

**END OF FUNDING PERIOD REPORT**  
**LAUC Statewide Grants, Research & Professional Development Committee**

Primary Applicant(s): *Manuel Erviti*  
Campus: *Berkeley*  
Email: *merviti@library.berkeley.edu*  
Telephone: *510-643-6197*

**TITLE OF PROJECT:** *An Edition and Study of N.C. Bochsa's "The Power of Imitative Music"*

Time Period of Grant: *July 1, 2008—December 31, 2008*

Amount of Award Received: *\$1,750*

Original Abstract as Submitted:

*Research on the contents of a large, previously unidentified nineteenth-century orchestral manuscript score recently donated to the UC Berkeley Music Library has uncovered a unique concert melodrama, called "The Power of Imitative Music," composed by the controversial harp virtuoso Nicholas Charles Bochsa (1795-1856). Primary source materials—contemporary newspaper reports and related manuscript material—have helped delineate the performance and reception history of the piece, which is essentially unrecorded in the scholarly literature on the composer. Several key questions about the piece, however, remain unanswered. The consultation of additional rare serial publications held at two libraries outside of California offers the promise of providing information to complete the reception history. This project seeks funding for travel in order to consult these sources and gather information to write the draft of a study of Bochsa's composition. Such an essay is required to accompany the musical text of a modern edition, now in preparation, together comprising the core of a formal publication proposal to A-R Editions, Inc. None of Bochsa's more than twenty-one known large-scale compositions has ever been published in modern edition. The completed proposal for an edition and study of "The Power of Imitative Music," envisioned as the end product of this project, is a first and important step toward contributing to the increase of knowledge in the field of historical musicology.*

**I. ACCOMPLISHMENTS and EVALUATION**

- Describe what was achieved during the time period of the grant.

*Findings from the sources consulted on the first research trip added very valuable support to a particular interpretation of the reception history I had been developing as part of a publication proposal, while the unfulfilled expectations from the second trip confirmed that a number of important sources needed to complete the study thoroughly are simply not available in the US.*

- What aspects were completed as proposed? If your study could not be completed as proposed, explain how your plans were altered.

*Both research trips in the proposal were completed, though only one successfully. The research trip to Tempe was immensely productive, as I was able to consult documents listed in the proposal and found a number of important statements in the Allgemeine Theaterzeitung relevant to the study of the reception history of the composition. The trip to Washington, on the other hand, was disappointing, as the catalog holdings statement for Pressburger Zeitung turned out to be in fact incorrect, with crucial materials not included in the microfilm holdings of the collection. Though I had misinterpreted the catalog holdings statement for the second source consulted, Corriere di Napoli, this item was in fact never located on the shelves of the collection after it was paged.*

- Did the project accomplish what it intended? Did it make a difference?

Yes, I was able fill in a few holes in the story and proceed with writing a substantial draft of the reception history of the composition under study, to be submitted soon in the proposal for an edition sent to a music publisher. LAUC funding for this project was a huge impetus for me to start looking at how to complete and begin writing a research interest that had been dormant for some time. LAUC website publication of my R&PD proposal even led to email contact from several scholars interested in this topic.

- What would you do differently next time, if anything?

I would consider asking for more funding and expanding the project to cover more research lacunae already uncovered, but not necessarily vital to completing the publication proposal for the edition. This would include consulting a number of research sources still buried in order to outline the reception history more fully, i.e., getting films made at foreign archives and making research trips to other rare holdings (NYPL, Mills Music Library at UW—Madison). The result, however, would lengthen the project period and complexity considerably and could have an adverse effect on the LAUC grant proposal being accepted in the first place.

- What advice do you have for others applying for LAUC research grants?

Do not try to keep your grant request as lean as possible.

**II. IS YOUR PROJECT COMPLETED? Yes X No**

If No, what is needed to complete the project? Is more time needed? Or more funds?

**III. FINANCIAL STATEMENT**

Please explain how the funds received were spent. Attach your original budget and indicate how well your estimates matched with actual expenditures. Receipts are not necessary.

The original budget request for travel funds to covered two separate research trips—one to Washington, DC and one to Tempe, AZ:

	DC	AZ	
Round-Trip Airfare	425	275	
Lodging	450	250	
Meals (\$50 per diem)	150	100	
Ground	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	
Total	1075	675	= \$1750

Actual expenses, rounded to the dollar, with amounts exceeding the amount of the award covered out-of-pocket, are listed below. Budget accommodations obtained during the summer heat in AZ were offset by higher than anticipated lodging costs (and duration of stay) in DC:

	DC	AZ	
Round-Trip Airfare	305	230	
Lodging	960	122	
Meals (\$50 per diem)	89	46	
Ground	<u>25</u>	<u>22</u>	
Total	1379	420	= \$1799

**IV. SHARING YOUR PRODUCT/RESULTS**

What are your plans for disseminating the results of your work? If it will be a web page or product, or published article or book, when will it be available to the public? Include citations/URLs if known.

*The draft of an introduction for an edition was completed and is nearly ready to send in a publication proposal to a publisher. If accepted, further work on this essay directed at forming a more finished story—and more polished essay—will be necessary. If the proposal for an edition is not accepted, several portions of the introduction could conceivably be refashioned to be submitted for publication in a music journal.*

**V. NOTE**

Information included in this report may be reprinted or posted on the web for dissemination to UCOP, other UC Libraries, and future potential LAUC grant applicants.