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6-10 July 2015 saw important SMA events that took place at Keele University: The Summer School followed by KeeleMAC. For five solid days, Amanda Bayley, James Hepokoski and David Neumeyer doubled as Summer-School tutors and conference keynote speakers. Reviews of both events are provided by Rebecca Day, Toby Young, William van Geest and Trevor Rowborne. For the first time in MAC history, there was a plenary session discussing the status of women in the discipline (see Anne Hyland’s piece). Entitled ‘Mind the Gap’, this session lead to discussions among the committee about a new role for a diversity and equal op officer. We are still developing it and are open to queries and expressions of interest.

In order not to overstretch the SMA’s resources, we have usually skipped over TAGS this year (the Summer School amply made up for that), and for this reason there is no TAGS essay in this issue. However, you will find some scholarly compensation in Esther Cavett’s (detailed!) digest of four papers by Jonathan Dunsby, Jonathan Cross, Matthew Brown and Rachel Beckles Willson, given at a special Colloquium at KCL on 7 October, 2015, in honour of Arnold Whittall’s 80th birthday. These discuss the past and future of the discipline, a topic that has occupied Arnold himself in various articles and talks, not least, or long ago, in this Newsletter (see “Is Music Analysis History?” in the November 2012 issue). Taking issue with some of the positions these papers espoused, Ian Pace argues that ‘diversity’ and ‘inclusivity’ have been unfortunately complicit in reducing investment in technical skills (with particular implications for music analysis), and that a prima facie virtuous ideology is uncomfortably close to a calculating economic convenience. I would welcome responses in the next issue.

Please make sure you don’t skip the diary at the end: it has deadlines of three SMA-related events that are just around the corner at the time of writing.

Last but not least, we bid farewell to one of our longest-serving committee members, David Bretherton. Our VP, Kenneth Smith, has written a ‘fond’ send-off in the style he is accustomed to. Persons of a delicate disposition be warned.
President’s Letter

If the observation that it has been a busy few months for the Society looks like a rhetorical cliché, then I take comfort in its factual accuracy. We welcome Rebecca Day as our new student representative, to whom I would like to extend congratulations on her election. And we owe a huge debt of gratitude to Nick Reyland and his indefatigable team of helpers at Keele, who between them took on the formidable task of hosting not only the plenary conference, but also the third International Music Analysis Summer School. Both events were thoroughly absorbing and meticulously planned. Our distinguished tutors – James Hepokoski, David Neumeyer and Amanda Bayley – captivated participants across three enjoyable but intensive days; their contributions as the conference’s keynote speakers where equally stimulating. I surely speak for the whole membership in extending our heartfelt thanks.

The theme of diversity emerges strongly from KeeleMAC. The range of sessions was bewildering in its plurality, encompassing popular music, film music, world music, repertoire from Bach to Grisey, and the full gamut of current theoretical research. The foray into ethnomusicological territory, in the form of an engrossing panel convened in collaboration with Analytical Approaches to World Music, is especially welcome; I hope this affiliation can be sustained and developed in the future. Differently construed, diversity formed the backdrop to the roundtable on Women in Analysis, which shed clear light on the issues of gender equality confronting our discipline on both sides of the Atlantic. I would like to extend my warmest congratulations to the Chair and participants – Janet Schmalfeldt, Laurel Parsons, Anne Hyland and Amanda Bayley – for assembling a panel that conjoined the experiences of the SMA and the SMT in the best possible way, and which rightly placed equality and diversity at the centre of the SMA’s current and future agenda.

Moving farther afield, members may also be aware that the European theory societies have agreed in principle that Strasbourg should host the next EuroMAC, and that Moscow should have first refusal as host after that. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all who returned an opinion on this matter, and for helping to form the SMA’s position. The somewhat informal process through which the hosting of EuroMAC is determined has raised fresh debate about the principles guiding the succession of conferences, and this in turn nourishes a discussion about the SMA’s place in the European analytical and theoretical community. In view of the looming possibility of a national referendum on EU membership, and mindful of the negative consequences that an exit from the EU may have for British academia, the time seems appropriate to reflect briefly on our small place in this larger context. The question of how far the integration of the European societies could ever proceed is less pressing at this stage than the need for a strong expression of British solidarity with the European community of analytical scholarship, in addition to the close transatlantic ties we rightly foster. The North American orientation of Anglophone theory can sometimes seem overwhelming; but theorists working in diverse fields can ill afford to forget the foundational debt to European thought that much of this endeavor owes. And this is to say nothing of the rich potential for conjoining often disparate strands of theory that European dialogues can still unlock (how might the intersection between transatlantic and Russian theoretical traditions develop, for example?). Regardless of whether or not British political separatism prevails, there is a strong sense in which we must, in disciplinary terms, remain in our own way pro-European.

The recent election of two of the Society’s members to the Council of the Royal Musical Association (Michael Spitzer and me) begs for a parallel discussion about our place in the national disciplinary arena. The SMA is, to be sure, a relatively junior partner in this relationship, but as KeeleMAC reinforced, we remain imaginative, disciplinarily liberal and capable of punching well above our numerical weight. I look forward to working with our colleagues in the RMA, and to representing the interests of theory and analysis in this wider context.

Julian Horton
University of Durham
16th September 2015
2015 SMA Election Results

No other candidates having come forward, we are pleased to announce that Julian Horton has been re-elected as President, and that Shay Loya has been re-elected as Information Officer.

Rebecca Day (pictured left) has joined us as Student Representative in September. She hails from Royal Holloway, where she studies under the supervision of J.P.E. Harper-Scott. Her PhD research area is on Mahler and modernism, and she has a special interest in bridging music analysis (specifically Sonata Theory, Schenkerian analysis, and Neo-Riemannian theory) and critical/philosophical thinking (Adornian, Hegelian, Žižekian, and Lacanian). She is currently involved in organising several SMA-related events, including this year’s TAGS.

Martin Čurda (pictured left), who is about to complete his PhD at Cardiff University, has stepped down as Student Representative after two years of faithful service. Martin’s research involves both analytical and cultural-critical aspects of Pavel Haas’ music, and as Student Representative he has been likewise enthusiastic about broadening the reach and scope of music analysis. One of Martin’s most fruitful projects as SMA Student Representative was the music analysis workshop, the first of which was launched in November 2014; the second will take place on 27 February 2016 (see the call for participants for this event). These workshops were especially designed to allow different analytical methods to become more familiar and widely used among postgraduate students who would not have necessarily known about them or used them much before. For this, and much else, we are very grateful, and wish him every success in his future career. Martin’s replacement will be announced at the end of January or beginning of February. Now, shift mental gears for the next piece by Kenneth Smith.

Bank of England Recalls All Currency Dispensed by SMA Treasurer (Or: A Fond Farewell to Dr David Bretherton)

The societal coffers are in relatively good condition thanks to the ‘activities’ of Dr David Bretherton (Southampton), the treasurer of the SMA and Music Analysis since 2010. Armed with a set of dodgy Bank of England plates (bought from his SMA predecessor Ed Venn (U of Leeds) for a packet of smokes during their days in The Scrubs) he has kept the societal income protected from any form of real expenditure in over 5 years by passing around ‘dodgy notes and bum checks’ [sic]. Choosing to jump before he was pushed, David has decided to retire from his position ‘with immediate effect’, after he was ‘shopped’ by an unnamed member of the RMA who noticed that David’s homemade fivers featured ‘an indelicate pose of Her Majesty’. Besides, now that the SMA is recruiting an equality and diversity officer, David is no longer allowed to conduct all of his fiscal business in ‘the Gents’ at Euston station, and faces eviction from his cubicle. In deep gratitude, the SMA would like to pay tribute to one of its finest generals.

Never one to leave a job half done, David generally elected not to attempt jobs at all. He leaves behind him a trail of chaos which only the devoted Kirstie Hewlett (David’s replacement) can hope to sort out. A supporter of the SMA since before her days as student rep, Dr Hewlett went on to found the SMA writing clubs, spearhead the SMA video podcasts and … [Hang on, this is supposed to be about David right? Ed.] … Despite being branded as ‘just a tight-fisted old curmudgeon with his grubby hands in the presidential purse’ by President Horton,1 David had many other strings to his bow. Nor was he ‘only a drunken boor’ as Information officer, Dr Loya has dubbed him.2 By hobby, David was also something of a magician; having deconstructed the trick where the man in the fez produces coins from behind his ears and gives them to children, David perfected the art of making coins and notes disappear behind his avaricious lug. In court, his standard repost was that he was ‘subverting the genre’. His other trick was his famous disappearing act, which he usually pulled in restaurants, just before the bill arrived.3 The

1 Pers. comm. [date uncertain] KS’ paraphrase of JH’s drunken lucid moment.
2 Ibid.
3 A Peter Cook joke I think.
only money that the SMA has actually spent in recent years was for regularly bailing David out of jail when some beak or other wasn’t fooled by his pleas of ‘temporary insanity’.

David was the life and soul of the party at conferences, and had a knack of offending every SMA member within earshot of the bar. But in rare moments of sobriety he showed an understated wisdom and perspicacity; he always knew where to invest the society’s money to see maximum returns. And this wasn’t always at the race-track; he’s been spotted investing in roulette, pitch ‘n toss, and his poker face (as shown on one of his newly-minted £20 notes: see plate 1) tells a tale of its own. He was sensitive to the thoughts and feelings of all of those he came into contact with through the SMA, at least to their faces (who knows what dark thoughts lie behind the mask of such a man?). He was diplomatic, tactful and always courteous in dealings and to my knowledge has never broken the societal code of conduct. (David keeps the code of conduct under his belt and we have never seen it; but we think it exists.)

One of David’s largest projects in recent times has been the ongoing negotiations of the SMA’s charitable status, which has taken countless hours of discussion and planning which most other members would never have been able to face. This is one of the reasons that the Treasurer’s post is not an elected position; not because no-one would elect David, but because it’s a job that few but him would want to / be able to do (sorry Kirstie, but it’s true). David cares. He cares deeply. And I suspect that he will go on caring after leaving the executive committee. David, whether you’re in Switzerland smoking cigars, or in Sing-Sing selling Silk-cut, we wish you well and thank you deeply for all that you have done and will continue to do in the name of the SMA.

He has taken with him the passwords to the SMA’s bank accounts (empty anyway), so if any members reading this require financial remuneration of any kind, please invoice the RMA.

With Scholarly and Fiscal love,

Kenneth Smith

PS 1. David, somewhere beneath all of these pointless jokes, is my/our [Ed.] way of saying that I love you and will miss you very much.

PS2. To HMRS / the police / the fuzz / Rozzer et al, none of this is actually true (except the bits about us missing David, and about him exploiting the tramp).

4 True story. Ask him.
Introducing the SMA Video Podcasts

2016 sees a new venture for the SMA. Over the past year we have been busy developing a series of videos, driven by the aim to help widen participation in our discipline. Each episode provides an introduction to a different application of, or approach to analysis; this could range from elucidating a particular theory or analytical method to demonstrating how close analysis can inform broader historical, ideological or socio-cultural arguments. We hope the videos will provide an accessible route into analysis for anyone from teachers and lecturers looking for engaging pedagogical resources to individuals such as performers, musicologists, students or amateur musicians seeking tools to gain a deeper appreciation of musical texts.

Series 1 explores the relationship between analysis and other avenues of music scholarship, offering examples of the kinds of questions that can be raised and answered with analysis. In episode one, Julian Horton demonstrates how the close analysis of a work can inform our understanding of its historical value, taking as his case study Brahms’ First Symphony and its relationship to the broader development of the symphony in the nineteenth century. Allan Moore confronts the challenge of working with recordings as texts, analysing texture, timbre and the ‘sound box’ in tracks by The Beatles, The Police, Leona Lewis and Snow Patrol. Anne Hyland illustrates how formal and harmonic mechanisms can play on our perception of the passing of time, identifying retrospective or recollective techniques in the music of Schubert. And in the final episode of the series, Kenneth Smith (pictured sitting next to the piano) uses his analysis to make connections between the music of Skryabin and the cultural, philosophical and psychological ideas that were in common currency at the time of composition.

Producing this series would not have been possible without the generous help and support of many people. First and foremost our speakers, who gave their time and knowledge free of charge and whose input was invaluable in creating a style of presentation that felt more like an intimate tutorial than a formal lecture; our crew, Neil Neenan (director), Jason Creasey (sound) and Max Brill (cameras and lighting), whose expertise and dedication shines through in the sleekness and professionalism of the videos; the Music Department at the University of Surrey, who allowed us to film for two days in their studios; and our colleagues in the SMA and on the Music Analysis editorial board, who helped to firm up the aims and outcomes of the project. Kenneth Smith, who oversaw the project as Executive Producer, and Shay Loya have been especially central to developing and realising the project. We hope that this collaborative effort will bear fruit in a rich resource for students, teachers and researchers, and become a staple and valued part of the SMA’s activities.

Episode one is scheduled for release in February 2016; all subsequent episodes will then appear monthly. The videos will be hosted on the SMA website along with supplementary content such as reading lists, diagrams, scores and playlists, and will also be available to stream on Vimeo and YouTube. Please keep an eye out for emails from the SMA Information Officer, Shay Loya, with details about new episodes or subscribe to our Vimeo and YouTube feeds to keep informed about new releases. We will be charting the reach, impact and application of the videos in teaching and learning during and after the launch of each episode. If you would like to participate in a feedback group or provide individual constructive comments on the first series then please email Helen Thomas at development@sma.ac.uk.

We also hope to broaden our net in future episodes and are open to suggestion for suitable topics and themes to tackle. If you have any ideas about what you’d like us to cover, please get in touch at development@sma.ac.uk.

Kirstie Hewlett (Producer)
Helen Thomas (Production Coordinator / SMA Membership Development Officer)
Both national and international students welcomed the return of the SMA's Summer School this year with great enthusiasm. The intensive programme was held over two days at the leafy campus of Keele University with 22 postgraduate students attending. It aimed to provide an interactive environment for the advanced study of music theory and analysis, encourage the exchange of ideas, stimulate discussion about, and problematise the position of, music analysis as a discipline, and enable postgraduate students to share their research with peers and senior academics. The Summer School was structured around the research interests of the three international experts who would present keynote lectures at the Keele Music Analysis Conference at the end of the week: sonata theory (Professor James Hepokoski), screen music (Professor David Neumeyer), and performance studies (Professor Amanda Bayley). The first day consisted of three plenary sessions that introduced each analytical area. It was followed up by in-depth discussions and presentations the next day in smaller group tutorials. In preparation for each session, students were set thorough—sometimes dauntingly extensive—bibliographies, films to watch, and scores to analyse.

James Hepokoski: Sonata Theory

The slow movement of the ‘Hammerklavier’
Eagerly anticipated by the aspiring sonata theorists present, Professor James Hepokoski opened the first day of the summer school with a plenary session entitled, ‘Coordinating Vertical and Horizontal Modes of Analysis: Beethoven’s op. 106/iii, Adagio sostenuto’. Students were asked to compare three close analyses (by Donald Francis Tovey, Charles Rosen, and Robert Hatten), and prepare their own analyses for the session. Hepokoski then presented his own, very compelling sonata theory reading of the Hammerklavier’s Adagio, placing a special emphasis on Beethoven's unusual use of the Neapolitan key area and its role in the narrative trajectory of the movement.

Sarah Moynihan

Mahler’s Symphony No. 3
For Hepokoski’s tutorial portion of the summer school, students were divided into groups according to their chosen piece: either the final movement of Mahler’s Third Symphony or the first movement and finale of Prokofiev’s Violin Concerto no. 1. Each of those who chose the Mahler (amongst them myself), were then given a passage of 50 bars or so to examine in closer detail alongside reading the movement as a whole, and by extension the entire symphony due to Mahler’s frequent quotation of earlier movements—no small task for a work of up to 100 minutes in duration. With a focus on the dialogic method of formal analysis (originating from, but not strictly adhering to, Elements of Sonata Theory), we each attempted to grasp a ‘larger sense of coherence’ offered by the work’s treatment of themes, harmony, cadence-attainment (or indeed non-attainment), and those textural aspects that make up the ‘Mahlerian style’ in order to ‘come to terms with the sense and expressive purposes of broader wholes.’ Upon listening to the movement section by section, each student took it in turns to open the discussion with their findings before Hepokoski then supplemented the reading with his own understanding of the musical events, until, piece-by-piece, we each had a full rotational reading of the movement. The final product was as revelatory as the music sounded in the beautiful Sneyd room of Keele Hall, and students left feeling enriched and enlightened both by Mahler’s formal procedures and Hepokoski’s analytical methods—an experience that will remain with each of us, no doubt, for a long time indeed.

Rebecca Day

Prokofiev’s Violin Concerto No. 1
The second of Hepokoski’s tutorials focused on the outer movements of Prokofiev’s first Violin Concerto Op. 19, a work that has received very little scholarly attention and for which no published close analysis exists. This session took on the same format as the Mahler tutorial: short student presentations on designated sections of the movements in chronological order. Students were encouraged to reflect upon the overall formal structure of the movements and their
dialogic relation to preceding sonata traditions as well as to European and Russian modernism. Particularly striking was the observation, made by Natalie Matias and Martin Čurda, that the secondary theme of the opening movement is fully restated – albeit hidden and transposed – in its developmental rotation. At the end of the tutorial, Hepokoski revealed his poetic and virtuosic reading of the entire concerto as a ‘fantasy-dreamscape’, using the expression markings sognando and narrante as hermeneutic windows. The opportunity to share our own sonata readings with one of the co-creators of Elements of Sonata Theory was at once rewarding, invigorating, and reassuring.

Sarah Moynihan

Hepokoski teaching at the Summer School

David Neuymeyer: Film Music

Professor David Neuymeyer opened his plenary session with a social-media-orientated introduction, using live tweets from recent screen music conferences as a novel way of provoking questions and comments on the issues that a music analyst faces when approaching music in film. His session included a demonstration of the firmly attached associations music takes on when used in conjunction with moving images, using Darth Vader’s theme from the Star Wars films as an example. The session ended with a discussion of the use of late-romantic-style symphonic music during the opening credits of the 1950s Hollywood film, The File on Thelma Jordon.

In the seminar the next day, Neuymeyer gave a comprehensive introduction to his set of film music binaries, a tool for the analysis of music for screen. These include: clarity and fidelity, foreground and background, synchronization and counterpoint, empathetic and anempathetic, presence and absence, and Claudia Gorbman’s controversial terms, diegetic and non-diegetic. After a whistle-stop tour of the history of the feature film, he proceeded to lead a second-by-second analysis of the music from the sequence of another film from the ‘golden age’ of cinema, the black comedy Sunset Boulevard (1950). (The film was screened on campus the preceding evening.) The scene in question introduced the faded movie star character, Norma Desmond, and served as an interesting case study for the application of Neuymeyer’s binaries. The analysis prompted enthusiastic participation from the entire group.

Amanda Bailey: Performance Studies

In the last plenary session, Professor Amanda Bayley introduced her research on the interaction between composer and performer during the creation of Finnissy’s Second String Quartet, which was specially commissioned for the Kreutzer Quartet for the project. Students were given the freedom to explore the main output of this collaborative project: an interactive DVD produced with Michael Clarke (2011) entitled, Evolution and Collaboration. The DVD contains documentation of the process of composition, rehearsal, and performance, including interviews with the composer, recordings of the rehearsals, videos of different performances, and musical sketches, among other sources. These can be navigated through in non-linear fashion to encourage the user to reflect upon the ‘different levels of communication and coordination in ensemble playing’. The session was rounded off as we shared our individual experiences of using the software, and how and why we carved certain paths through the data. The group contemplated the use of the DVD as a research and pedagogical tool, and the potential use of other multimedia like apps as interactive research tools.

For the tutorial next day, Bayley invited students to consider how Evolution and Collaboration could assist in investigations of the collaboration between composer and performer in musical contexts other than Finnissy’s quartet, in other works or repertories. The potentially problematic role and authority of the analyst in this context was one significant point of debate. The discussion later took on an informal atmosphere as students used mind maps and tree diagrams to consider how the software could be adapted and developed for the purposes of their individual research.

Summer School Plenary Discussion

The Summer School culminated with a plenary discussion introduced by Professor Julian Horton, the SMA President, about the potential issues faced by music analysts when attempting to communicate with a wider, non-specialist audience or readership. Communicating musical analytical ideas and concepts to the public is acutely difficult, when compared with other disciplines in the arts and humanities. Theories of musical forms, systems, processes, genres, and meaning, often involve the use of esoteric and complex technical language and visual representation that are not readily simplified. The session expanded into a broader consideration of the future of music analysis (that perennial issue!). Debate continued into the evening over
dinner and drinks but not before heartfelt thanks were made to the three tutors, the SMA committee, and special thanks to Dr Shay Loya and Keele University’s Dr Nicolas Reyland for their successful and efficient coordination and administration of the Summer School.

For those that were lucky enough to take part, the SMA’s 2015 Summer School was an inspirational and rewarding start to a very memorable week. The Summer School flowed seamlessly into the KeeleMAC conference where many of its students showcased their research in an array of fascinating papers employing a wide variety of analytical approaches.

Sarah Moynihan

Some of the Summer School participants in a more relaxed moment. From left to right (standing): Vasiliki Zlatkou, September Russell, David Jayasuriya, Rebecca Day, Sarah Moynihan, James Hepokoski, Natalie Matias, Chris Tarrant and Steven Vande Moortele; (seated): Stefanie Acevedo, Martin Čurda, Archieb Fiala.
**KeeleMAC 2015**
8-10 July 2015, Keele University, convened by Dr Nicholas Reyland (Keele University)
Keynote Speakers: Professor Amanda Bayley (Bath Spa); Professor James Hepokoski (Yale); Professor David Neumeyer (The University of Texas at Austin)

**Editor’s note:** KeeleMAC 2015 brought together scholars of many nationalities. The 88 speakers presented an equally rich variety of topics, including popular music, Schenkerian analysis, sonata theory, world music, performance analysis, multimedia, schemata theory, film music and exoticism. Although it is impossible to address all of the papers in a conference of this size, five reviewers have managed to cover most sessions. The reviews do not necessarily follow the order of the Conference Programme. The Keynotes, spread over three days, are presented at the very end of this review. But we start with the very first event: a plenary roundtable, ‘Women and Analysis’, which is reviewed here by one of its participants, Anne Hyland. Our other reviewers were postgraduate SMA members Rebecca Day (Royal Holloway), Toby Young (University of Oxford), William van Geest (University of Oxford) and Trevor Rowbone (University of Huddersfield).

![Nick Reyland (convenor) flanked by conference assistants Hannah Bayley (right) and Becky Thumpston (left).](image)

**Review 1: Mind the Gap: Women in the Field of Music Analysis (plenary roundtable)**

Anne Hyland (University of Manchester) ‘The trouble with girls: an examination of female progression in the field of music analysis in the UK’

Stephanie Acevedo (Yale University) ‘The gap and its effects on North American music theory’

Laurel Parsons (University of Victoria) ‘Surfing the waves: the work of the SMT’s Committee on the Status of Women’

Amanda Bayley (Bath Spa University) ‘Broadening our horizons’

Janet Schmalfeldt (Tufts University) Response to the four position papers

Opening the Society for Music Analysis’ annual conference last year was a plenary roundtable of quite a new breed: ‘Mind the Gap: Women in the Field of Music Analysis’, chaired by Laurel Parsons with contributions from Stefanie Acevedo, Amanda Bayley, Janet Schmalfeldt and Anne Hyland, was the first all-female panel to address the society since its inauguration in 1992. Bravo to the SMA (and to the conference organiser, Nick Reyland) for affording the issue of gender (in)equality a dedicated platform at an SMA event, marking what was a significant milestone for the society and its members. Each of the four speakers – representing the UK and North America, and spanning doctoral student to Professor Emerita – adopted a distinct perspective on the topic, meaning that a cross-national picture was presented, although one with intersecting interests and recommendations. The focus pointed firmly towards the future, both in terms of the role of women within the field, and of the discipline itself; an overarching message was one of intellectual diversification and disciplinary invigoration.

Hyland began the session by capitalising on the recent Tim Hunt controversy regarding women’s place in the life sciences, and highlighting its relevance for the status of women in academia more generally. Her presentation focused on the present situation in UK music analysis, tracing the progression of female students from UG to PG courses in music analysis, into positions in academic institutions, and on to promotion both within those institutions and on the boards of the learned societies that support the discipline in the UK and Europe. Although the statistics paint a particular(ly bleak) picture, she cautioned against an over-reliance on numbers: despite low representation, women’s intellectual involvement in music analysis in the UK (in terms of conference participation and publication) is robust, in part owing to the support of the SMA and to the recent broadening of the discipline which has brought a greater variety of those involved, including an increased number of female scholars.
Acevedo’s paper investigated similar demographic data on gender within music theory, but from a North American perspective, illustrating that gender equality enjoys a longer and better-established system of support in the US in comparison to the UK – largely a result of the hard work of the Committee on the Status of Women (CSW), currently chaired by Parsons. Of course, the SMA is a comparatively smaller and younger society than the SMT, and the disparity in the gender balance of their membership is largely reflective of this fact. Acevedo’s second focus was disciplinary: she showed that while the SMT’s membership reveals a roughly 70/30 split, the Society for Ethnomusicology and the American Musicological Society have a more balanced c.52/47 split each. She noted, moreover, that gender dynamics in music psychology differ dramatically from those in music theory (in 2014, of 354 members in the ‘Psychology and the arts’ division of the American Psychological Association, 48.9% were female), and suggested that increased interest in and collaboration with cognitive science may ultimately benefit our disciplinary culture. The growing sub discipline of music cognition was discussed as a particularly fruitful area.

Parsons brought a different voice to the discussion, one drawing on the personal experiences of some women in North American academia who have faced discrimination. In response to this, her paper foregrounded the pioneering work of the CSW in improving gender equity. Among its many projects, the CSW holds annual sessions at SMT meetings, offers two year-round mentoring programs which encourage a greater number of submissions by women to conferences and academic journals, and runs an active Facebook group and a blog, Women in Music Theory which discusses relevant articles and hot topics. This work remains relevant and necessary today, particularly in the face of continued under-representation of women in article submissions to/publications in US academic journals, and on academic boards.

In stark contrast to this picture, Amanda Bayley offered a staggering inventory of the many female scholars and practitioners who not only bridge the gender and generational gaps, but also broaden our conceptualisation of analytical objects of study. Uniting the diverse body of research catalogued by Bayley was the underlying question of ‘How does it work?’, one which remains a foundational impulse in all music-analytic practice regardless of whether the question is addressed through notation, sound, film, process, or mixed media. Her point was simple and effective: once we view analysis in these broader terms, the number of women active in the field dramatically increases.

In this sense, Bayley’s presentation resonated strongly with both Acevedo’s and Hyland’s, each of which focussed on the diversification of the discipline in terms of methodology and repertoire, respectively. Thus, the enrichment of our discipline brought about by female scholars whose work embraces broader theoretical fields, diverse musics and objects of study (as well as those who introduce novel analytic approaches to more familiar, canonic music) was a unifying force of the panel, and a thread upon which Janet Schmalfeldt wove a characteristically lucid and inspiring response. Framed by the motto ‘It Gets Better’, Schmalfeldt’s presentation offered a long-range perspective on the status of women in US music theory and analysis, highlighting the number of female role models currently active in the field while also emphasising the need for us all to find the space for thoughtful, innovative research. It is here – through our published work – that women can rise to positions of leadership and inspire younger generations, drawing them into the field. It bears mention that Schmalfeldt’s own work on the interaction of analysis and performance in the interpretation of Beethoven’s Bagatelles (JMT, 1985) has been a driving force in music analysis for more than three decades. In her work, we see living proof of what Bayley might term the reconceptualisation of the analytic object as score and sound; a topic that continues to stimulate serious interest, not least in Bayley’s work into composer-performer collaborations.

If this panel has any lasting outcome, it will remain unknown for some time; such is the nature of the problem. That said, the immediate impact of the session – felt, I think, almost directly afterwards in conversation – is that the issue is firmly (and finally) open for discussion. While my fellow panellists and I were glad to get the conversation going, we are even more heartened by the subsequent announcement of the SMA’s intention to appoint an Equal Opportunities Officer to oversee the implementation of a newly conceived policy for equality and diversity within the society. Should this come into effect, the SMA will take a decisive step in the right direction, one which promises to foster the broadening of music analysis, invigorate our discipline, and demonstrate by example that ‘It Gets Better’. Watch this space.

Anne M. Hyland
University of Manchester
Review 2: Schenker, Enharmonicism, Sonata Form, ‘Bach, Galant, Beethoven’ and ‘Tonal Trajectories’

2a: Schenker
The papers of this session explore Schenkerian theory and analysis, and at the same time provoking a critique of Schenkerian thought and principles. Nathan Pell (Mannes College) discussed the contradiction inherent in Schenker’s theory of interruption, which, he argued, is explicable if the Kopfton is simultaneously retained and subordinated. With further exploration the claims of this paper could provide a greater understanding of the difficulties and complexity of background-level prolongation, often taken for granted.

Sarah Marlowe (New York University) provided a thoughtful analysis of the harmonic ambiguity in the subject of Bach’s Fugue in D major, WTC II, showing the capacity for the subject to be harmonically differentiated in various contexts. The ambiguity of the subject was creatively explored, shedding light on Bach’s compositional choices. As part of a larger project, the work would be useful to assess the extent of such harmonic ambiguity in Bach fugues and other fugues of the period, and in what syntactical contexts they occur. This is an excellent paper that explored the harmonic style of Bach in a creative way.

Philip Robinson (University of Bristol) gave an interesting philosophical and analytical account of orientalism in Russian music. The observations provided a reconsideration of the functional aspect of overtones in a novel departure from Schenkerian usage. The ‘Arabian Dance’ from Tchaikovsky’s Nutcracker is shown not to be goal-directed in a Schenkerian sense, but prolongationally static. It was a thoughtful paper that provided a novel approach to exoticism in the late-Romantic period.

Soo-Hyun Jeong (University of Cincinnati) synthesised neo-Riemannian operations and Schenkerian prolongations in order to assess the contentious role of centricity in late-Romantic enharmonic music (in this case Richard Strauss’s). Furthermore, by expressing the former theory’s principle of parsimonious voice-leading through the latter’s graphing methods, Jeong was able to demonstrate how ‘linear scale degree motifs’ were generated both by post-tonal operations and the tonal background. It was an interesting attempt not only to reconcile two major tonal theories but, even more intriguingly, to bridge the gap between tonal and post-tonal perceptions of the same music.

4a: Rethinking Enharmonicism
This compelling session concerned the relationship between auditory (heard) enharmonicism and notational enharmonicism. Yosef Goldenberg (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Jerusalem Academy of Music and Dance) provided a systematic approach for depicting enharmonic spellings, showing the number of spellings of half-diminished chords that exceeded ‘textbook’ knowledge. Goldenberg presented an illuminating lexicon of spellings, devised through voice-leading and semitone relationships, which elucidated the logical motivations for alternatives. The main contributions of the paper included showing conflicts between horizontal and vertical listening strategies and unearthing rare enharmonic spellings.

John Muniz (Yale University) presented a ‘tendency-transformational’ model that distinguished perceived enharmonic modulations from notational enharmonic equivalence, arguing that these are often conflated in the scholarly and pedagogical literature. There is a disambiguation of these concepts through distinguishing between stable and unstable scale degrees. The incremental tendencies in various voices of texture are explored, termed ‘tendency transformations’, which occur prior to notational enharmonicism. The tendency transformations, which operate as a family of operations, provide a rigorous model for understanding enharmonic modulation, and in this paper was demonstrated with illuminating examples.

Uri Rom (Tel Aviv University) distinguished between diatonically and chromatically orientated enharmonicism. He furthered the concept of ‘directional tones’ (Sadai, 1980), explaining audible enharmonic modulations in terms of the changing directionality of pivotal tones, drawing from the work of Harrison (2002) and Muniz (2014). Rom convincingly demonstrated the significance of the functionality of directional tones. He differentiates between enharmonic modulations and para-diatonic modulations, which involve enharmonic reinterpretations between two diatonic systems. A fascinating case study of Schumann’s Humoreske, Op. 20, is provided that displays enharmonic reinterpretations of an augmented triad.

5a: Sonata Theories 1
David Damschroder (University of Minnesota) gave an insightful talk where he presented his ‘Harmonic Theory’, which, he posits,
complements the ‘Sonata Theory’ of Hepokoski and Darcey (2006), providing an analysis of Beethoven’s Sonata in E Major, Op. 109. The analysis gives a Schenkerian critique of Sonata Theory, which clarified harmonic points that Sonata Theory was not designed to model. ‘Harmonic Theory’ works in tandem with theories of form, but relies heavily on the theory of Schenker, and so it is to some extent questionable if a complete redressing in a novel system and terminology is required, or whether the traditional framework would have sufficed.

John Lai Hei Yeung (The Chinese University of Hong Kong) discussed the shadow tonic F sharp/G flat in the first movement of Bruckner’s String Quintet in F. The paper examines the semitonal relationship between F and F sharp (or G flat), tracing the use of this shadow tonic in the sonata movement. The recapitulation is shown to resolve the semitonal tension between these keys through the restatement of the F-sharp major subject in B major. The shadow tonic, as Yeung states, seems like ‘a burden that must be redeemed in the recapitulation’.

James DiNardo (University of Michigan) investigates the soloist as form-functional agent in Rachmaninov’s D-minor piano concerto. DiNardo offered a critique of Hepokoski’s and Darcy’s Sonata Theory, arguing that the Romantic concerto better falls more neatly into the Type-3 sonata form category than into Type-5 (based on a Classical concerto paradigm). He argued that there is a tension created by the soloist and orchestra, as both forces present the primary themes (P) and secondary themes (S). This paper warned against too rigid a view of this type of deformation, and more generally exposed the pitfalls of applying too rigidly a well-established theory.

Rebecca Day (Royal Holloway) presented a theory of a ‘multi-directional Ursatz’ that could be synthesized with Sonata Theory. She explored the relationship between Schenkerian theory and Sonata Theory in a non-traditional setting, the *Andante Comodo* of Mahler’s Ninth Symphony, centering on how unity is provided through a dialogue with convention, and showing how formal areas corresponded with this new Ursatz conception. The paper reconsidered the notion of organismism, and showed how a varied trajectory of closure was conceivable. Like Damschorder’s paper, this paper expounds a synthesis of Schenkerian and Sonata Theory, but provides more fruitful avenues for future research as well as an original reframing of the *Ursatz*.

8a: Bach, Galant, Beethoven

Cécile Bardoux Lovén (Stockholm University) investigated themes from the galant style considered through what she terms a ‘syncretic method’, namely an amalgam of the theories of Heinrich Schenker, Leonard Meyer, and Robert Gjerdingen. Lovén compared the hierarchical levels of Schenkerian theory with Meyer’s and Gjerdingen’s archetypes that concern the identification and explanation of localised features, such as schemas. Perhaps a tighter definition of the syncretic method would have been welcome since the discussion appeared to rest on Schenker’s and Meyer’s alternative readings without establishing how they related to a wider syncretic framework. Many of the analyses were illuminating in themselves and the paper constituted an interesting step towards reconciling these diverse theories. However, the claims and narrative of the paper was a little unclear and a systematic treatment for reconciling the theories of Schenker, Meyer, and Gjerdingen was not provided.

William van Geest (University of Michigan) discussed the metrical ambiguity in a number of fugue subjects of J. S. Bach’s *Well-Tempered Clavier*. The discussion looked at the tendency for fugue subjects to begin in metrical ambiguity and proceed towards metrical clarity with the introduction of other voices in texture. Van Geest’s analyses demonstrated how various metrical interpretations of the theme were possible until the entries of other voices created a more stable, unambiguous perception of metre. They demonstrate sensitivity to the shaping of metrical structure and an understanding of the grammatical theory that underpins music of this period. This is an excellent paper that provides new insight into the metrical structures of Bach’s fugues, and Baroque fugues in general.

Sterling Lambert (St. Mary’s College of Maryland) elucidated the relationship between Britten’s *War Requiem* and the Bach oratorio which ‘he had performed more than any other’, the *St. John Passion*. Lambert provided interesting analytic comparisons that demonstrated a direct influence: for example, the use of melody and bass ostinati in Bach’s aria ‘Mein Teurer Heiland’ and the adaptation of this idea in the *War Requiem*. At a more abstract level, Lambert showed that Britten’s system of textual and musical allusions were also modelled on Bachian oratorio techniques. The argument was cogently laid out, with a final focus on analysis that strengthened the presenter’s main claims.
9b: Tonal Trajectories

Joan Huguet (Williams College) discussed form-functional loosening in Beethoven’s sonata rondsos. He argued that sonata rondo was perhaps the most complex of the Classical forms, through its blurring of formal boundaries. It is shown that modulations in expositions diverged more significantly from their counterparts in the recapitulations than in most traditional models of sonata form would attest. Furthermore, ‘post-recapitulatory space’ was given greater formal significance, challenging the limited weight given to this space in traditional models. The paper’s main point was to present a revised sonata-rondo prototype, where tightly knit themes and formal boundaries become loosened during the course of the movement. This was an interesting and challenging paper that provides a novel model and narrative of form.

Eric Wen (Julliard School of Music) focuses on the ‘sequential period, a I–V…x–V–I schema, where the ‘x’ denotes variable harmony. An example of this schema is the opening phrase of Mozart’s K. 576, where the consequent is a transposed version of the antecedent, and dominant harmony is ‘prolonged’ into the consequent phrase (x). The chord that initiates the consequent phrase can assume a large variety of forms, as in the Adagio Mesto of Brahms’s Horn Trio, op. 40, where the opening melody is repeated in the consequent at b. 11 in the mediant key. Various analyses of sequential periods using Schenkerian methods were presented, thereby further illuminating the tonal relationships and understanding of the schema. This paper is a good contribution to the Formenlehre tradition, but is also particularly challenging for galant schema research, offering a more flexible interpretation of schemata than many recent theories, such as Gjerdingen (2007) and Byros (2009) permit.

Loretta Terrigno (City University of New York, Graduate Centre) discussed tonal problems as a source of narrative in Brahms’s ‘Unbewegte laue Luft’. She argued that tonal relationships signify the inherent emotional conflict, mirroring emotional states such as the protagonist’s passionate internal desire, or, by contrast, nature’s calm external rest. Progressions were shown to be concurrent with the narrative of the poem, for example the rising and falling chromatic pitches that expressed the protagonist’s desires. The paper provided an insightful reading of the poetic aspect of tonality and was well received by conference delegates.

Man-Ching Donald Yu (Hong Kong Institute of Education) examined the sonic property of diatonic materials in Ligeti’s Etude No. 15 ‘White on White’. Drawing on the work of Joseph Straus but departing from Straus’ focus on ordered pitch-class intervals, unordered pitch-class intervals were identified in order to shed further light on the underlying consonant quality of the work. The piece is distinct in that it exhausts all diatonic subsets drawn from the diatonic scale on C, rather than all twelve chromatic pitches. In other words, the dyads, trichords, and tetrachords heard in the piece are derived from the diatonic major scale, the perception of which, through analysis, uncovers the ‘beautiful’ simplicity of the structure.

Trevor Rowbone

Review 3: Popular Music, Film Music and New Theory

The debate between hermeneutic and formalist methods of analysis has been well rehearsed. Theorists pro formalism (Derrick Puffett among others) have argued that the hermeneutic approaches associated with the hegemonic ‘New Musicology’ school are intrinsically limited in their subjectivity, whilst the diatribes contra (most prominently Lawrence Kramer) have aimed to show the importance of contextualizing the musical work in a cultural framework. Yet, as James Hepokoski’s elegant keynote at KeeleMAC clearly demonstrated, this binary characterisation has mostly been dissipated in the reality of contemporary practice. Less constrained by the methodological tenacity of earlier formalists, analysts today often develop working practices, which combine the hermeneutic and formalist to work side by side, rather than bridge the conjectural gap between.

In the younger disciplines of popular music, film and media analysis however, this emancipation of methodology is still surprisingly absent. Popular music was well represented at the conference, but each of the two fascinating sessions felt as if it were adopting a side in the debate. Popular Music 2 took the mantle of hermeneutics, with three papers grounded in sociological thought. Victoria Malawey’s opening presentation was an interesting examination of the diversity of meanings that are presented through the varying vocal styles encountered in some of the plethora of contemporary popular music genres, and was very successful in its scope. Esmee Hoek’s talk on the producer Joe Meek attempted to present a socio-philosophical enquiry into the work of a maverick musical figure, yet its lack of any specificity or analytic content led to an overly simplistic argument. By far the highlight of the
session though was Brian Inglis' convincing discussion of queering and sexual difference in early twenty-first-century indie pop. Taking evocative analyses of songs by British band 'The Feeling' as its starting point, Inglis explored the qualities of otherness and outsiderism – so clearly evident in the music – from a semiotic and sociological stance, redolent of Susan McClary's infamous discussions of Schubert and homosexuality. In all, this was a sophisticated and compelling paper about identity, which skillfully combined elements of musical analysis and queer theory to present a rounded, hermeneutic view of the music.

In contrast, Popular Music 1 provided the platform for several attempts at examining these genres of music through formalist enquiry. One such example came from a presentation by Ben Curry, attempting to re-interpret Muddy Waters' blues harmony through a Neo-Riemannian apparatus. Although at one level Curry's discussion provided an interesting take on the fluidity of dominant and sub-dominant relationships in the Blues, using the duality of the Tonnetz cycle to redefine the tonal hierarchies of his examples into a generalised formal framework felt unconvincing. Curry's argument was not helped by inaccuracies in several of his musical examples, incorrectly transcribed by the software Melodyne due to subtleties of pitch shifting and timbre in the original tracks. A presentation from Maxime Cottin on emotion in Roxy Music was interesting in part, but let down by the imprecision of his analyses, with many delegates suggesting more convincing readings from Cottin’s reductions during the questions afterward. This issue neatly prepared the way for Michael Spitzer's paper, which aimed to objectify musical emotion through an expansion of the work of the music psychologist Patrik Juslin. This was a well-presented and stimulating presentation, with a convincing discussion of social coding and emotional subtlety, although during the opportunity for questions, it was clear that delegates were mildly sceptical of the strict taxonomies that form the basis of Juslin's work. However, it was the virtuoso opening paper from Edward Venn on the Arctic Monkey's song 'I bet You Look Good On the Dance Floor' in which formalism and hermeneutics really sang together. Taking the metaphor of energy at its core, Venn skillfully weaved a path through melodic and textural analysis, coupled with Schenkerian reduction and even humour(1) to create a rich tapestry of insight into the work.

Similarly, in Film Music 1, both sides of the hermeneutic / formalist divide were demonstrated separately through two excellent papers from Kevin Clifton and Erik Heine respectively. Clifton's discussion of narrative empathy in Hitchcock's 'Psycho' was a convincing: his study of semiotic association and gesture in the film made sense both instinctively and in rigorous theoretical terms. Heine presented a broader categorical discussion of mediant relationships in several film scores, accompanying the analytical elements with an interesting pedagogical slant. Again, both of these elements merged together beautifully in Kenneth Smith’s witty and stylish paper on the musical gaze in ‘Vertigo’, skillfully combining Neo-Riemannian analyses of harmonic transformation and voice-leading with post-Lacanian psychoanalysis. With numerous discussions throughout the conference of whether the analyst can, and should be, a pluralist, excellent papers such as Smith’s and Venn’s showed that in the newer analytical areas of popular and film music studies, philosophical reflection and cultural interpretation – in addition to formal rigour – are highly welcome additions to the analyst’s toolkit.

As these (inter)disciplines of popular and film music studies develop, it is conceivable that their analytical approaches might welcome advancement beyond these current working methods. New Theory offered some suggestions of how such models might look, in particular in the opening paper, a virtual presentation delivered via Skype by Joshua B. Mailman. Focusing on extending common practice spatio-temporal metaphors for music (such as flow, flexibility, etc.) into quantifiable musical parameters, Mailman’s paper provided a convincing extension of customary musical discourse. Analytical methodology within the areas of popular and film music study is still ripe for development, and where the traditional notions of harmonic and rhythmic complexity are often subordinate to timbral and sonic parameters, this type of approach – known by Mailman as ‘dynamic form'
may provide an extremely useful tool for affording new precision and detail to the analysis of these genres of music.

Toby Young

Review 4: Texture and Timbre, 20th- and 21st-Century Music, Schemata and Exoticism

2b: Register, Texture, Timbre
The papers in the Wednesday session entitled ‘Register, Texture, Timbre’ explored parameters that are sometimes considered ‘secondary’ but which are, as this session’s scholars showed, no less significant or rich than so-called ‘primary’ ones. In the first paper, ‘Structure and Style at the Summit: High Register in Beethoven’s “experimental” Piano Sonatas Op. 90 and Op. 101,’ Malcolm Miller (Open University, and IMR) argued for the presence of harmonic-linear patterns in the two works as found in registral extremes and related these patterns to the pieces’ motivic material. Given that the matter of registral extremes must be closely related to the dimensions of the instrument in question, one might hope for further exploration of this aspect in future work.

Agnieszka Draus’s (Academy of Music, Kraków) paper ‘The Concept of Classification and Analysis of Texture and Sound Figures in Polish Contemporary Music of the Second Half of the 20th Century’ discussed Józef Chomiński’s ‘sonoristic’ approach to music analysis. Draus described three senses in which works may be classified and understood and examined works by Pendericki and Stachowski.

In his paper ‘Timbre as a Harmonic Factor in Modern Music’, Marcin Strzelecki (Kraków) introduced an analytical tool called ‘multidimensional scaling’ that evaluates the ‘sensory consonance or dissonance’ of sonorities, whether with regard to dynamic level, timbre, or other parameters. This approach is particularly welcome in light of the increasing attention to timbre among Western composers, as Strzelecki observed, not to mention among analysts.

Finally, in ‘A Musical Form of Sound: Périodes by Gérard Grisey,’ Cecilia Taher (McGill University) addressed matters of density and intensity to elucidate the form of this work. Beginning from the composer’s description of four ‘respiration cycles,’ Taher traced the piece’s unfolding sensitively and intuitively.

4d: 20th-Century Music
Beginning Thursday morning’s session entitled ‘20th-Century Music,’ Simon Desbruslais (University of Hull) presented ‘Hindemith’s Quartal Pitch Collections: Theory, Analysis and Legacy’. Desbruslais first outlined the history of this harmonic principle and then addressed some of the difficulties of its identification. Invoking Lerdahl (2001), he proposed conditions for its identification, which he then proceeded to demonstrate in music by Hindemith’s students Genzmer and Reizenstein.

In her paper ‘Tonal Unity in Max Reger’s Orchestral Works,’ Miona Dimitrijevic (University March Bloch, Strasbourg) argued that common analytical difficulties with Reger’s music derive from deficiencies in the tools customarily employed for its analysis, particularly those based on Schoenberg’s Harmonielehre. She offered alternative ways of interpreting Reger’s complex chromaticism that revealed the music’s underlying harmonic logic and stability. A change of focus from individual chords to harmonic regions reveals an underlying harmonic unity.

Nicolò Palazzetti’s (Paris) paper ‘Bartók’s Legacy in Italian Post-war Music: the Cases of Malipiero, Maderna, and Donatoni’ examined the composer’s influence on the serialist movement, particularly in a ‘Bartókian wave’ in 1945–55. He argued that this influence rivals that of Stravinsky and the Second Viennese School, especially through the use of organizational principles like arch macroforms and palindromic sonata forms, but also of music folklore and the topos of Night Music. The author’s work on Bartók reception in Italy, of which this paper forms a part, promises to shed valuable light on the composer’s legacy.

5d: 20th/21st-Century Music
Thursday afternoon’s session entitled ‘20th/21st-Century Music’ might more precisely have been entitled ‘Structure, Determinism, and the “Open Work”’. In his paper ‘Indeterminacy in Serial Music: Pierre Boulez’s Structure Ia and “the phenomenon of the automatism of chance”’, Manuel Farolfi (Bologna) discussed the influence of John Cage’s aleatorism on Pierre Boulez following their 1949 Paris meeting, particularly through the correspondence that ensued and through Boulez’s Structure Ia.

Catherine Losada’s (Cincinnati) paper ‘Pierre Boulez and the Aesthetics of Proliferation’ explored the composer’s Domaines through its generating material, invoking copious examples from the published score and the composer’s sketches. She convincingly revealed the persistence of essential structural features despite
substantial reworking and demonstrated the emergence, through composing-out of basic material, of what she called a “functional middleground.”

In her tightly-organized paper ‘The Labyrinth: Musical Intuitions in an Open Work,’ Antonella Di Giulio (Buffalo) discussed Umberto Eco’s notion of the ‘open work,’ describing its evolution. While this notion seems to require an improvisatory element, Di Giulio showed how both Petrassi’s Inventione I and Sciarrino’s Etude de Concert may, despite not involving improvisation and despite their fundamentally different compositional processes, be considered an ‘open work.’

6b: Genre and Schemata
Sheila Guymer (University of Cambridge) opened with a paper entitled “Performer’s Analysis” and Genre’ that examined performers’ knowledge of musical works. She problematized the notion of ‘tacit knowledge’ and, borrowing from sociologist of science Harry Collins, distinguished three different types of this knowledge—relational, somatic, and collective—that permit a deeper understanding of character, genre, and topic. Given that the performers whom she interviewed were all forte-pianists like herself, one wonders to what extent work with performers of other instruments might shed additional light on this investigation.

In her paper ‘Playing with Schemata,’ Janet Bourne (Northwestern) related three major theoretical/analytical approaches: Caplin’s form-functional theory, Gjerdingen’s schema theory, and Hatten’s topic theory. Arguing that the aspects these theories illuminate in fact function together in a listener’s experience, she examined their interplay by means of a continuum of parametric relations. While her claims were highly suggestive, the 20-minute format prohibited their adequate exposition, as the author herself admitted; however, her forthcoming article on the will be anticipated by many. Trevor Rawbone’s (Huddersfield) paper ‘The Generation of Local Schemas in Grammars of Western Music’ explored the cooperation of various musical parameters in generating schemas. He investigated in particular what he terms ‘butterfly’ schema, chiastic structures that begin and end on a tonic harmony, and argued that the relations between constituent parameters are historically and culturally specific.

In his paper ‘Fonte in Mozart’s Piano Sonatas, and the ‘Possibly Corrupt Minuet’ K. 331,’ David Jayasuriya (Southampton) constructed a well-considered argument based upon both Joseph Riepel’s work and ‘empirical’ examination to shed light on a problematic passage. After discussing several possible solutions, he suggested that Mozart may have been undecided about how the passage should go, and recommended that performers draw their own informed conclusions. Such a conclusion, although frustratingly indefinite to some, must be praised for its faithfulness to the evidence and refusal to draw overly-rigid conclusions.

9d: Exoticisms
The papers in Friday’s session entitled ‘Exoticisms’ explored questions too frequently neglected by music theorists and analysts. In his paper ‘Auto-exoticism? The case of Mosonyi’s Hungarian Children’s World and Studies’, Shay Loya (unaffiliated scholar at the time, now City University London) discussed how a dominant culture may shape the identity of a subordinate one through the latter’s objectification, even as it seeks ‘authentic’ representations of it. The paper warned against a simplistic or blanket use of the term ‘auto-exoticism’, however, and also demonstrated the value of music analysis for broader questions of cultural influence.

In his paper ‘Pentatonicism of Stravinsky and his Les Apaches Associates,’ Lam Chun Fai John (Hong Kong) pursued interactions between pentatonic and octatonic collections, particularly by way of chinoiserie. He discussed several examples from both Stravinsky and Schmitt where pentatonic motives were heard prominently against an octatonic background, thus giving us a fascinating glimpse into modernist Western techniques of representing Chinese music in early twentieth-century France. Vasilis Kallis’s (Nicosia) ‘The Acoustic Scale: History of Usage’ discussed this scale from theoretical, ethnographic, analytical, and historiographical viewpoints. He presented a number of examples—to which those in attendance also added—and discussed why the scale has been largely overlooked.

The session concluded with Quingfan Jiang’s (Columbia) ‘From Barbaric Tune to Origin of All Ancient Musical Systems: Chinese Music in France 1735–1791.’ The author traced a transformation of attitudes toward Chinese music—first as barbaric and later as expressive of universal musical principles—through five French treatises. This paper touched on the sensitive point of the historical denigration of non-European cultures. Jiang’s unorthodox view (from a post-colonial perspective) that things had actually steadily improved throughout the rise of colonialism in the nineteenth century launched an interesting debate.

William van Geest
James Hepokoski, Keynote 1: ‘Gottheit, Silence, Life, and Death in Beethoven’s Heiliger Dankgesang’

James Hepokoski’s (Yale) research, as the programme informed his audience, aims to contain ‘a broad, overarching view of the past and current state of the ever changing discipline, its challenges and opportunities’—an objective also evident within the first of the three keynote lectures of the conference. Hepokoski opened the talk with an account of existing analytical literature on the central movement of Beethoven’s Quartet in A minor, op. 132., the sheer weight of which tends to confine interpretation to Beethoven’s affliction with deafness and illness. It soon became clear that Hepokoski’s intention was to acknowledge, accept, and place this ‘past’ literature to one side, to ask new questions about the movement’s structure in order to embrace the ‘challenges and opportunities’ of the ‘present’ through his interpretation.

It was accepted from the outset, then, that the movement deals with the ‘human being in extremis’ through a structure that is traditionally set out as a straightforward A B A’ B’ A”. Here, the A theme consists of a cantus firmus hymn, and the contrasting B theme connotes ‘neue Kraft, Fühlend’ [new power, feeling] in order to suggest the narrative of ‘a prayer of supplication followed by a vigorous recovery of health’. The task, then, would be to demonstrate each of the ways in which this narrative is both reinforced and challenged, to build upon past interpretations through a hermeneutically infused rotational reading.

Hepokoski’s lecture was as teleological as the analysis itself, where the rotational design came to form the structure of the talk through the welcome repeated statement that we should always be able to hear the material being discussed—we were thus afforded the luxury of listening to every passage in full upon completion of each rotation’s commentary. The address then gradually unfolded in five parts, where each time the cantus firmus hymn slipped into its ‘meditative chorale’, the referential pattern of sickness, supplication, and response was solidified. The ‘past’ was never too far away, as we were reminded at suitable intervals of the ‘heavenly language’ and ‘spiritual metaphors’ with which this music is often described and from which Hepokoski’s rotational pattern took its source.

It was not long before the fundamental question at the heart of this rotational process was unveiled: If the hermeneutic trajectory is that of sickness to health, upon completion of one rotation, why would another then instantly throw us back into a further cycle of illness, prayer, and recovery? In the final read-through, Hepokoski drew our attention to each way that the music suspends linear progress, blocking the supplicant as a ‘phantasmagoric limit’ in prayer. Rather than the straightforward structure that was accepted at the lecture’s opening then, we were guided towards a five-part rotational design (A—B, A’—B’, A”—[|]. A’—[|. A’’—[|] where the final three half-rotational treatments of the A chorale material were seen to block the new power of the B material in a collapse of the narrative and structure. The final rotation then, was read as a ‘sober, realist’ commentary of earlier ones, where we were reminded that all cycles of illness and cure would at some point be broken, and that renewal would no longer be forthcoming. The final phrase was presented as an ‘existential facing of death’, at which point the above rotational reading of the movement, towards which we were gradually guided, was revealed in full.

After an exhaustive examination of what is already a perplexing (and at times difficult) movement, Hepokoski graciously accepted questions from the audience, one of which was memorably described as having ‘hit at his Achilles heel’. Most leaned towards the hermeneutic narrative of the reading, some challenged the overall form, and others further probed the trajectory of sickness to health. Steven Vande Moortele—shooter of the (fortunately non-fatal) arrow to the hermeneutic heel—astutely queried whether the conceptual healing does not, in fact, take place in the piece as a whole; and if so, how can a narrative that looks towards death, so universal to the human condition, be contained within a movement that was not the composer’s last? To this, Hepokoski suggested that the movement should perhaps be read as a reflection on healing, rather than as an unfolding sequence of events, and began to further question himself how we are supposed to experience the narrative of the other rotations knowing the eventual outcome. Still undeterred in his closing words, however, Hepokoski reiterated his larger aims. For him, the riddles of the movement are akin to a ‘musical sphinx’ that, in order to be understood, must remain in dialogue with preexisting commentary, in a carefully constructed overarching view of past and present. His talk accomplished precisely that, by reinterpreting the existing hermeneutic implications of the movement’s themes through a rereading of the thematic rotations.

Rebecca Day

Amanda Bayley’s keynote explored musicians’ interactions in intercultural settings through composition, improvisation, and performance. There was an intricate definition of intercultural music-making at the outset. Bayley usefully distinguished between ‘cross-cultural interaction’ and ‘intercultural interaction’, the latter term avoiding binary encodings (Knowles, 2010). The concept of ‘intercultural theatre’ – the ‘mixing and matching’ of subcultures (Pavis 1992) – was at the core of her analytical framework. The rationale of the composer, the question of authorship, and the status of notation remained salient issues throughout Bayley’s talk, as was the argument that interaction constituted a complex synergy of the forces and elements of cultures, and that ‘music doesn’t simply “flow” across the gap as some talking about cultural globalization and transnationalism like to imply’ (Stokes, 2012, 99).

Bayley then reviewed a number of collaborations that explored issues of intercultural interaction, such as those that arose from the encounter between Alim Qasimov, an Azerbaijan vocalist/percussion player, and the Kronos string quartet. Since musicians from Azerbaijan do not use notation, much of the recording sessions involved negotiating the written musical materials. Indeed, many of the Western musicians pointed out that the main challenge was working with non-note-reading musicians – presumably because it was contrary to their text-centred, hierarchical understanding of the relationship between a composition and its performance. Qasimov pointed out that working with note-reading musicians was also a challenge due to the lack of freedom in the performing and improvisation process.

Another collaboration involved the Kronos string quartet working with the Afghan vocalist Homayun Sakhi. This piece was initially composed aurally and with instruments, not notation. The collaboration blurred the domains of composing, performing, and improvisation – a shift from the schematic nature of music-making familiar to Western musicians. The use of improvisation and memorised formulae, a normative practice in oral cultures in general, is not really part of Western classical musicians’ training. The exactness and prescriptiveness of notation was alien to the Afghan vocalist. In a further collaboration between the Ukrainian folk singer, Mariana Sadovska, and the Kronos quartet, the same issue of oral-meets-written culture was examined through the art of ornamentation. In this case the interaction between the singer and the quartet was characterized by the singer’s communicability and her infectious encouragement to improvise. She argues that the ultimate responsibility lies with the performers, not the composer. However, the quartet players required clarity about which elements are fixed and fluid, and so notation must in this case be carefully considered because it has an intrinsic deterministic quality; notation must be adapted to incorporate improvisational qualities.

These encounters are not only about the interaction of cultures, but also individuals. If the Afghan musicians were less idealistic and Kronos quartet were more flexible, the meetings might have been more successful. However, they provide an interesting and fruitful fusion of contrasting cultures, and Bayley successfully conveys the interaction. Perhaps the most significant point this paper made was that it showed that intercultural music-making is multifaceted and variable in practice. Sometimes it creates clashing cultural notions of composition, performance, and improvisation; other times it provides moments of integration and synthesis that challenge preconceptions about cultural differences. The methodology of this paper is somewhat free – rigid hypotheses and claims are avoided at the outset – the study employs an ethnographic framework suitable to its exploration of intercultural interaction: prescriptive theories are held in check by fieldwork data and compelling observations about the rituals, practices, cultural attitudes, and personalities that shape and determine the course of these intercultural collaborations.

### Bibliography

Trevor Rowbone
David Neumeyer, Keynote 3: Music Analysis and the Audiovisual: Problems and Prospects

The conference concluded with the last of three keynotes, delivered by David Neumeyer (Texas at Austin) and entitled ‘Music Analysis and the Audiovisual: Problems and Prospects’. Neumeyer, whose most recent book *Hearing the Movies: Music and Sound in Film History* (second edition, 2015) has opened up new possibilities for film music analysis and adds to a long list of distinguished publications, began from the assertions that film-music analysis is a promising enterprise and easier than one might think, and that appropriate analytical tools are readily available.

He first discussed methodological considerations, which included the problem of the overwhelming amount of information in films and the necessity of historical contextualization, the redefinition of the ‘authoritative text’ in film music as opposed to ‘concert’ music, and film music’s provocation of a ‘new way of listening.’

He also outlined an approach to film-music analysis, which included five ‘binaries’: 1) clarity–fidelity, 2) foreground–background, 3) diegetic–nondiegetic, 4) synchronization–counterpoint, and 5) empathy–anempathy. These binaries are intended to ‘force’ more detailed analysis by focusing on aspects of the relation between sound and image, and particularly in what ways and to what degree sound serves to support the narrative.

Neumeyer went on to demonstrate this approach with excerpts from the film *Picnic at Hanging Rock* (1975; the entire film had been shown on the previous Wednesday). He focused on two pieces in particular. The famous Prelude in C from the first book of Bach’s *Well-Tempered Clavier* provided the means by which he proceeded to describe the five proposed binaries, highlighting in particular how this music accompanied—if not always congruently—a transition between two contrasting settings and how scene-changes related to its harmonic structure. He then examined the different function of the second movement of Beethoven’s ‘Emperor’ Concerto. This music, which re-entered at several important moments throughout the film, mediated between the natural and the colonial worlds, posed a contrast between an implied innocence and cruel fate, and served to distance the schoolgirls from the real world. In his view, the role this music played related to the empathetic binary particularly well, as it seemed indexed to the anxiety triggered by the girls’ disappearance and the subsequent search efforts.

In many respects this was a provocative presentation. Neumeyer’s interest in identifying the specific role a film’s soundtrack plays in it, a role he likened to simply another character in the film, is not only highly suggestive but indeed consistent with its typical handling. Even if his binaries are very general—by necessity—they serve well to provoke more pointed examination into a given film. His claim that the tools for film-music analysis are are pretty much the same as those already used for ‘concert music’ (as he termed it) proved a little problematic, however, as it seems the binaries he proposed did not always call upon ‘traditional’ musical-analytical tools, nor were more than a handful of such tools invoked over the course of the presentation. Furthermore, as in the more established field of opera studies, it remains to be seen whether the majority of music-analytical tools are even appropriate or helpful for film music, given the fundamental difference between film music and ‘concert music’.

William van Geest
Celebrating Arnold Whittall’s 80th birthday: ‘Musical Analysis: Past and Future’
Roundtable Colloquium at King’s College London, 7 October, 2015

Speakers: Jonathan Dunsby (Eastman School of Music), Matthew Brown (Eastman School of Music), Jonathan Cross (University of Oxford), Rachel Beckles Willson (Royal Holloway)

Arnold Whittall (pictured left), professor emeritus (formerly Professor of Music Theory and Analysis) at King’s College London, a leader in the UK development of theory and analysis from the 1970s onwards, celebrated his 80th birthday in November 2015. A special colloquium in his honour was a chance both to look back at the achievements of musical analysis in the past half century and to speculate about its future. Many of Arnold’s present and past colleagues, students and friends attended, on stage and in the capacity audience. The account below is a collation by Esther Cavett (former undergraduate and doctoral student of Arnold’s in the 1970s and 80s) of what was said by the four formal contributors and by members of the audience. Though subject to minor amendments for the sake of continuity, this report comprises the original work of each named speaker, and is published here with his or her consent.

Jonathan Dunsby (former colleague of Arnold’s at King’s, and founding editor of the journal Music Analysis) started the proceedings by reflecting on the various binaries that were likely to be referenced in the discussion. These included past and future as an inevitable frame of reference for such an extraordinary, decade-old legacy as Arnold has provided to date. Those binaries also include newer as against older kinds of musical scholarship. King’s no longer boasts a chair in music theory and analysis as it did when Arnold taught there, perhaps because there is not so much that such a post could be thought to reflect nowadays, or not so much that is perceived as needing to be invigorated, or indeed initiated. The binary Jonathan went on to highlight, however, was one of which he was acutely aware as a former British scholar now active in the United States. It is captured in a quotation from a book being written jointly by him and Henry Klumpenhouwer, called The Claims of Music Analysis. The quotation refers to place, but is also emblematic of a link between the past and future in music analysis, in a way emphatically revealing the Whittallian stamp, in that it shows Arnold’s typical stance as not only a practitioner of musical interpretation, a practitioner of the interpretation of composition in the modern and postmodern aesthetic whose sensibilities Arnold’s life of research now straddles, but also as a chronicler of the thinking behind that interpretation. The quote, bearing in mind the use of the term ‘music theory’ in American to convey more or less what the ‘theory and analysis’ in Arnold’s erstwhile professorial title also indicates, refers to ‘modern concepts and practices in this vibrant discipline which has stakeholders worldwide, with English as a common language. This is at a time when there is a strongly interrogative atmosphere among leading writers on music theory, as the old paradigms that were not only prevalent but relatively fixed in the late twentieth century collapse’. By ‘old paradigms’, the authors mean roughly what Arnold has always referred to as music analytical ‘method’. In his 2011 essay on Tymoczko’s and Rings’s recent books, for instance, entitled ‘Hunting for Harmony,’ Arnold specifically points to Hasegawa’s call for an integration of analytical methods, in what Arnold refers to as “a pluralism that bridges the tonal/atonal divide and, in so doing, erodes the distinction while still acknowledging that there must always be some separation between the perception and explication of motivic and harmonic processes”.

Quite what is meant by the frankly rhetorical word ‘collapse’ is a different, less specific matter perhaps, but this is where ‘place’ comes in. It is surely clear to any observer that the well-known American distaste for metatheory, which results in wave upon wave of uninspected epistemological correctness, has not benefited from anything like the force of sober reflection on meaning and purpose that Arnold continues to exert in so many areas of British musical scholarship.

As Arnold embarks on what will be his seventh decade of offering his prolific ideas in print, Jonathan, working in the American paperchase, treasured the reflective practice of Arnold’s
particular kind of theorizing, its commitment to a liberal critique of the ever unsettled present in scholarly discourse, to symbiosis rather than either isolation or confrontation. He did not want to dwell on the geographical binary that might make the seminar that evening a distinctly, and rightly British kind of discussion, but was very conscious of senses in which music theory can often be seen to be led from this side of the Atlantic, not least by those who feel they have absorbed the most important Whittallian lessons.

Jonathan Cross (who was at King’s as a graduate student, 1983–6) looked back only as far as 1982 when Arnold, who had been at King’s since 1975, was appointed the first ever UK Professor of Music Theory and Analysis. The title was itself an indication of a sea-change taking place in the British musicological landscape at that time. It represented a very particular moment, coinciding with a number of other key occurrences for the discipline of musical analysis, most notably:

- The publication in 1979 of the English translation of Schenker’s Free Composition, making that text much more widely accessible in the Anglophone world, especially within pedagogical contexts, followed hot on its heels by Forte and Gilbert’s Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis.

- The publication in 1980 of the 20-volume New Grove, which, under the visionary leadership of Stanley Sadie, moved the venerable Grove’s Dictionary from the parochial into the international arena. This included the entry on analysis by Ian Bent, still a discipline-defining article, and not just in the English-speaking world, even if – inevitably – the discipline itself has changed immensely in the intervening 35-or-so-years. Surprisingly, some years later, when the French analysis society was looking to publish a similarly reflective, discipline-defining text, it chose not to commission a new one but to publish a translation of Ian’s (inevitably) Anglocentric article. This has only very recently been superseded by L’Analyse musicale, une pratique et son histoire and Théories de la composition musicale au XXe siècle, emerging from a world beyond the narrow purview of the Sorbonne and the regional conservatories, which had generally framed French analytical discourse up to that point. (This is distinct from the composer-led approach to analysis, typified by, say, the theories and writings of Messiaen and, after him, Lévinas at the Paris Conservatoire.) It is important always to remind ourselves how far any discipline, analysis included, is shaped and framed by institutional structures, pedagogy, funding environments, politics (of course), technology, generational perspectives, geography, language, and so on.

- The founding of the journal Music Analysis within the University of London, with Arnold as Chair of the Editorial Board and Jonathan Dunsby as its first editor.

The mid-1980s were certainly an exciting time to be a student at King’s. We felt we were part of something new, and that the transition of musical analysis from a sort of gentlemanly English dilettantism towards a more professionalised, international context represented a real watershed. Ironically, of course, this focusing of theory and analysis here in the UK also coincided with the beginnings of a wider critique coming out of the USA of what was perceived to be a theoretical isolationism, most notably in Kerman’s 1980 article ‘How we got into analysis, and how to get out’, followed in 1985 by the book Musicology, with its rallying cry for a new criticism as an antidote to positivism and formalism (his watchwords). The noisy debates surrounding the so-called new musicology soon ensued. So while, on the one hand, British universities were beginning to introduce the systematic teaching of analytical method into their undergraduate and graduate curricula (as reflected in Arnold and Jonathan’s book Music Analysis in Theory and Practice), in essence an elegant re-write of the King’s analysis MMus from the 80s), on the other hand, UK music courses were also gradually and more broadly beginning
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9 Nicolas Donin & Laurent Feneyrou (eds), Théories de la composition musicale au XXe siècle, 2 vols (Lyon: Symétrie, 2013).
to embrace ethnomusicology, feminist and queer theory, cultural studies, popular music studies, and so on. To some, the moves in both directions represented an alien Americanisation of UK higher education; to others it represented an injection of rigour and inter-disciplinarity. As far as Jonathan (Cross) was concerned, this was only to be welcomed. UK Music Departments had long suffered from their own disciplinary isolation in ways that were not true of either their North American or their Continental European counterparts. UK students rarely received a parallel training in, say, literature or philosophy like a student at Freiburg, the Sorbonne or Princeton. But there were at least compensations in early specialisation, as well as the unique institutional situation of British Music departments, where the separation between history, analysis, composition and performance was rarely demarcated. In Jonathan’s view this situation led to music theory and analysis quickly taking on a very different hue in the UK.

If we go back to the first volume of the journal, we find the inimitable Hans Keller on analysis & criticism, sticking his eloquent boot in before even a word or graph of analysis has been presented; Arnold on music analysis as human science after Foucault; Christopher Wintle on analysis and performance; music and words in the shape of opera analysis; Adorno (translated from the German); and music semiotics (translated from the French); plus two representative models of more intensive analytical work from Eric Wen and Craig Ayrey. In other words, the tone was set for analysis in context, analysis as part of a broader professional, international, interdisciplinary and sceptical project within – not separate from – musicology and the humanities. This broadly contextual approach still characterises much of the best analytical work that takes place today within the cultural, historical, political and institutional bounds of the UK. This might help to explain why neither the obsessive excesses of SMT-style theory-making nor the wilder ravages of music-free new musicology really took root here.

It is therefore odd that there are those who continue to take pot-shots at analysis, mainly out of ignorance, but also on purely ideological grounds. The very word seems to trigger a Pavlovian response. Yet – here in the UK at least – we talk of analysis rather than theory, and that is important: analysis is a set of practices, fluid, embedded within multiple other practices. Analysis leads to a reading, to a provisional truth, for a particular person, place and time; despite the repeated admonitions of the likes of Taruskin and Kramer, there is no-one, surely, who really still believes in The Music Itself, and that analysis somehow has unique access to the truth.

In his own teaching of undergraduates, Jonathan likes to introduce topic theory at the earliest opportunity. It is very effective at unblocking ears and minds: it immediately gets students thinking and listening beyond and behind the score and its performance, and yet still requires them to attend to such matters as melody, rhythm, harmony, tonality, and so on. Even something as simple as, say, leading a student towards the realisation that a sacred aria by Bach is actually built from the patterns and form of a secular dance can be revelatory, because it prompts further questions about the historical contexts of such music, how it might have been heard then and how we listen to it now, what performing traditions this invokes, the wider relationship between church and society in the 18th century, and so on. It quickly encourages inter-textuality, that is, questions of meaning, and is reminiscent of probably the best article ever published in the journal Music Analysis: Naomi Cumming’s piece on the subjectivities of ‘Erbarme Dich’.12 In the way it starts from a very particular and personal situation, in its adept use of voice-leading and other approaches, in order to tackle key philosophical and theological questions, it is a model still to be emulated. It is a thorough-going analytically article, and yet analysis is ultimately the tool that prises open bigger issues of interpretation.

Jonathan then referred to being invited in 2013 to give a series of masters seminars at Stellenbosch University in South Africa, in order to work with students on topic theory – broadly defined – of which they had little experience. He started in the 18th century and worked towards readings of very recent music. He was not prepared for their reaction. This was not just academic game-playing for them. Everything is politicised in present-day South Africa, for understandable reasons. Western European classical music, perceived as the privileged pastime of a wealthy, educated, white élite, is under furious attack, not least in universities and conservatoires. Topic theory suggested possibilities for these young musicologists as to how bring what we might call, crudely, the analytical and the social into the same space. The sort of thing that Adorno did very well, of course, and who set the tone for the journal way back in volume one.

As for the future, well who knows? Certainly, it is to be hoped that the embedding of analysis over
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the past decade within a plurality of other modes of enquiry will continue – historical, philosophical, performative, psychological, anthropological, and so on. Maybe, as Jim Samson speculated at the end of his chapter on analysis in the 1999 volume *Rethinking Music*, analysis as such will disappear and will be absorbed into a wider, deeper engagement with music, wherever that is found, however it is discussed. Would that matter? We shall still need the tools of analysis (and he worried that the teaching of skills was not nearly as widespread as it once was) but equally important is the development of a critical attitude that enables one to ask appropriate questions of music and to be able to discover methods for pursuing those questions. But that, in fact, is something very old. It is not, ‘What can I impose on the music?’, but rather ‘What questions does the music prompt in me?’ *Sonate, que me veux-tu?* to repose Fontenelle’s question. ‘Music, what do you want of me?’

Matthew Brown (who was an undergraduate at King’s in 1975–1978) noted that when he was preparing his contribution he quickly realised that the only way he could do so was to discuss his own views about music analysis and how they have changed over the past forty years. He took this approach because, on the one hand, the field has become so large that nobody can keep up with more than a small fraction of what is being published and, on the other, his immediate environment fundamentally shapes approach to music analysis. He works at a music conservatory and spends far more time teaching model composition and counterpoint than teaching music analysis, his students are mainly performers and, in the instances when he supervises a PhD dissertation, he usually works with advanced students who are already skilled at analysis. Against this backdrop, he noted that the ways he analyses music have not altered much since he was an undergraduate at King’s in the mid 1970s. It was Arnold who first introduced him to Schenkerian analysis and who cultivated his interest in music theory. And he has not changed the sorts of music he tends to analyse since Arnold led him to him study a wide array of music: pre-tonal, tonal, and post-tonal music, as well as instrumental, programme, and stage music.

But while Matthew hasn’t changed the ways or the repertories that he analyses, he has different reasons for doing music analysis. Forty years ago, he analysed pieces in order to understand how they are put together, thinking of music analysis as a form of problem solving or code breaking with a goal of figuring out how pieces worked. Although there are times when he still thinks this way, it is no longer the main reason why he analyses music. During the mid 1980s and early 1990s, he began to treat music analysis not as an end in itself, but as a means to some other end. In particular, he came to view Schenkerian theory not simply as a method for analysing particular pieces, but rather as a tool for understanding the nature of tonality. Once he took this step, he started to worry less about what happens in a specific work and more about what might in principle happen in any tonal work. He was soon forced to take sides in methodological debates between organicists, such as Oswald Jonas and Ernst Oster, who focused on the richness of each reading, and formalists, such as Milton Babbitt and Michael Kassler, who worried more about the explicitness, consistency, and completeness of the model. He still sides with the formalists.

In the late 1990s, however, his thinking shifted once again and he began to think more about the nature of tonal relationships and about whether they are primarily cultural or cognitive phenomena. Although they are in some sense both, he focused on the latter and on the idea that Schenkerian theory explains how expert composers cognise tonal material rather than how ordinary people hear tonal music. This view, which he defended in his book *Explaining Tonality*, prompted further debates with music theorists such as Fred Lerdahl and David Temperley. Once again, the differences have methodological implications. Whereas Lerhahl and Temperley rely heavily on data gathered in carefully controlled laboratory experiments, he likes to draw on messier evidence gleaned from composers’ teaching materials, sketches, letters, and so forth.

In recent years, his thinking about music analysis has taken yet another turn. One of his biggest phobias is that of having to give analytical presentations. When Arnold first introduced him to Schenkerian theory, it appealed in large part because he liked drawing pictures more than writing prose or giving talks. Over the years he tried to overcome this phobia by presenting his work in unconventional ways, such as writing it in the form of a fairy story or a paleontological mystery, or by littering his prose with allusions to popular culture. Now, in his most recent phase, he has become interested in using analysis to inform musical experiences that don’t involve writing pages of prose or talking for very long. One obvious outlet is in the classroom, where
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Schenkerian analysis can be used to teach model composition. This idea fits nicely with the cognitive claims that he makes in *Explaining Tonality* and with Schenker’s comment at the start of *Der freie Satz* that the best way to improve one’s understanding of tonal music is to learn how to improvise preludes and cadenzas.

Another outlet is Table Top Opera, a chamber ensemble that specializes in multi-media presentations of classical pieces. He uses his own analyses of works to prepare scores for performance: this task involves removing superfluous passages, inserting music from related pieces, and even adding newly composed passages. Besides collaborating with P. Craig Russell on comic-book versions of Debussy’s *Pelléas et Mélisande* and Strauss’s *Salome*, Table Top Opera recently performed a version of Mahler’s *Kindertotenlieder*. They used the performance to compare the problems of child mortality and child poverty in the time of Rückert and Mahler with those in contemporary America. The presentation consisted of music, segments of text, and 19th-century post-mortem and paranormal photographs. Besides Mahler’s song cycle, they also used material from other pieces by Mahler, such as from his 1st, 5th, and 6th symphonies, and from pieces by other composers, such as the “Prelude” to Act 3 of Wagner’s *Tristan und Isolde*, Schoenberg’s piano piece Op. 19 no.6, and Thelonius Monk’s *Round Midnight*. Since Mahler wanted the songs to be performed continuously, Matthew used music analysis as an editorial tool for joining one score to the next and for highlighting the contrapuntal structure of the music.

So much for the past and the present, what of the future? Matthew said he has absolutely no idea where music analysis is headed. During his recent tenure as editor of the journal *Theory and Practice*, he saw the range of papers continue to grow, editing analyses of traditional classical music, twentieth-century music, rock music, TV music, and so on. There is no reason to suppose that this trend towards diversification will stop in the years to come. The future for Schenkerian theory also seems pretty rosy: over the last month, he has contributed an analysis to a companion to Schenker’s *Harmonielehre* with Bob Wason and Bill Drabkin. And yet, he also expects to spend more time applying his analytical experiences to create other multi-media projects. Some of them are already underway: a reconstruction of Debussy’s *La chute de la maison Usher* and comic book versions of Dukas’ *Ariane et barbe-bleue* and and Wagner’s *Der Ring des Nibelungen*. Needless to say, the approach to the latter will be extremely reductive.

**Rachel Beckles Willson**, who arrived at King’s in 1995 as a pianist to work on the music of György Kurtág as a doctoral student of Arnold’s, took a different approach to the discussion. Drawing from her chapter in the forthcoming book *Music Analysis and the Body: Experiments, Explorations and Embodiments* (eds. N. Reyland, S. Sewell, & R. Thumpston Peeters, Leuven Studies in Musicology) she asked: what sort of questions do we want music analysis to help us with? When music is understood as an object that contains meanings, music analysis serves to unlock some of those, and to suggest how they are encoded. But when music is understood as an embodied practice, a process, a technology or anything else, analytical thinking will inevitably be used differently. Questions of meaning may still be important, but the elements brought into play may be more diverse. Of the questions themselves may be new, the analytical attitude quite different as well.

An explicit focus on embodiment therefore nudges our questions into new territories, especially if we align our thinking with broader arguments that have dispensed with ‘the body’. Bodies are differently enabled and constrained by the regimes in which they exist: if bodies are shaped by their environments then there can be no positing of a ‘normal’ body, and no body can be considered purely individual either. So there is no ‘body’: there are only bodies – these of varying size, shape, colour, gender, ability and so on.¹⁴ Musicologists and analysts can also draw on the work of scholars who have pressed for a properly relational approach to our place in the world – see, for instance, Irigaray’s ‘porosity’, Dewsbury’s ‘illusory’ body, and Abrahamsson and Simpson’s ‘semi-permeable’ body.¹⁵ Some writers, generally from outside the institutions of musicology, have connected a fluid sense of embodiment to sonic experience in particular.¹⁶ Bodies are permanently
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unsettled. They might be considered compositions in progress.

In consequence of such thinking music-analytical work has been increasingly honed on reciprocities between sounds and bodies and objects, and ways that these entities are shaped and sensed by individuals, groups, environments and politics. The strengths of such recent studies include their explorations of particular technologies of sound production (cassette players, digital sound files, sound-enhanced clothing) and hitherto unexamined areas of sonic experience, and connecting these areas and experiences to broader political and social concerns. But Rachel’s interest is in arguing for similar thinking in contexts of music making and technologies that have longer histories. In what ways can the recognition of an unsettled embodiment transform our music analytical thinking more broadly?

One guide in these explorations is the concept of affect, understood as a movement of feelings between humans and non-human entities in a shared space. But Rachel is also concerned with a more intimate sphere, what she terms individual sensoriality rather than affect, which is part of what archaeologist Yiannis Hamilakis has termed a ‘sensorial assemblage’. Developing Deleuzian thought with a specific emphasis on the senses, Hamilakis uses this expression for ‘the contingent co-presence of heterogenous elements such as bodies, things, substances, affects, memories, information, and ideas’. Our sensory experiences may feel private, individual to our embodied selves, but they are partially shared: it contributes to the sensorial ‘glue’ holding together assemblages that are ‘temporarily territorialised in specific locales, and later dispersed, de-territorialised, and re-assembled (re-territorialised) elsewhere’.20

Sound and music, once understood as affect and sensoriality, may be understood as movements or energies that are co-constituted by a range of other forces sensed through vision, touch, movement, and so on. But sound is distributed among and transformed by everything and everyone present: its constant transformation bespeaks an inherent flux. Rachel proposed to probe how, by following the shifty ‘glue’ of sonic assemblages, we may find ways in which we can make connections between sensoriality and authority, between intimate experience and affective regimes. Ultimately her theoretical interest is in how sensoriality enables us to examine varying forms of sonic authority in progress, and adopt an analytical strategy in so doing.

Rachel introduced a fieldwork example, intending to introduce specificity even while indicating scope for broader generalizations. It involved a London theatre event that entailed a silent audience and a single male performer delivering a lecture to the accompaniment of a soundtrack and images. She examined this as a hybrid, plural and shifting sensory performance operating on several explicitly embodied levels including individual perception, the local sensorial assemblage, and the broader social context of energy consumption and climate change. Individual sensorial experience could thus be situated within a broader affective contexts, and probed for broader regimes of power, and the implications they have for our analytical methods.

In conclusion, she reflected on how taking situated positions as analyst can be a performative strategy in writing, simply because it constitutes a rebuttal of an apparently neutral, disembodied externality. The result may be an uncomfortable awareness of partiality and provisionality; but she argued that it is necessary to an understanding of music as a process rather than as object. Her hope was that such positionings enable the conception of unfolding events or processes for readers themselves. Positioning engenders (re)positionings – the method is in such process – in such work, analysis is a form of strategically embodied positioning.

Following the four contributions from panellists, Daniel Leech-Wilkonson noted that a common theme was the belief that what music does and

20 Hamilakis, Archaeology and the Senses, 126-127.
how it does it remain a common enterprise. Another audience member wanted to know, in light of Rachel’s contribution, whether there was a ‘body’ in Schenkerian analysis. Matthew responded that there were many kinds of Schenkerian analyses and discoveries of new ways of analysing, so that usage and process of discovery were a kind of embodiment. Rachel considered that certain types of repertoire lend themselves to embodiment, and pointed out that it is music’s technologies (scores, instruments) and our actions that give us our sense of music’s embodied or disembodied existence.

Jonathan (Dunsby) commented that Rachel’s commentary on embodiment struck him as interestingly sociological and, to bring the discussion back to musical basics, he observed that for Schenker the laws of tonality are embodied in the harmonic series, which is not a general psycho-sociological concept but a physical fact of enormous consequences for human life. One of the consequences is the fact that it is the harmonic series which enables humans to speak, i.e. be understood, and linguistics and scientists researching vocality (in its musical sense), as well as those looking at the role of music as a substrate of language in early human civilization (despite what the fashionable Pinker says), are thus taking notions of embodiment into physiological areas of understanding of human behavior.

Another audience member picked up on Jonathan Cross’s concern that it was more difficult now to teach the skills of music analysis, and Rachel’s reference to broader repertoires, by asking the panel to consider whether musical inclusivity necessarily leads to de-skilling. If we deal in a seminar such as the current one with the complex issue of the analytical structures within music, he asked, where does this leave those who are teaching students who come to us with limited skill? Jonathan Cross responded that our role as teachers, when students come to us without a vocabulary, is to help them develop critical skills, and Matthew noted that this issue is as acute in the US as the UK.

Arnold spoke to say two things. Firstly, to thank King’s for hosting the seminar and the audience for being there and in particular, and here he was referring to the topic of analysis of tonal and atonal music which ran through the evening, to ‘the “dissonant” quartet who delivered this seminar: they did so in a way that was thoroughly emancipated yet created a thoroughly positive dissonance’. Secondly, he said that thinking about the future of music analysis and theory took him back to the 1980s. The first time Allen Forte came to the UK, for KCLMAC84, as the first ever UK music analysis conference was called, he was author of the Structure of Atonal Music and, with Stephen Gilbert, An Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis. Talking to Allen enabled Arnold to recognize the change that took place between tonal and post tonal repertoires and become more confident that this was a helpful distinction to make.

From the floor one colleague asked Arnold if he had noticed abandoned avenues of music analysis over the years, and losses he regretted; to which the response was that far from areas having been abandoned, there were additional ones, such as the positive links being developed between composition and analysis, for example in pc-set analysis extended to microtonal temperaments and spectralism. Arnold considered that, ideally, post-tonal music analysis would not only be produced by contemporary composers but inspire them in their own work. He predicted that later in the 21st Century there might be a real revival of true tonal composition, as opposed to neo-tonal composition. If so, those future composers of tonal music might profit from Schenkerian theory, even though in the process “what is left of Schenker’s body might be rotating rather rapidly”. He concluded that the fruits of this seminar show that Music Analysis wasn’t just a brief ‘candle in the wind’, but it survived and adapted, adding his hope that it would go on doing so.

Finally, Arnold was presented with a goblet, to ensure that he took something away from the proceedings in addition to a warm glow. Arnold immediately noted a fortuitous resemblance to the Parsifal grail and raised it above his head as it was handed to him as a lasting mark of our appreciation of his life and work and our good wishes for both to continue to flourish.

Esther Cavett

---

21 That member of the audience was Ian Pace (City University London), who wrote the next piece [Ed.]
To do justice to Arnold's enviable legacy, we should reverse a tendency towards the de-skilling of a discipline

During the contributions to Arnold Whittall's 80th birthday colloquium at King's College, London, Jonathan Cross linked two events: Arnold's appointment as the first Professor of Theory and Analysis in 1982, and later in the decade the purported expansion of musicology to incorporate issues of gender, sexuality and race, methodologies from sociology, anthropology, cultural studies and elsewhere, and greater focus on popular musics and other traditions outside of Western art music. Some of the latter phenomena are associated with the so-called 'new musicology' in the US and its slightly milder counterpart 'critical musicology' in the UK.

All of these were portrayed by Cross as a general broadening of the discipline, a welcome infusion of increased diversity of subject and methodology, a natural step forward. But an academic field now in large measure antipathetic to claims of musical autonomy seems nonetheless to claim a fair degree of autonomy for its own trajectory, in a way I find implausible and even disingenuous. There may be some common determinants underlying all these apparent broadenings of the field, and both systematic analysis and the new musicology have been opposed by conservatives such as Peter Williams. Nonetheless, the wider ideologies underlying these disparate developments can be quite antagonistic, as was certainly made clear in an important interview between Arnold and Jonathan Dunsby published in *Music Analysis* (Vol. 14, No. 2/3 (Jul. – Oct., 1995), pp. 131-139) for the former's 60th birthday.

The 'new musicology' is frequently argued to have been inaugurated with the publication of Joseph Kerman's *Contemplating Music* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985) (UK title *Musicology*). Despite being replete with factual errors, Kerman's appeal to a musicological inferiority complex, a field presented as trailing far behind other disciplines in terms of adoption of ideas from phenomenology, post-structuralism, feminism and more, not to mention his negative view of both musical modernism and historically informed performance, as well as residual anti-German prejudice, would prove very influential.

But Kerman was also the author of the polemical 'How We Got into Analysis, and How to Get out' (*Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (Winter 1980), pp. 331-331), absolutely at odds with what Arnold was advocating and aiming for at around the same time. The contexts for these two musicologists were very different: Kerman was responding to a particular North American situation (though he was shameless in extrapolating universal pronouncements from a rather provincial perspective), with a much starker distinction between 'historians' and 'theorists' than in the UK. In the US, a heavily mediated rendition of Schenker's work had flowered since 1931 through his student Hans Weisse, and in the early post-war era through other students Felix Salzer and Oswald Jonas, whilst other intense analytical approaches had been developed by Rudolph Réti, Milton Babbitt, Allen Forte, George Perle, David Lewin and others. In the UK, on the other hand, as Arnold would note in a 1980 article ('Musicology in Great Britain since 1945. III. Analysis', *Acta Musicologica*, Vol. 52, Fasc. 1 (Jan. – Jun. 1980), pp. 57-62), systematic analysis had made little advance, despite a gauntlet having been set down by Ian Bent's advocacy at the Congress of the International Musicological Society in 1972. What did exist—through some interest in Réti's work, the 'functional analysis' of Hans Keller, and a smattering of other work from Alan Walker, David Osmond Smith and a few others—was occasional and patchy. This disciplinary patchiness was undoubtedly a major factor in Arnold's co-founding, in 1982, of the journal *Music Analysis* together with Jonathan Dunsby, with whom he would author what remains the leading general textbook on analysis in English six years later. The subject has continued to grow and develop, with excellent work from UK academics, such as Matthew Riley's studies on Haydn and Mozart, Michael Spitzer's work on the affective function of gesture, Nicholas Cook on analysis and performance, or Allan Moore's work on rock (to mention only a few), but it is difficult in 2015 to see analysis as having attained a central position in musicology as might have seemed possible in 1982. Various musicologists who assumed prominent positions from the 1990s onwards have made no secret of their disdain for this sub-
discipline, sometimes inspired by American writings of a similar ideological persuasion.

Assumptions of autonomous development of the discipline in the 1980s and 1990s are belied by issues such as the wider politics of education from the Thatcher years onwards. These entailed cuts in musical provision in schools, the 1992 removal of the formal distinction between universities and polytechnics, and then expansion of student numbers. After a doubling of the number of students (in all subjects) between 1963 and 1970 following the Robbins Report, numbers remained static until the late 1980s, when during a period of around a decade student numbers practically doubled from 17% in 1987 to 33% in 1997, then rose steadily to peak at 49% in 2011. This move from an elite to a mass educational system occurred in parallel with attempts to erase the very real differences in preparedness and background amongst students at different types of institutions, with a net levelling effect upon many.

Much of the new embrace of popular music had less to do with genuine diversification than an enforced denial of very real differences of various forms of musical production's relationship to the marketplace. One of Thatcher's neoliberal mantras, 'There Is No Alternative' (TINA) was echoed by many a musicologist scornful of any possible value in state-subsidised musical activity thus able to operate with a degree of autonomy from short-term market utility. As subsidy is rare or minimal in the US, this ideology was convenient for American musicologists eager to claim some radical credentials through valorisation of the commercial whilst still appearing patriotic; it was disappointing to see so much of this ideology imported wholesale in the UK, a country with a modest level of subsidy for music compared to its continental European counterparts.

I have always thought of music, at a tertiary level, as a highly skilled discipline for those who have already developed and refined musicianship prior to entering university. This belief may reflect a background in a specialist music school in which, if nothing else, the teaching of fundamental musical skills was rigorous and thorough. Nonetheless, the importance of not allowing music slip to become a 'soft' subject requiring only nominal prior skills (and, as with much work in the realm of cultural studies, not requiring any particular artistic disciplinary expertise or extended knowledge) is to me self-evident. But with declining primary and secondary musical educational provision, frequently the extent of such prior skills amongst students can be quite elementary.

Furthermore, following the trebling of tuition fees in 2012 and other measures removing caps on recruitment, higher education has become a more ruthlessly competitive market with institutions fighting to attract and keep students. This is the context from which we should view the growth in many departments of types of popular music studies, film music studies, cultural studies, and some varieties of ethnomusicology, in which engagement with sounding music is a secondary or even non-existent concern. Such focus enables the production of modules which can be undertaken by those students with limited prior skills, but militates against musical analysis in particular.

We now have a situation, unthinkable a few decades ago, where some senior academics—even at professorial level—have no ability to read any type of musical notation. These academics (not to mention some of their students who will go on to teach at primary and secondary levels) may only perpetuate and exacerbate this situation for their own students. Similarly, a number of sub-disciplines of academic music can now be undertaken without linguistic skills, or much background in history, literature, the visual arts, philosophy and so on. Students have always had uneven backgrounds in these respects, but the will to help them improve upon this has also declined in various institutions. Expansion of musical study to encompass wider ranges of music and disciplinary approaches is certainly to be welcomed when this entails the cultivation of equal degrees of expertise and methodological refinement and critical acumen, but not necessarily when these are simply a means for attracting and holding onto less able students.

In short, these developments in musical higher education have seen a well-meaning liberal quest for inclusivity amount in practice to a pseudo-egalitarian de-skilling of a profession. In order to build upon the legacy bequeathed above all by Arnold for the support of specialised and rigorous analytical skills, we cannot ignore this issue any longer.

Ian Pace
City University London
## Diary (February deadlines)

**27 February 2016 SMA**
**MUSIC ANALYSIS WORKSHOP**
Senate House, University of London
Deadline: 12 February 2016
[http://www.sma.ac.uk/2016/01/call-for-participants-music-analysis-workshop-2/](http://www.sma.ac.uk/2016/01/call-for-participants-music-analysis-workshop-2/)

**13-15 July 2016**
**HISTORY, ANALYSIS, PEDAGOGY – MUSIC ANALYSIS CONFERENCE**
University of Nottingham
Deadline: 18 February 2016
[http://www.sma.ac.uk/2015/12/cpf-nottingham-mac-2016/](http://www.sma.ac.uk/2015/12/cpf-nottingham-mac-2016/)

**2-3 April, 2016**
**TAGS**
University of Liverpool in London,
33 Finsbury Square, London EC2A 1AG
[http://www.sma.ac.uk/2016/01/call-for-papers-tags-conference-2016/](http://www.sma.ac.uk/2016/01/call-for-papers-tags-conference-2016/)

---

## SMA Grants

The Editorial Board of the Journal *Music Analysis* makes grants from its Development Fund in the form of support for travel and subsistence to UK-based students and scholars working in the discipline of music analysis to attend conferences abroad, to consult library and archival resources or to pursue other comparable research activities. Individual grants will not normally exceed £500 and applicants must be members of the SMA. The board also supports UK academic conferences, seminars and meetings concerned wholly or in part with the discipline of music analysis. For more details and application procedure see [http://www.sma.ac.uk/grants/development/](http://www.sma.ac.uk/grants/development/). Students wishing to apply for travel bursaries should consult [http://www.sma.ac.uk/grants/travel/](http://www.sma.ac.uk/grants/travel/).

## SMT international travel grants

International Travel Grants are available for the purpose of attending Society for Music Theory (SMT) conferences. Application information can be found on the website of the SMT's Committee on Diversity: [http://www.societymusictheory.org/grants/travel](http://www.societymusictheory.org/grants/travel)