

What's up with the "Gestures for Music"?

*Questions and supplements to articles by Alan Stott
Reinhard Wedemeier, DE-Berlin*

In his two comprehensive and deep articles (*Newsletters* Nos. 36 & 37), Alan Stott pleads for the "classical" tone-gestures which he thinks are the essential basis for music eurhythm. But I think he unfortunately misses the crux of the matter.

For nearly every student of eurhythm during his/her training a discrepancy arises in the experience of the gestures for speech sounds and that for angle-gestures. The speech sounds from the beginning can be understood and ever more deepened, but with the notes questions and problems already arise from the beginning. Often we feel we must be unmusical to experience the gestures and we save the situation by diligently "learning the notes", often in front of a music stand with the score before our noses. A path to lay hold of and experience the tone-gestures is as a rule not given.

I think that still too little consciousness of the historical and topical problems of tonal-gestures is present, and for this reason I would like to supplement Stott's "historical survey" with a few points of view.

It has become quite clear by now that the tone-angles were originally conceived as *gestures for the degrees of the scale*, differentiated in the major (above the shoulder level) and in the minor (below). This means, to repeat, that what we call the gestures for C major was the *basic gesture* for *all* the keys. The differentiation of whole-tones and semitones as well as sharps and flats does not originate from Steiner (see the account by Elena Zuccoli in "From the Tone Eurhythm Work at the first Eurhythm School in Stuttgart 1922-24". Verlag Walter Keller, Dornach 1981).

Already very early on two directions appeared amongst the eurhythmists, some took the tone-gestures as "absolute" and others remained with the "relative" tone-gestures. Apparently there were disagreements. In any case the situation was saved through Steiner's answers at the Teachers Conference, Stuttgart Waldorf School, 15th Nov., 1920.

X: *I'd like to ask, should the C-major scale be retained, and in music-eurhythm should value be placed on the absolute note? I have been wondering whether one should not take music eurhythm as relative music-eurhythm.*

Dr Steiner: *One can certainly do this.*

A eurhythm teacher: I always proceed from the absolute note.

Dr Steiner: *You can consolidate the movement in eurhythm by remaining in the absolute [conception]. We don't need to stick to it pedantically.*

Rudolf Steiner's liberal answer shows that both variations are equally possible.

Alan Stott would like in a certain way to combine both principles, by advocating, that with the gesture "G" in G Major, not only prime but also the archetypal 5th degree (in C major) is to be experienced. It is quite clear that *only in this way do the absolute tone-gestures have meaning*. The presented demand, however, is exceptionally high and is hardly to be achieved even by musicians of many years' training. Initially one has to achieve the ability to hear straight away the degrees of a scale from any given keynote.

Take a simple song (e.g. *Der Mond ist aufgegangen*) and carry it out in eurhythm *purely from listening* in C major, then e.g. in E major. Already many people will have problems in C major – what then happens in E major? Just observe yourself...

"Eurhythm as Visible Singing" was given in 1924 and here many questions arise for me to do with all this

- the "tone-gestures" are only *once* alluded to in passing (p. 12; E.T. p. 5), then *never again*. Instead, Steiner starts to develop the gestures for major and minor, then what we call the interval-gestures. *Why did he not speak on the tone-gestures?*
- Why did Steiner repeatedly emphasize, especially at the beginning of lecture 2, that gesture should be *experienced* gesture.... It appears he was missing something... ("Gesture which is to be used for the expression of music must be gesture rising out of actual experience, and this can only be an experienced gesture if the underlying experience is there first.")
- After the *Tonkurs*, the strict angle-gestures, completely independent

independent of pitch, were combined with the new indications for pitch. Here the gestures, which previously were only carried out *on the side of the body* (in the sideways plane), were now placed in the *frontal* area. A tremendous change occurred. Try the difference in practice and you will sense to what I refer. My experience, in short, is this. If I remain with my gestures in the frontal [sideways] plane, I experience more strongly the *raying in from the periphery*. If I carry out gestures in the front space and move the pitch, this sense is almost completely lost. My question is, does this change make any sense? Was the combining of pitch and angle-gesture intended at all?

Now the the topical problems: the gestures which are to express the musical phrase should be an experienced gesture. Honestly speaking, who experiences, for example, when forming a G# in E major an experience of the 3rd degree, in addition to the third degree as the experience of E major in relation to C major, that is, [with E] beginning on the third degree? Or differently expressed, What immediate experience do I actually have with the gesture G#?

If today people are discarding absolute tone-gestures, then this is probably because an experienced gesture is sought, in tune with lecture 2 of "Eurythmy as Visible Singing".

Experience, however, of the degrees in relationship to the keynote in each key, as expressed in the original angle-gestures, can be trained relatively easily and it opens up new worlds in experiencing the series of degrees of a melody (many examples on this are to be found, e.g. in Christoph Peters' book «Zur Sprache der Musik in Mozarts Zauberflöte» ("Mozart's 'The Magic Flute': the language of music", E.T. in MS by Alan Stott).

With this contribution in no way should "absolute tones" be judged, especially when so profoundly represented as by Alan Stott. Rather it is extremely urgent to question the honesty of our experience. "Do what you feel!" Elena Zuccoli answered me, when I once shared with her my problems with the tone-gestures. The answer of a true artist, for which I have always been grateful.

Falling Asleep while Staying Awake

In answer to Reinhard Wedemeier

Maren and Alan Stott

After reading Alan Stott's articles (*Newsletter* 36 & 37), Reinhard Wedemeier kindly offers an interesting response. What a pity to "miss the crux" about the angle-gestures! So we are indeed grateful for Herr Wedemeier's kind words, honest questions and positive approach. Can the *Newsletter* serve to discuss practical problems? Ought our own *Newsletter* be the most exciting read available? Let us keep trying!

Herr Wedemeier is rightly looking for spontaneous feeling. Rudolf Steiner¹ expects this from the word go: the audience "experiences what the eurythmist is feeling and inwardly experiencing" (GA 277a, p. 5). In lecture 5, moreover, Steiner gives the ultimate answer to those who speak about freedom. The author of *The Philosophy of Freedom* observes

there is "no infringement of freedom", rather "what remains is the freedom to carry out the movements beautifully" (p. 53). Addressed to the artist, "Do what you feel!" can only mean (we suggest): "Feel yourself as a personality with the professional task of feeling and showing the music."

Wedemeier also demands instant listening response expressed in eurythmy. Have we understood this aright? Such an ideal is a lifelong aim – so too is a mature interpretation. Do people imagine an instant eurythmy for 2003? Perhaps a *visible listening*? With speech we can hear a sound straight away, but in music we cannot so quickly recognise a degree of the scale or name the chords. Now, according to Ralph Kux,² Rudolf Steiner created many eurythmy forms almost at once. First he had the music played, next he saw the eurythmist's attempt, then, pencil in hand, he heard the music for the third time and drew the form. What musicality and what preparation lie behind an example of such creative ability?

Even so-called musical improvisation is always prepared – it relies on set patterns, instrumental virtuosity, and so on. Everyone knows that great musicians practise and rehearse: every conductor studies the score, every instrumentalist does his eight hours a day. Yet the *element* of improvisation enters every good performance. Art, for Steiner, is always a question of *how*, and the emphasis, we may all gratefully agree, is on feeling experience. In writing about it all, can we approach the "the crux of the matter" for the practice of eurythmy?

One thing does not seem possible – to get behind Steiner. Can anyone reach deeper than he did for the task of renewing art? You can't get anything denser than the bones! And if you penetrate to the marrow you will eventually meet the human being of light (GA 233, 12th Jan., 1924). This human being does not simply sing and speak – he *is* Song and the Word. This realisation is not limited to the mysticism of the few, but is a scientific-mystical fact available to everyone. To approach a solution to topical questions of music eurythmy, we are led to penetrate the nature of musical sound.

Musical sound

Hermann Pfrogner, the well-known music theorist, expanded on Steiner's insights into musical sound. He describes³ its threefold nature. We have the physical notes. The sevenfold scale is "the resounding picture of the human being, pure and simple": the "ethereal level *in the tonal system*" (his emphases). The system of twelve is the astral (= "starry") level *in the tonal system*. The third and final (spiritual) level Pfrogner terms "the enharmonic level". He sees musical development aspiring to make this level concrete (pointing to the 12 primes of the seventh cultural epoch). To the theory of music, Pfrogner supplied the missing concept of *Tonart* – "tonal region", or "tonal realm". The system of angle-gestures in eurythmy can reveal *all* this musical material.

Musical techniques, to repeat, are available. The system of angle-gestures was given – as the first indication, and, moreover, given to children – to show the music. To face the crux of the matter we do need to recognize musical sound. This is forced on us because Orpheus has been dismembered in the 20th century. Pfrogner's analysis shows that today there exists

- (i) an art of music (*Tonkunst*),
- (ii) an art of sound, or resonance (*Klangkunst*), and
- (iii) an art of acoustic sound (*Schallkunst*).

If you are interested to show the covering, or husk (*Hülle*), either of "resonance" or "acoustic sound", then you have to search for appropriate gestures. Expressive dancers are well versed in this search. "Classical" is not our word for the angle-gestures of eurythmy. "Musical" is the right word – the angle-gestures can show classical, romantic, and modern music, indeed, any music you like, for "the soul wants to experience in music what as soul and spirit lives and vibrates in it here on earth" (CA 276, lec. 3).

Herr Wedemeier's questions and supplements

Why did Steiner in 1924 not include explanations on the angle-gestures? Firstly, because he was giving new material and would assume his invited audience of artists would know the system given in 1915 (CA 277a, p. 68; E.T. p. 71). Secondly, it was suggested (not intended as a mutually exclusive view) that the six "unspoken lectures would cover the subject" (Newsletter 37, p. 24, E.T. p. 22). A third approach finds references to the angle-system of the eurythmic instrument in the 1924 lectures – not to the system itself, but its application, e.g. CA 278, lecture 5, to show "every individual key". Is the "crux of the matter" implied here? Notebook 494 (published complete only in the study-edition) also contains some material for research, especially one of the previously missing whole pages (p. 25) showing a sketch of the arm with the directions for major and minor and added note-names (clearly meaning degrees of the scale).

Now for some corrections:

- (a) The suggestion of "not only notes or intervals, but notes and intervals" is not original to the present writers, as Herr Wedemeier kindly suggests, but (it should have been more clearly stated) more a report on the decades-long practice of the artists with whom we have worked. U.-I. Cillert, for example, gives useful exercises precisely on this technique in her useful monograph.⁵
- (b) The flats and sharps *did* originate from discussions with Rudolf Steiner "after the end of the [1915] course" (Kisselk, p. 79).⁶ The modification of the 30° angles to express semitones does not change the system. Perhaps that is why Steiner is reported to have replied to the question of showing the semitones with *Mahnwägen* – "I have no objection". The 90° bend at the elbow, moreover, was introduced for both sharps and flats.
- (c) Steiner's answer (Conference, 15th Nov., 1920) can be understood differently. Can we not see the patience of a master teacher, waiting for the day when eurythmists will know their theory as practical experience? Steiner is restraining himself from giving fixed answers: responsibility is thereby given to the artists.

Eurythmy developed consistently. The essentials upon which to build had been given; Steiner knew the eurythmists would wake up to realize their musical experience (like everybody else's) is already integrated (more on this below). Knowing what happened in 1915, 1920 and 1924, we can attempt to answer the questions of 2003. The elements were given separately in order that eurythmy could enter "a living stream of development" (CA 278, p. 79). That includes doing "several different things simultaneously... [with] simultaneous devotion" (p. 86).

When all is said and done, there are no shortcuts to expression. The cited dispute between "absolute" and "relative" is merely historical. That situation is superseded by realizing the nature of musical sound. The original, archetypal scale in CA 277a is rightly *not* called "C major" but this basic pattern of the major scale coincides with what we call C major. May we suggest that Herr Wedemeier's implied criticism is directed against those who have not yet discovered the expressive potential of the angle-gestures? After all, "learning notes" is already known to every instrumentalist, who, if he is also a musician, goes on to achieve concert ripeness. Musicians do not "show the system" nor what they have "learnt" (cf. Steiner's remarks about the virtuoso, CA 278, p. 43); this is taken for granted – the musician's job is to play the music. "Eurythmists in the becoming" are frequently criticised – occasionally unfairly, though often necessarily, for some still "spall" or pick out notes, like depressing the piano keys but not playing the music. But the *helpful* thing, whether for those of the "do, do, do" school, or alternatively for those who criticise that mindless practice, is to develop expressive visible singing. The proverbial *prima donna* of earlier centuries apparently knew precious little about music, but she could sing. But today, even here, musical knowledge is becoming essential and serves to improve the art of performing. Paul knew it long ago, "I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also" (I Cor 14:15). So, eurythmy is arguably not more difficult and in essence not unlike the singing profession, or the mastering of a musical instrument (CA 278, p. 54). "Think how beautiful it will be when you carry out all this detail, how articulated and expressive a piece of music will be..." (p. 86).

Was the combining of pitch and angle-gestures intended at all?

Herr Wedemeier's experience with "the frontal, sideways plane" is most interesting. The element of pitch, he points out, was added later. Well, is this not an enrichment of expressive possibilities? We all needed our mother's milk and the apron strings. In other words, by all means repeatedly tune up to the original angles! Great instrumentalists practice scales, too. (When ex-child-prodigy violinist Yehudi Menuhin went to George Enesco for lessons, he even made him play open strings till they sounded beautiful!) But as soon as your heart and arms know the angles as reference points you can begin to use them in works of art – you don't have to create the system each time; neither, for example, bore the holes in your flute for each note you play. If that is the early history of music eurythmy in a nutshell, it is only right that each artist recapitulates the stages. Then we step into real responsible freedom. (A personal comment might be allowed. Every day of my working life I play the archetypal scale for students. A so-called chore! Years later it has unexpectedly opened for me direct access into spiritual science – the nature of the human being and the stages of earthly evolution. The eightfold-path article had its origin here, too. A.S.)

Our musical experience depends upon the supply of musical sounds, or notes. Musical art, it may be agreed, includes *how* they are played, yet they have to be the correct notes in the first place. This leads to another topical problem: When obviously audible singing cannot abandon the tonal system, can visible singing do so and still claim to reveal the music? Some initial experience with simple songs was corrected by Steiner (CA 278, p. 73). Eurythmy never was

intended to double the instrumentalists' task. It never was "one-for-one" (or, note-for-note equivalence). The task is to get beyond the "reposing form", the "sculptural element". The astral body, the cosmic, formative music in us,⁴ which "usually remains stuck in a state of repose" (CA 278, pp. 56, 47), is to be revealed through movement. *This* movement, revealing the Musician, or Singer (termed "the chief musician" in the Psalm titles) in and between the artists and audience, has to answer the perennial question, "Why do I need to open my eyes when listening?"

The simplest tune will suffice to show the challenges – for example, Steiner's own "homespun" melodic ditty (CA 278, p. 38f). Here he speaks of the notes, breaths, bar lines and phrasing. "You see, the presentation of eurythmy quite especially reveals that the melody takes up the actual spirit and carries it on. Fundamentally speaking, everything else does not add the spirit of the musical element, being at all events a more or less illustrative element" (p. 39). Devastating words?! Who can deny that Steiner chose to face the crux of the matter? The invention of visually effective, sweeping choreography for extended works is by far an easier challenge. However that is, the eurythmic means can give "a perfectly adequate revelation of the musical element" (p. 86), but only when the rest of Steiner's sentence is taken to heart: "simultaneous devotion" to detail and "management of your body". Detail is never isolated, and "body", of course, is never mere body but an "instrument" (p. 54).

Mozart and the performer's ideal

How agreeable that Reinhard Wedemeier cites Christoph Peter's masterpiece⁵ "The Language of Music: Mozart's *The Magic Flute*"! Let us now take Mozart's well-known *Andante* theme (K.331; it was given a form by Steiner). A eurythmist (as Frau Cillert⁶ similarly explains) might say: First I practise the scale in its inner dynamic from prime to octave and back again, starting on the sixth degree of the archetypal scale (termed "A" for short) and correspondingly proceeding for the whole exercise. I live into the physiology of this particular configuration in the eurythmic instrument (basically, of expansion and contraction, not forgetting "in the transitions") as it comes to differentiated expression in the arms. I feel the point of departure moving along the arms (CA 278, lecture 7; more below).

Nobody, we suggest, "honestly experiences" an "A" or "G#" etc. in the way Herr Wedemeier implies – the question is misleadingly put. Any melody in tonal music is experienced by the listener and performer – eurythmists too – as *relationships* from start to finish, that is, degrees of the scale, melodic intervals and real or implied harmonic colouring (not to speak of rhythm, and so on). Who is it who "honestly experiences" all this? Why, everybody who can hum a tune! But if the above is the professional *formulation* of the spontaneous experience of everyone (in varying degrees of awareness – this embraces, too, the question of the right key), then there must be a way of expressing it all in a complete musical art-form – instrumental as well as eurythmic. And we all know there is. In every symphony, every Christmas carol, every lullaby, "Three blind mice" and "Der Mond ist aufgegangen", melody, harmony (heard or implied) and rhythm are expressed simultaneously and are experienced simultaneously (not to mention timbre, dynamics, and so on) – eurythmy can aspire to express it all. Only the intellect has

to recognize and speak about one aspect at a time. Eurythmic experience is *spontaneous and concrete*, completely and utterly. The terms "A" and "G#" are *abstractions* – and about as useful as a modern filing system; useful precisely for discussing music.

Returning to the piece by Mozart, it seems justified for the next paragraph simply to take up again the "first-person" style. My gesture, then, starts and ends in experience. I am to develop *visible singing* (this includes active listening). Beginning from the point of departure between the shoulder-blades, "out of the air, on to the air", on the third degree (*nuance* of awareness in the lower arm), I expand to the fifth (corresponding places in the eurythmic instrument, especially of the arms); I contract a melodic fourth and arrive on the second degree, and proceed to complete a similar phrase. I discover the first half of Mozart's theme reaches to the fifth degree (the "feeling third" of the archetypal key, so-called «E»). The second half starts on the fifth and reaches the octave (original "sixth" degree). All the nuances of degrees, melodic intervals, breaths, and so on are practised on the basis of "not only but also" – as pointed out before, doing "many different things... [with] simultaneous devotion" (CA 277a, p. 86). This is artistic research – "a staying-awake-while-falling-asleep" (CA 278, p. 9): the challenge, like any study of the human being, is limitless. Each time, the discipline of the composer guides my research. The question of style solves itself through my attention to the musical elements. The soul lives in the technique (CA 279, p. 10; cf. CA 278, p. 72).

Is it necessary to state that normally we are not aware *with our heads* of the relationship of the archetypal scale to the others? In fact "you must not be thinking" (CA 278, p. 81) *when carrying out eurythmy*, or art generally. Even with thinking, we can't "think about thinking" *at the same time* as the creative act of thinking. But that does not imply we are not invited to think in *preparing and evaluating* that act. For art, as Steiner goes on to confirm, *everything* is translated into the language of feeling – neither *at that moment* my feeling about my aches and pains nor a contemplation of my navel, but sharing, communicating, "in every branch of eurythmic activity" the feeling of "the personality, the whole human being of the eurythmist... so that eurythmy may become an expression of life itself" (CA 279, p. 21), concretely, in and through the eurythmic instrument. To repeat: not thinking notes and rests, but feeling them in heart and arms.

With the *Andante* theme, I am unlikely ever to reach final satisfaction with my interpretation. But that is the musician's experience, too – perhaps especially with Mozart. The legendary virtuoso pianist Michelangeli even gave up playing Mozart in public: "Too difficult!" By contrast, towards the end of his career the pianist Artur Schnabel declared that he chose to play those very composers whose music he could never definitively play – Schubert, Beethoven and Mozart. Two attitudes to a problem well-known amongst performing artists! These anecdotes underline the well-known fact that *attempted naivety is becoming increasingly no option*. If "spontaneous" listening and "spontaneous" art is possible – "a second innocence" (Clifford Curzon) – then it is the fruit of painstaking work. All the effort is worthwhile, because, we believe, it is not only part of "the second chapter of eurythmy" (R. Steiner, 1915; CA 277a, p. 159). Its other name is "the second half of earth evolution".

- 1) Rudolf Steiner. *Eurythmy as Visible Singing*. CA 278. Anastasi. Woobley 1998. E.T. and commentary by A.S.
- 2) Hermann Pfrogner. *Zeitwende der Musik*. Langen Müller. München/Wien 1986. E.T. by A.S. in MS; and *Lebendige Tonwelt*. Langen Müller. München/Wien 1981.
- 3) Ralph Kux. *Erinnerungen und Eurythmie u. Musik*. Mellinger Verlag. Stuttgart 1976. E.T. by A.S. in MS; and conversations reported by Friedrich Gillert.
- 4) Discussed, with some words on the atonal conception, in Appendix 5 of the study-edition commentary (endnote 1 above).
- 5) Ursula-Ingrid Gillert. *Wege zum Eurythmischen Gestalten*. Selbstverlag 1993. E.T. by A.S. in MS.
- 6) Tatiana Kisselef. *Eurythmie-Arbeit mit Rudolf Steiner*. Verlag Die Pforte. Basel 1982.
- 7) Rudolf Steiner. *Eurythmy: Its Birth and Development*. CA 277a. Tr. A.S. Anastasi. Woobley, 2002.
- 8) R. Steiner. *The Essentials of Education*. 10th April, 1924 a.m. CA 308, p. 58f., one of the five occasions in 1924 mentioning the point of departure between the shoulder-blades.
- 9) Christoph Peter. *Die Sprache der Musik in Mozarts Zauberflöte*. ["Mozart's 'The Magic Flute': the Language of Music."] Stuttgart 1997. E.T. by A.S. in MS.

Absolute Tone-Gestures or not?

Notes on Reinhart Wedemeier's reaction to Alan Stott's two articles in the two previous Newsletters

Hans-Ulrich Kretschmer, NL-Den Haag

At the request of the editor, I would like to answer Reinhart Wedemeier's article on the angle-gestures in eurythmy with a couple of thoughts. Firstly, in his article I am very pleased that in the discussion on the eurythmic gestures he seeks the point of departure in his own experience. It seems to me absolutely contemporary to want to link the elementary artistic lawfulness of eurythmy with your autonomous experience of the evidence. And for the future of eurythmy it could be the "Cretchen question", whether eurythmists move something that they have learnt, or whether they move what has become something of their own through an experience of inner correspondence of the gesture. Perhaps it is not so easy at all to decide on your own: What actually is really authentic artistic-spiritual experience? What do I just guess at the beginning? What do I rely on through habit and for that reason do not question any longer? What – in contrast to the real – is only *imagined* experience, that in my own world with all good intentions I have talked myself into, as long as I believe in it? In this connection, the observation can be allowed that in the anthroposophical world there is surely much that would not have been spoken or written about if the authentic experience had really always been the measure.

The angle-gestures pose a great difficulty for such authentic experience. As far as I can see, this lies in the first instance that an absolute experience of musical sound is probably for most people for a long time still music of the future. Even if you are gifted with absolute pitch – i. e. you have an inner capacity to memorize a pitched sound – it is still quite another

question whether with the note C the essence of C is experienced in contrast to the essence of E, F#, etc. Yet this would be the assumption if you want fully to experience the correspondence of an angle-gesture in eurythmy. To whom is it given, to feel authentic inner pain, when a eurythmist does "wrong" notes, that is, the gestures for other notes, as they are heard? One of the first eurythmists – I think it was Ilona Schubert – reported this from Rudolf Steiner, who saw her rehearsing. For me personally, I feel irritated when I see "wrong" notes, but I have perfect pitch and can easily check it. Nevertheless, this feeling arises even if I do not consciously look at the correctness of the angle-gestures, so that through this feeling I so to speak begin to awaken and register the "incorrectness" of the gestures. But I would not yet want to describe it as a full experience of the agreement of the angle with the absolute tone, it is but a first step toward it.

Do eurythmists exist who out of the movement fully consciously experience the essential identity of angle-gesture and what they hear? In any case many eurythmy students certainly initially struggle with the note-gestures. The correspondence of the angle-gestures with the degrees of the scale, which only C-major has, is here no more than a "bait", in order to begin to arrive at a felt musical experience in the gesture, as the experience of the degree of the scale easily makes possible. Reinhart Wedemeier – as numerous eurythmists already in Steiner's day – consequently questions whether it were not better, or in any case "more truthful", to use the angle-gestures generally only as degrees of the scale, regardless of the key that you happen to be in and what the absolute notes are called. Even if I agree of course with Reinhart Wedemeier, that practising the experience of the degrees is a very important and grateful task, and that he is right that in the beginning stages of music eurythmy they did not yet in fact distinguish between note and interval gestures, yet still I think that a use of the angle-gestures for the absolute tones is an important development of music eurythmy which should not be reversed – even if only in the future a generally full experience of the evidence of the angle-gestures is able to arise, and that we are still at the stage of childhood. And this for the following reasons:

(1) As a musical element, the note takes up a special place because its essential nature does not lie in the "in the inaudible between the notes", which is the case with all the other musical elements – the intervals, the harmonic relationships, pitch, rhythm and beat. We have rather to look for its essential nature "behind" the aural impression. In this sense the note is an absolute being, in contrast to the above-mentioned elements which have to do with relationships between the notes. In "Eurythmy as Visible Singing", the second phase of the development of music eurythmy, Rudolf Steiner deals with those relative elements of music, after he had given already in 1915 the absolute angle-gestures as a picture of the "singing process" in the human being (just as the gestures for speech sounds are in the human being, see further my book "Grundlagen der Toneurythmie"). What happens in the larynx and the neighbouring organs invisibly when singing is consequently the basis of the angle-gestures, which Rudolf Steiner points out in numerous addresses (e.g. 24th Feb., 1919). The singer, however, sings notes, not degrees of the scale. These only form – just as for example major-minor, pitch, note lengths, dynamics, etc. – the soul-

... of the notes, to which of course the singer also contributes. The actual process of singing does not lie in

the soul-colouring of the note but in the note *production* as such. Now, the eurythmic angle-gestures in my experience are the only gestures with which one can really *sing* like a singer, all the other gestures are musical fashioning of the “in-between”. Only as gestures for the notes as such is their “singing potential” really used up. The degrees of the scale, major and minor zones, and so on, as they existed in the early days of eurythmy (Reinhard Wedemeier mentions Elena Zucconi’s books) are in my opinion only preliminary steps, “bait” on the way to a real singing of the *tones*.

(2) It is the ideal of the really good singer, to let the musical sound manifest freely, *i.e.* freed in space from the bodily nature. The ideal singing sound is consequently the one where we receive the impression *as though it sounded from the periphery*, and not the one where we receive the impression that the singer himself is sounding. The above-described singing process, consequently, culminates in the appearance of the sound in the surrounding space. The same goes for the angle-gesture in eurythmy: It achieves its aim when the gesture calls up the impression as if the musical sound appears in the surrounding space. Even if this does not always happen – rather less than often –, the eurythmic angle-gesture carries the potential in itself. And here I personally have a really authentic experience as an onlooker: I was fortunate once to have “seen” how the angle-gesture of a truly sounding eurythmist was answered by a “beam of light” out of the periphery. Of course, the larger intervals are connected to the periphery, but here there always remains a *soul relationship between me and the periphery*. But the essence of the musical sound *lives in the periphery* and to this I can build up *no* soul connection. It can only answer out of the surroundings, as I say, under specific circumstances (more details again in my book “Grundlagen der Toneurythmie”).

(3) With this, I have tried to describe that the *nature* of the eurythmic angle-gestures corresponds with the nature of singing and the peripheral being of the musical sound (tone). A reduction of the angle-gestures into merely an experience of degrees of the scale would stifle the potential of the angle-gestures and thereby rob music eurythmy of its most essential dimension. The problem of the *angle-gestures* remain: Here we will have to remain with a patient approximation of an authentic experience; eurythmy in a way has its future still to come. But I do think if one can fully connect oneself with the singing *and* the peripheral quality of the tone-gestures regardless of a specific angle – and this should be possible –, then we already have an experience of singing and sounding, which can counteract the unsatisfactory situation with the angle-gestures, which mostly one can only learn out of the musical score. And perhaps one approaches in time the being of the absolute musical sound (tone) and begins to feel a little something of the character of a “C”, and so on. Even the character the individual keys – C-major might possibly reveal something of the note C – can possibly help here as another “bait”. For your own honesty, this means in the meantime to live with the hypothesis, amongst other things also to trust Rudolf Steiner. But when we look closely, don’t we do this, also with many other aspects of anthroposophy, wherever we do not possess real spiritual vision, yet have at least a feeling trust which determines what we do? This does not mean a blind uncritical trust, but one of which I can say: Of this and that I am certain, but here I live with something about which I have so far only taken hold of one dimension, and where I am on the way some time in the future to understand even more dimensions. What would be the alternative? No angle-gestures or only such as degrees of the scale is for *me* no alternative, for the above-mentioned reasons.