This article was downloaded by: [University of Strathclyde]
On: 06 October 2014, At: 04:04
Publisher: Routledge
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered
Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41
Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Proceedings of the Musical Association

Publication details, including
instructions for authors and
subscription information:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/jrma18>

On a Suggested Simplification of the Established Pitch- Notation

Sedley Taylor Esq., M.A. ^a

^a Trinity College, Cambridge
Published online: 28 Jan 2009.

To cite this article: Sedley Taylor Esq., M.A. (1874) On a Suggested Simplification of the Established Pitch-Notation, Proceedings of the Musical Association, 1:1, 18-40, DOI: [10.1093/jrma/1.1.18](https://doi.org/10.1093/jrma/1.1.18)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jrma/1.1.18>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions

and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

DEC. 7, 1874.

THE REV. THOMAS HELMORE, M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

ON A SUGGESTED SIMPLIFICATION OF THE
ESTABLISHED PITCH-NOTATION.By SEDLEY TAYLOR, Esq., M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College,
Cambridge.

By way of introduction to the more distinctly practical portion of this paper, I propose to examine concisely the following question :—‘What are the essential requisites of a good notation for musical pitch?’ I shall then enquire how far the system in common use satisfies the conditions which an answer to this question must embody. Before submitting to the Association some suggestions of my own for remedying the defects which will thus be brought to light, I shall make a few observations on the leading methods by which others have sought to attain the same object. This will be done with no desire to disparage the merits of these schemes, but merely in order to show that their success has not been so complete as to render further efforts superfluous and uncalled for.

Music has, of course, an existence absolutely independent of, and prior to, all notation whatever. *Volkslieder* are handed down from generation to generation by oral tradition alone. If our language contains no recognised equivalent for the German word just used, our country none the less possesses the thing, and a distinguished member of our Association has earned the gratitude of every patriotic English musician by endowing us with a permanent record of these homely and home-recalling strains. Now what is the feature in the notes of one of these simple airs which enables us instantly to recognise it, whether we hear it whistled by a shepherd o’er the lea, or ground on a barrel-organ in a foreign land? Most certainly it is not what we call the *absolute pitch* of the different sounds heard. Whether these be the deep tones of a manly bass, or the ringing notes of a childish treble, the recognition is equally unhesitating. In fact, we no more think of calling for a ‘Standard A’ tuning-fork to settle the point, than we do of asking for a foot-rule to enable us to recognise the portrait of an absent friend. That the tune begins on *c*, or *g*, or *g*#, as little influences our power of recognition in the one case, as the fact of our friend’s face in the picture being 10, 11, or 12 inches long does in the other. It is, then, the *relations* of pitch among the notes of a melody which fix its character, just as it is the relations of size and form among the parts of a portrait which constitute its likeness to the person whom it represents. Of

course I am here designedly leaving the other elements of melody—time and rhythm—out of consideration, as they do not affect our present enquiry.

From what has been said above, an important conclusion immediately follows. In representing the constituent notes of a melody by a series of symbols, full effect must be given to the consideration that the mutual relations of these notes to each other are of paramount importance, while their relations to some fixed standard of pitch extraneous to the melody are of very secondary consequence. In other words, a direct exhibition of *intervals* is the first requisite of a good notation. By all means provide equally well for absolute pitch, if possible, but not by subordinating relative pitch to it. If there is not room on the stairs for the two to go down to dinner arm-in-arm, absolute pitch must walk behind.

The point of departure from which intervals should be reckoned is implicitly determined by the tendency of modern music to establish a direct relationship between each of the notes which form a musical phrase, and its key-note or tonic. The simplest experiment suffices to show the immediateness of the connection. Thus, if the notes of a common chord in its fundamental position,

are successively sounded, what at once strikes the ear is the fact that the last three notes form respectively a third, fifth, and octave *with the first*. The intervals they form *with each other*, viz., minor third, fourth, and minor sixth, pass altogether unnoticed, and in order to determine them our attention must be specially directed to the enquiry. In short, relation to the *key-note* is instinctively recognised by the ear as *direct*: relation to any other note possesses no such prerogative. It follows that the intervals exhibited by a good notation of pitch must be *tonic intervals*—i.e., they are to be reckoned from the key-note.

Assuming, then, that tonic intervals are to be represented, the question arises, what the precise *extent* of these intervals is to be? The answer which at once suggests itself is that the intervals must be those which are pronounced by the ear to be *perfectly in tune*; but this consideration, though pointing to the true and only final authority in the case, is not of itself immediately decisive of the question. To obtain a perfectly definite answer recourse must be had to acoustical science, which will decide the point as follows. The only intervals which strike the ear as perfectly in tune are those which accurately satisfy certain simple numerical relations connecting the number of vibrations executed in the same time by the pairs of notes which form such intervals

with each other. The intervals thus defined are termed *natural*, in contradistinction to all others, which are called *tempered*. The position just laid down is no mere *opinion*, but an ascertained physical fact, as certain as that water consists of oxygen and hydrogen in the proportion of one volume of the former to two of the latter. No person who has adequately studied the evidence on which the established conclusions of physical science rest will seriously propose to dispute the competence of acoustics on a matter unquestionably lying within its jurisdiction. At the same time, many of those whose acquaintance with music has been limited to its artistic and æsthetic side, are naturally reluctant to accept a series of dogmatic decisions imposed on the bare authority of acoustical science, and perhaps stated by some of its expositors with an irritating arrogance of tone. Now, that resolute, manly independence of mind which refuses to submit to any authority whose credentials it has not had the means of adequately verifying, is not to be put down by oracular snubbings from men of science, but must be satisfied by the production of arguments, whenever the nature of the subject in hand allows these to be presented in an untechnical and intelligible form. It fortunately happens that, with regard to the question of natural and tempered intervals, I can appeal to experiments which will come home to the most non-scientific or anti-scientific person present. Professor Helmholtz had a harmonium constructed, on which, starting from an assigned tonic, he was able to play either natural or tempered intervals. In order to ascertain which of the two were selected by a singer in executing a simple melody, he accompanied the opening notes on his harmonium, and then ceased playing. When the vocalist sang a third or a sixth—intervals where the defects of the system of equal temperament are the most considerable—he struck either the corresponding natural or the corresponding tempered note on the instrument. The result Helmholtz states to have been that *in every case the voice was in unison with the natural interval and in dissonance with the tempered one*.¹ A similar comparison made with the sounds of a violin derives a special interest from the name of the artist who assisted on the occasion. 'I had,' writes Helmholtz, 'the happy opportunity of instituting experiments of the same kind on my harmonium with Herr Joachim. His tuning of the strings of his violin produced *exact coincidence with the natural g, d, a, e of my instrument*. I next asked him to play the scale, and the moment he reached the third or sixth, I struck the corresponding note on the harmonium. By means of the beats it was easy to ascertain that *this distinguished musician played natural, not tempered, thirds and sixths*.'² Is it a mere fancy if, in this striking and conclusive experiment, which shows us the greatest physical

¹ *Tonempfindungen*, third edition, pp. 633, 634.

² *Ibid.* p. 509. The technical notation used by the author has compelled me to paraphrase the above extract, but its meaning has not undergone a shade of alteration.

philosopher and the most eminent artist in Europe working together side by side for the further attainment of truth, I seem to see a good augury for that happy and fruitful union between the Science of Acoustics and the Art of Music which it is the aim of this Association to foster and, as I hope, its destiny to consummate?

It would be easy to point out further objects which it is desirable that a notation should secure, and some of these will come under our notice further on. For the present we will restrict our demands to these two, that it shall indicate, in some plain and straightforward way, *tonic intervals*, and that these intervals shall be *natural*, not tempered ones. Let us see how far the established notation satisfies these requirements.

As long as we keep to the key of C, tonic intervals are clearly and directly exhibited by the established notation. They can be counted off from the starting-point indicated by the clef with all the facility to be desired. But when other keys have to be represented by it, this is no longer the case. We are then merely directed to widen or narrow some—or possibly all—of the intervals of the C scale, by certain symbols prefixed to the corresponding notes of that scale. That in this manner fresh scales similar to the C scale are obtained is a fact of independent experience, which, as far as anything contained in the notation is concerned, might equally well not be true at all. An easy rule, no doubt, enables us to determine whether any (and if so what) key a particular group of accidentals indicates, but the rule is based on information which these symbols themselves do not completely convey. There is nothing on the face of the notation to tell us *where the tonic is*, and, in the absence of such an indication, no resource but still to read all intervals off from the original starting-point C. A huge and perfectly gratuitous complication is thus introduced into a very simple matter. The sounds of a melody are no longer referred to their own tonic, but to a different note which has no real claim to their allegiance. This is very much as if the Acts of existing Parliaments were couched in language implying that not Victoria but William the Conqueror now sat on the throne of England. It is ignoring the live tonic in order by an artificial phraseology to make a dead tonic appear to breathe and govern. By a process of this description the simplest relation may be made to look complicated. Suppose I take two pieces of wood, and by merely placing them side by side ascertain that one is just twice as long as the other. So far, nothing can be more simple. But, then, an adherent of the absolute-length theory comes up and insists that both sticks shall be measured and their lengths expressed in standard feet, inches, and fractions of inches. We will suppose that this is done, and that the results come out five feet one inch and three-quarters of an inch, and two feet six inches and seven-eighths of an inch, respectively. All simplicity is, by this arrangement, entirely got rid of, and the fact that one stick is

twice as long as the other—the only thing it was really essential to communicate—is buried under a heap of intrusive arithmetic, from which nothing less than a sum in compound division of vulgar fractions will suffice to unearth it.

In order to show that this illustration fairly represents the procedure embodied in the established pitch-notation, let me take an instance or two, almost at random.

What, for instance, is the direction conveyed by

'Strike a minor seventh from middle C, and then a ninth from the same note, or a whole tone from its octave.' Every singer feels at once how difficult the second step appears when thus indicated. But the difficulty is solely due to the fact that the direct relation of the second note to the first has been superseded by the indirect relations of both to a third. If the direct relation be restored, and the singer told to follow the first note by a second a major third above it, the step which before was hard now appears perfectly easy. Similarly,

which orders a minor third, a fifth, and a minor seventh from C to be successively sounded, is only an obscure and roundabout way of calling for a major triad on E $\flat$ as root. Instances in which such needless difficulties are heaped up to an almost intolerable degree will abundantly occur to your recollection.

Our patient and even contented, nay complacent, submission to this heavy yoke seems to me all the more extraordinary when I remember that, in immediate juxtaposition with our complicated *absolute* pitch-notation, we have a perfectly simple *relative* time-notation, the simplicity of which is directly due to the fact that it is relative, and would disappear the moment we attempted to make it absolute. Suppose that our notation, instead of presenting us with minims twice as long as crotchets, and crotchets twice as long as quavers, were based like the pitch-notation on some fixed standard, and indicated the duration of these notes by the number of seconds or fractions of a second for which each was to be held. The opening of 'Rule Britannia' at the usual *tempo* would then be written, as far as time went, as follows:—

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c} \frac{15}{34} & \frac{15}{17} & \frac{15}{68} \frac{15}{68} \frac{15}{68} \frac{15}{68} & \frac{15}{17} \frac{15}{34} \frac{15}{68} \frac{15}{68} & \frac{45}{34} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

The fact that our time-notation becomes hopelessly complicated when its relative basis is replaced by an absolute one, ought to encourage us to expect a great simplification from a precisely opposite change effected in our pitch-notation.

The established notation, it has been seen, only indicates tonic intervals in a single key, and this circumstance is fatal to all directness and simplicity of representation in other keys. Further, as is perfectly well known, its intervals except that of the octave are tempered, i.e., out of tune. It is well adapted to the purposes of an instrument with twelve fixed tones in the octave, tuned on the system of equal temperament, but totally inadequate to supply the needs of more perfect instruments which have the happy privilege of roaming unconstrainedly over the whole range of pitch within their compass. Now, to impose on these latter a notation based on the infirmities of the former is just as if, having succeeded in constructing an automaton man, whose feet could execute exactly twelve movements, we were to decree that henceforth all dancing-masters should teach their pupils on the established twelve-step system, and all manuals of the art be compiled on a notation implying that human feet need move in no other ways. I will leave it to those who are perfectly satisfied with our existing pitch-notation, to say whether they think the measures I have hinted at would, if early adopted, have exercised a happy influence on the development of the ballet.

Whatever difference of opinion there may be as to the practical importance of the defects which have been pointed out, the existence of these drawbacks amply justifies attempts to remove them. The most important of these is embodied in the 'Tonic Sol-fa' notation, of which I propose to give a brief description for the sake of those who may not be acquainted with it.

The whole apparatus of staff and notes is discarded by this notation, and replaced by the initial letters of the time-honoured syllables, 'do, re, mi, fa, sol, la, si,' arranged in horizontal lines, as in ordinary letterpress. To avoid ambiguity between *sol* and *si*, the latter is altered into *ti*. A rise or fall of an octave is indicated by a superscript or subscript accent. Thus d^1 is an octave above d , d_1 an octave below d . Whatever key is employed, *do* always denotes the tonic for the time being, and *re, mi, fa, &c.* represent notes forming with it the successive tonic intervals of the natural major scale. Accidental tonic intervals are denoted by additional syllables. Modulation is indicated by an ingenious contrivance called the 'bridge-tone,' which exhibits at a glance the twofold relation borne by a note of transition to the outgoing and to the incoming tonic. Each relation is, of course, expressible by a proper interval-initial, and the displacement of one of these letters by the other symbolises the supersession of the old tonic by the new one. The 'bridge-tone,' constructed on this principle, places the retiring initial above and to the left of the entering one. Thus d_1 indicates the commonest

transition, that into the key of the dominant. The 'do' of the outgoing key is to be sounded, *but its name changed to 'fa.'* Immediately after a modulation, the old syllables resume their sway; but the notes indicated by them, being reckoned from a different starting-point, are no longer the same that they were before the transition occurred.

This meagre outline, which is all that the time at my disposal allows me to give of the Tonic Sol-fa notation, yet suffices to bring out its two conspicuous merits. The intervals which it indicates are *tonic*, and they are *natural*. Mr. Curwen—who, though not the inventor of the method, has greatly improved and developed it (the bridge-tone is, if I am not mistaken, due to him)—is therefore entitled to a hearty recognition of the fact that the system with which his name is identified is free from the two most serious defects of the established notation.

In a volume published about a year and a half ago,¹ I spoke of the Tonic Sol-fa system in terms of strong approval; but, while recognising its superiority as fully now as I did then, I think that there is one great advantage possessed by the established system which we cannot afford to part with: I mean its pictorial character, which appeals so directly to the feeling that we must go *up* to a shrill note and *down* to a grave one. The sacrifice of this help to the mental conception of pitch I regard as the very opposite of an improvement on the old notation. Further, I am convinced that letters can never be read with the ease and rapidity attainable with notes of the ordinary shape. The subscript and superscript accents are difficult to read, and very liable to misprints; and, what is still more serious, errors arising from this source are often *cumulative*—i.e., a single mistake in an accent may throw everything which comes after it an octave too high or too low. The way in which every minor key is treated as a mere appendage of its relative major I consider very objectionable, and the special time-notation incorporated in the system appears to me, when applied to at all intricate divisions, decidedly more complicated than that which it seeks to replace.

Considerations such as those just laid before you induced Mr. W. H. Gill to seek to combine in a notation of his own the principal advantages of the established system and of the Tonic Sol-fa. He has published a short account of his method, to which he has given the name 'Tonic-Staff Notation.' He employs a staff of *three* lines instead of five, and notes of the ordinary form, whose pitch, however, is not *fixed*, as in the old notation. Whatever be the key employed, its tonic is always written on the *lowest line* of the staff. Notes occupying the remaining spaces and lines represent sounds which form with the key-note the tonic intervals of the major scale. When a modulation occurs, the whole staff is shifted bodily up or down, until its lowest line is coincident with the incoming tonic in the former position of the staff. In

¹ *Sound and Music*, pp. 213-215. (Macmillan & Co.)

this manner Mr. Gill's notation embraces the exhibition of natural tonic intervals and the retention of a pictorial scale of pitch. Further, by placing the second line of his staff sometimes nearer to the third than to the first line, and sometimes nearer to the first than to the third, he constructs two varieties—the former to be used for major, the latter for minor scales. The *principles* on which Mr. Gill has gone are identical with those of my own system, and I gladly acknowledge his priority in publicly stating and using them. At the same time I do not think that the modes of applying these principles which he has adopted are free from serious objection. To mention one or two of these.

It certainly seems undesirable, in a system avowedly 'designed as an introduction to the study of the ordinary staff notation, on the moveable *Do* principle,' to nail the tonic permanently down on the bottom line of the staff, because when once this association had been formed in a learner's mind, he would experience a great deal of unnecessary difficulty in reading off intervals from *any assigned line or space*, which he will in his subsequent established notation studies constantly have to do. It would be a frequently occurring consequence of the same arrangement, that before and after a modulation a note of one and the same degree of pitch would first appear on a line, and then in a space, or *vice versa*—a circumstance likely to cause much confusion when the ultimate change to the established notation came to be made. The difficulty of writing music on this system appears to me all but insuperable, and I understand that its author does not contemplate its being applied to instrumental music. For these reasons I cannot regard his system, ingenious though it is, as a final solution of the problem.

In proceeding to describe that to which I have myself been led, I wish to state, explicitly, that while I maintain the principle of tonic relationship embodied in the system to be both sound and complete, I make no such claim on behalf of the expedients here proposed for carrying it out. These are mere tentative suggestions, the utility or inutility of which nothing but subsequent experience can determine.

The five-line staff and the clefs commonly used are retained unaltered. *The position of the tonic for the time being is indicated by a wavy line drawn along the appropriate space or line of the staff.* This is the essential feature of the system, and must therefore be illustrated by an adequate number of examples.

The seven so-called 'natural' keys are provided for by this method, as follows:—

For 'sharp' and 'flat' keys—i.e., those whose tonics do not appear in the scale of C major—the form of the wavy curve is modified, loops turned upwards being used for the former, and downwards for the latter.

Thus

indicates the key of F#;

that of Bb. Similarly

and

denote the keys of Db and C# respectively.

Notes standing without any sign of pitch-modification prefixed to them belong to the major scale of the reigning key-note, and are to be read off according to their distances from the line or space occupied by the tonic curve. Thus the scales of C major, F# major, and Ab major would be written as follows :—

Minor tonic intervals are distinguished from such as are merely 'accidentally' modified intervals of the major scale by a special symbol (L) prefixed to them. The descending minor scale, in its ordinary form, is written as follows for the keys of C, G#, and Bb :—

The signs $\sharp$ and $\flat$ are exclusively reserved for *chromatics*, and with this limitation on their ordinary scope that *they only influence those notes to which they are actually and immediately prefixed*. The sign $\natural$ is by this convention rendered superfluous, and may be dispensed with altogether. I append two chromatic phrases, written in the established notation, with a translation into my system beneath each:—

Whenever a modulation occurs, the tonic curve correspondingly shifts its position, or alters its form, or undergoes both these changes at once. The following are instances of each case:—

It has already been seen that, at a modulation, a note of transition stands in a twofold relation to the outgoing and to the incoming tonics. If the new relation admits of being expressed by a major interval, the notation itself shows what that interval is. We have, of course, only to count it off from the new tonic curve. If, however, the interval in question be minor or chromatic, the fact can be indicated by writing immediately *after* the note of transition an appropriate symbol—e.g., $\flat$ in the former case, and an 'accidental' in the latter. For instance:—

Only one point remains to be explained. We are familiar with cases in which a *change of notation indicates no change of pitch*. Thus, $C\sharp$ may be replaced by $D\flat$, or *vice versa*, though the note to be sounded remains the same. When such a change affects the tonic itself, there is, of course, no real alteration of *key*, but only of *key notation*. To call such a change a 'modulation' (as is done in the phrase 'enharmonic modulation,' commonly applied to it) is extremely misleading, since it tends to confuse together two things which ought to be carefully distinguished

from each other—viz., a change of *pitch* on the part of the tonic, which alone constitutes a modulation; and a mere change of *notation*, existing only on paper, which therefore is no modulation at all. In my system an enharmonic change involving the tonic is shown in such a way as to prevent its being mistaken for a real modulation. If a transition note is sounded both before and after the change of notation, a straight line is drawn from its first to its second representative, to show that no alteration of pitch is contemplated. In the case of a note entering without this kind of preparation, a straight line is drawn to it from the position on the staff which it would have occupied if it had been written down before the change took place. The following are cases in point:—

The system above described gets rid, by the expedient of the tonic-curve, of all $\sharp$ s and $\flat$ s, save those which indicate notes really extraneous to the major scale of the key-note in use at the time. In the established notation every major key at all remote from that shown in the signature brings in several $\sharp$ s, $\flat$ s, or $\natural$ s, the result being that it is often no easy matter to tell whether a particular note stands in a major, minor, or chromatic relation to the reigning tonic. The simplification which I advocate removes every such superfluous symbol, and also sweeps away the cumbrous key-signatures. The saving thus effected in the number of signs of pitch-alteration employed will, of course, vary with the composition to which the system is applied. In some very extreme instances I have found it amount to as much as 90 per cent.; in all cases where any considerable use of modulation is made, it will not, I am persuaded, fall short of 50 per cent. Every musician knows what a relief is experienced when a transition into a remote key is accompanied by a corresponding change of signature. My notation secures this advantage at every step of a composition, without demanding the constant effort of memory which rapid successive changes of signature would necessarily entail. The key-note stares the performer in the face throughout, and relieves him of all responsibility save that of remembering the invariable construction of the normal major scale.

To the singer my system offers all the advantages of the Tonic Sol-fa, while it preserves for him the pictorial exhibition of pitch and the superiority of notes over letters which that method sacrifices: it also provides a satisfactory continuous indication of absolute pitch, which, though not indispensable to a vocalist, is at least convenient for the sake of comparison with the notes of an accompanying instrument.

To the pianist and organist the main advantage derivable from it would lie in the removal of superfluous symbols, on which I have already dwelt. Still, I cannot but think that in their case, too, though to a less extent than in that of a singer, the fact of the major, minor, or chromatic character of a composition being constantly prominent on the face of the notation, and notice of every modulation being given as it occurred, would assist the intelligent performance of difficult works.

In order to facilitate comparison of my system with the established notation, I place here a portion of No. 11 of Spohr's 'Last Judgment,' written in both methods. The upper three lines of each bracket of six contain the established version, the lower three the simplified version. The number of accidentals, $\sharp$ s, $\flat$ s, and $\natural$ s, required by the old system, exclusive of those in the key signature, will be found in this instance to be 181, while 56 signs of pitch-modification suffice to represent the same extract in mine.

At the conclusion of the Paper the thanks of the meeting were unanimously voted to Mr. Sedley Taylor, and a discussion arose, in which the Rev. T. Helmore (the Chairman), Dr. Stainer, Dr. Pole, Dr. Stone, Mr. Charles E. Stephens, and Mr. Alexander J. Ellis, took part. Mr. Sedley Taylor replied.

FROM SPOHR'S ORATORIO, THE LAST JUDGMENT.—No. 11.

VOICE.

ACCOMP.

VOICE.

ACCOMP.

The image displays a musical score consisting of five staves. The first staff contains a series of notes, including a half note, followed by a series of eighth notes, and then a series of quarter notes. The second staff contains a series of notes, including a half note, followed by a series of eighth notes, and then a series of quarter notes. The third staff contains a series of notes, including a half note, followed by a series of eighth notes, and then a series of quarter notes. The fourth staff contains a series of notes, including a half note, followed by a series of eighth notes, and then a series of quarter notes. The fifth staff contains a series of notes, including a half note, followed by a series of eighth notes, and then a series of quarter notes. The notation includes various note values, rests, and accidentals, all written in a standard musical notation style.

The image shows a musical score page with six staves. The first three staves are grouped by a brace on the left. The first staff contains whole rests. The second staff contains a melodic line with notes and some accidentals. The third staff contains a more complex melodic line with many accidentals. The fourth staff contains whole rests. The fifth and sixth staves are grouped by a brace on the left and contain dense, complex melodic lines with many accidentals.

The image displays a musical score on page 33, featuring two systems of staves. Each system consists of a treble clef staff, a bass clef staff, and a grand staff (treble and bass clef staves joined by a brace). The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and trills.

System 1 (Left):

- Treble Staff:** Contains a series of eighth notes, some beamed together, and a trill marked with a wavy line and 'tr'.
- Bass Staff:** Contains a series of eighth notes, some beamed together, and a trill marked with a wavy line and 'tr'.
- Grand Staff:** Contains a series of eighth notes, some beamed together, and a trill marked with a wavy line and 'tr'.

System 2 (Right):

- Treble Staff:** Contains a series of eighth notes, some beamed together, and a trill marked with a wavy line and 'tr'.
- Bass Staff:** Contains a series of eighth notes, some beamed together, and a trill marked with a wavy line and 'tr'.
- Grand Staff:** Contains a series of eighth notes, some beamed together, and a trill marked with a wavy line and 'tr'.

The image displays a musical score for piano and violin, organized into two systems. Each system consists of a piano (p) part and a violin (v) part. The piano parts are written on a grand staff (treble and bass clefs), and the violin parts are written on a single staff (treble clef). The first system shows a piano part with a trill (tr) and a violin part with a trill. The second system shows a piano part with a trill (tr) and a violin part with a trill. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and trills.

The image displays a musical score for a piano piece, consisting of three systems of staves. The first system features a single melodic line on a treble clef staff, followed by two staves of accompaniment. The second system shows the same melodic line, but the accompaniment is simplified into a continuous, flowing line. The third system shows the melodic line with a more complex, rhythmic accompaniment. The score is written in a single system, with the three systems of staves grouped together by a large brace on the left. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and clefs.

The image displays a musical score on page 37, featuring two systems of three staves each. The notation is written in a style that includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and accidentals. The first system consists of three staves, with the top staff containing a melodic line, the middle staff containing a more complex line with many notes, and the bottom staff containing a line with fewer notes and some accidentals. The second system also consists of three staves, with the top staff containing a melodic line, the middle staff containing a line with many notes, and the bottom staff containing a line with fewer notes and some accidentals. The notation is written in a style that includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and accidentals.

The image displays a musical score for six staves, organized into two groups of three. The first group (staves 1-3) represents the original, more complex version of a piece, while the second group (staves 4-6) represents a simplified version. The first staff of each group contains a melody with various note values, including eighth and sixteenth notes, and rests. The second staff of each group shows a simplified version of the melody, where complex rhythms are replaced by longer note values and rests. The third staff of each group shows a further simplified version, where the melody is reduced to a single note or a few long notes. The staves are labeled with treble and bass clefs, and the key signature is indicated by a single flat (B-flat) in the first staff of each group. The overall structure suggests a comparison between a complex original and a simplified version of the same musical piece.

The image displays a musical score for three systems, each consisting of three staves. The notation is written in a style that combines standard musical symbols with some unconventional, possibly experimental, elements.

- System 1:** The first staff begins with a treble clef and a key signature of one flat (B-flat). It contains a series of eighth and sixteenth notes. The second staff starts with a treble clef and a key signature of two flats (B-flat, E-flat), featuring a mix of eighth and sixteenth notes. The third staff begins with a treble clef and a key signature of two flats, showing a sequence of eighth notes.
- System 2:** The first staff uses a treble clef and a key signature of one flat, with a series of eighth notes. The second staff starts with a treble clef and a key signature of two flats, containing a mix of eighth and sixteenth notes. The third staff begins with a treble clef and a key signature of two flats, showing a sequence of eighth notes.
- System 3:** The first staff uses a treble clef and a key signature of one flat, with a series of eighth notes. The second staff starts with a treble clef and a key signature of two flats, containing a mix of eighth and sixteenth notes. The third staff begins with a treble clef and a key signature of two flats, showing a sequence of eighth notes.

Throughout the score, there are various musical notations including clefs, key signatures, and note values. Some notes are enclosed in rectangular boxes, and there are instances of notes with multiple stems or unusual groupings, suggesting a complex or experimental musical composition.