将音乐理论和音乐史学这两个方面均纳入其叙事的分析与批评中,还有一个我尚未提到的非英文母语的学术传统:符号学(法文“Sémiologie”),可在艾伦·塔拉斯蒂、吉恩-杰克斯·纳蒂埃和马尔塔·格拉波茨的著述中看到。王博士在她的专著中综合论述了上述这些学者的研究成果,同样也是很好的消息。我相信在中国,王博士的这一研究成果富有特殊意义,不仅能让中国的音乐家和音乐学者全面系统地了解过去30年来西方音乐叙事理论研究,而且她提出了一些独到见解,并作为她诠释从肖邦到约翰·科里利亚诺作品的理论依据。我衷心祝贺她所取得的成绩,并期待阅读该书的全文,尽管我现在只能很遗憾地等待,直到该书被翻译成英文的那一天!

帕特里克·麦克科瑞勒斯

耶鲁大学音乐系教授

2013年2月10日于纽黑文

# 目 录

Preface .....	( 1 )
序言(中译) .....	( 6 )
<b>绪论 边界的划定:音乐可以叙事吗?</b> .....	( 1 )
<b>上篇 音乐叙事理论研究的维度与路径:1970—2010</b> .....	( 15 )
<b>第一章 承传与对话:音乐叙事与文学叙事的关联论</b> .....	( 17 )
第一节 文学理论与音乐叙事 .....	( 18 )
第二节 莫斯:音乐作为叙事 .....	( 25 )
<b>第二章 交融与碰撞:隐喻、修辞、符号理论对音乐叙事理论的启发</b> .....	( 29 )
第一节 古克与格雷:音乐叙事作为隐喻 .....	( 30 )
第二节 阿迦伍:主题与修辞理论 .....	( 34 )
第三节 叙事径与符号 .....	( 36 )
一、塔拉斯蒂:叙事径 .....	( 36 )
二、纳蒂埃:三重分析层 .....	( 37 )
三、麦克科瑞勒斯:基于罗兰·巴尔特的五种符码 .....	( 38 )
<b>第三章 际会与动向:音乐叙事理论中的“情节论”“原型论”</b> .....	( 42 )
第一节 纽康:情节原型 .....	( 42 )
第二节 卡尔:结构主义与音乐情节 .....	( 47 )
第三节 阿莱门:音乐叙事原型 .....	( 49 )

第四章 反思音乐叙事理论的学理体系 .....	( 54 )
第一节 重要“纽结”:核心概念 .....	( 54 )
第二节 症结所在:分析路径 .....	( 57 )
<b>中篇 音乐叙事的文本审思</b> .....	<b>( 61 )</b>
第五章 音乐叙事的“行为者”:主题—动机 .....	( 63 )
第一节 叙事理论:“主题—动机” .....	( 63 )
第二节 主题—动机叙事的形态建构 .....	( 69 )
一、“主题—动机的形构”与“理想范型” .....	( 69 )
二、主题内部形态间的关联性 .....	( 88 )
第三节 序列:主题的连接 .....	( 97 )
一、间隔式叙事法 .....	( 99 )
二、预构式叙事法 .....	( 107 )
三、轴式对称叙事法 .....	( 110 )
第四节 音乐主题—动机的叙事方式 .....	( 113 )
一、单一至复杂轴 .....	( 114 )
二、对比至统一轴 .....	( 129 )
第五节 主题—动机叙事功能实现的二重性 .....	( 136 )
一、易解性 .....	( 136 )
二、陌生化 .....	( 137 )
第六章 音乐叙事的结构途径 .....	( 140 )
第一节 叙事情节与音乐结构 .....	( 141 )
第二节 情节结构的组织模式 .....	( 144 )
一、线性结构 .....	( 144 )
二、非线性结构 .....	( 188 )
第三节 音乐情节的类型理论 .....	( 189 )

一、音乐情节理论 .....	( 191 )
二、音乐情节类型 .....	( 197 )
第七章 音乐叙事分析的路径 .....	( 200 )
第一节 音乐叙事分析的源点:叙事动力 .....	( 201 )
第二节 音乐叙事分析的多维路径 .....	( 202 )
一、叙事分析路径的有关研究 .....	( 202 )
二、“本源述体”到“音乐叙事” .....	( 204 )
下篇 音乐叙事的主体对话 .....	( 207 )
第八章 音乐叙事的主体 .....	( 209 )
第一节 音乐叙事者的研究 .....	( 209 )
一、科恩:“人格声音” .....	( 209 )
二、克雷恩:“抒情时间”与“叙事时间” .....	( 211 )
第二节 多重对话与“叙事流” .....	( 215 )
一、对话的多重性 .....	( 215 )
二、“叙事流” .....	( 218 )
第九章 音乐叙事理论中的“理想听者” .....	( 220 )
第一节 “理想听者”概念渊源 .....	( 220 )
第二节 “理想听者”的音乐能力 .....	( 223 )
第十章 音乐叙事理论的意义与指向 .....	( 227 )
第一节 跨学科动力 .....	( 227 )
一、音乐叙事理论与文学叙事学 .....	( 227 )
二、音乐叙事理论与接受美学 .....	( 230 )
三、音乐叙事理论与结构主义诗学—神话学 .....	( 232 )
四、理论的互动 .....	( 233 )
第二节 音乐叙事理论的研究指向 .....	( 235 )



一、“关系论” .....	( 237 )
二、“受众论” .....	( 238 )
三、“开放论” .....	( 238 )
<b>附录一：图表索引</b> .....	( 240 )
<b>附录二：谱例索引</b> .....	( 241 )
<b>参考文献</b> .....	( 244 )
一、中文参考文献 .....	( 244 )
二、英文参考文献 .....	( 248 )
三、乐谱版本 .....	( 258 )
<b>跋</b> .....	( 259 )