

**Analysis of Tonal Music: A Schenkerian Approach,
by Allen Cadwallader and David Gagné
(New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).**

Reviewed by David Neumeyer and Julian L. Hook¹

The late 1970's were heady days for Schenkerians, a time when increasingly successful "incursions" (to adapt William Rothstein's military metaphor)² into American college music departments made Schenkerian analysis a serious curricular player and suggested a plausible, culturally conservative alternative to reforms based on comprehensive musicianship, a movement whose roots go back to the Contemporary Music Project. Some twenty years after Felix Salzer's *Structural Hearing*, the first full-length textbook in Schenkerian interpretation intended for an American audience, Edward Aldwell and Carl Schachter could try to marry the (low-level) heuristics of Schenkerian analysis to the traditional two-volume harmony text plus workbook. In comparison with the pioneering book in this area, Allen Forte's *Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice*, the results were predictable: a less efficient pedagogy and sometimes dense and murky exposition, but *Harmony and Voice Leading* did overcome one perceived deficiency of Forte's book by getting across a characteristic trait of the New York school of Schenkerians: a deep love of a very narrow selection of historical European musics and the elevation of those musics' status to icons of a romantic aesthetic entwined with an exclusivist cultural ideology.

At about the same time, John Rothgeb could seriously propose reforming the undergraduate music theory curriculum to conform with Schenker's own proposals: students would begin with a year of strict counterpoint and figured bass, then proceed

¹Authorship credit goes as follows: Julian Hook is responsible for comments on details in the volume under review and for the critiques of analyses (Beethoven, op. 2, no. 1, and Haydn, Sonata in D Major, Hob. XVI:37, third movement); David Neumeyer wrote the rest.

²William Rothstein, "The Americanization of Heinrich Schenker," in Hedi Siegel, ed., *Schenker Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 193–194.

to a study of harmony as a tool for analysis in the second year. Only thereafter would they examine in earnest the relationship of strict counterpoint to free composition; that is, do Schenkerian analysis.³ Though radical, Rothgeb's outline was inescapably the correct one for a curriculum designed to provide the foundation for advanced study in tonal music, as Schenker conceived that study. Aldwell and Schachter, therefore, like Forte before them and Joel Lester and Robert Gauldin after them, show the weakening of Schenkerian resolve that Rothstein describes so well:

Once an arcane and difficult thinker, quite beyond the reach even of most university professors of music, [Schenker by 1985] had become a "flavor," a whiff of which would help to sell textbooks to undergraduates. Of course, I didn't really need this little epiphany to see what was going on with Schenkerism in America. It is one of the glories of American culture that it so readily absorbs foreign influences.... But those foreign elements that it adopts, it adapts in the process, often changing them in essential ways.⁴

In this environment, one can more readily understand why Forte and Steven Gilbert design the curriculum of their *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis* to begin, not with the background, but with no less than six chapters on the reading and notation of a foreground level mostly disconnected from earlier structural levels. In this, at least, they seem to predict Rothstein's prescription for an adequate compromise between the traditions of the American college music curriculum and the principles of a properly Schenkerian pedagogy:

...the potential for winning many more skeptical musicians would appear to be almost unlimited, if only we go about it in the right way. The right way, in my opinion, is never to force more of Schenker's approach onto anyone than can be truly absorbed and truly heard. If this means that most students and non-theorists generally are taught only how to interpret the foreground, well and good.... Backgrounds and even middlegrounds are not for everybody.⁵

³John Rothgeb, "Schenkerian Theory: Its Implications for the Undergraduate Curriculum," *Music Theory Spectrum* 3 (1981), 149.

⁴Rothstein, "Americanization," 194.

⁵Rothstein, "Americanization," 201.

Forte and Gilbert's goal (presumably forced on them by the publisher)⁶ was to play to two constituencies in the upper-level undergraduate market: the traditional form-and-analysis course and the newly "favorable" concise introduction to Schenkerian interpretation. By focusing on details and very gradually teaching a formal (if idiosyncratic) notation for the foreground, they make the work accessible to students with the usual lower-level undergraduate theory training; they go on to introduce the structural levels and then finally tackle traditional form schemata using the complete Schenkerian apparatus. Despite the proposal in the quotation above, however, Rothstein is more than a little impatient with this approach: "Forte and Gilbert have surrendered completely to the academic status quo in suggesting that, after only one year of basic harmony and counterpoint, analysis itself can be taught in just one year."⁷ To Rothstein, this is clearly "changing [things] in essential ways."

The ideological presumption Rothstein barely suppresses in the quote above is the belief that Schenkerians are the sole proprietors of true musicianship and therefore pedagogy consists mainly of strategies for winning converts. If we face this belief directly and openly, it would seem to lead us away from compromise and back to John Rothgeb's curriculum, which necessarily means rejecting the notion of introductory Schenkerian textbooks for the American market. Presumably, we should then establish curricular structures which would support parallels to Schenker's personal practice: teaching private lessons which combine performance and analysis or conducting small seminars for advanced students. Larger introductory classes would take up the usual fundamentals, strict counterpoint, and figured bass, in that order.

Cadwallader and Gagné have created a very good book which presents their own version of Schenkerian pedagogy clearly and effectively, but in which they stand rather closer to a "complete

⁶Another apparent victim of publisher's nervousness was Richard Parks, whose *18th Century Counterpoint and Tonal Structure* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1984) might be said to update Salzer and Schachter's classic *Counterpoint in Composition* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969).

⁷Rothstein, "Americanization," 203.

surrender to the status quo” than to an uncompromised curriculum. The audience is upper-level undergraduates (or master’s students) with four semesters of harmony training, though their comments seem to suggest that counterpoint as well as form and analysis are also prerequisite (vi). And they say the book can provide the framework for a course of one or two semesters (v). (As with all similar texts, the wisdom of the one-semester option is questionable.) Like Forte and Gilbert (but also following, if only in part, Rothstein’s advice for insinuation of Schenker into musicians’ practice), Cadwallader and Gagné begin with the foreground and follow a pedagogical path that leads to Schenkerian-based analysis of traditional formal types. In an article published before the book appeared, Gagné offers an outline for an upper-level undergraduate or graduate course. As he explains in a footnote, this outline is the framework of the book under review here:

- A. Melody and Polyphony.
- B. Bass Line and Harmonic Structure.
- C. Linear Techniques.
- D. Phrase Structure.
- E. Smaller Forms.
- F. Larger Forms.⁸

Here again one might sense the heavy hand of marketing requirements. In a book the authors proclaim to be “an introduction to Schenker’s work” (v), it makes little sense to order topics according to form schemata: *Free Composition*, after all, is organized by the contents of the structural levels, moving progressively from background to foreground.⁹ But in fact the

⁸David Gagné, “The Place of Schenkerian Analysis in Undergraduate and Graduate Curricula,” *Indiana Theory Review* 15/1 (1994): 30.

⁹Just to make sure that all the cards are on the table, the first co-reviewer acknowledges that the same fault attaches to a Schenker textbook of his (David Neumeyer and Susan Tepping, *A Guide to Schenkerian Analysis* [Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1992]). This book, mangled as it was by a lack of copy-editing attention from the publisher, also attempts to overcome the gap between Schenkerian pedagogy and form-and-analysis, but in quite a different

design is fully justified by the pedagogy: as the authors explain, their intention is to move progressively from small dimensions to large, or from phrases to complete movements (vi).

* * *

Some idea of the strengths and weaknesses of the book may be gleaned from the very first subject for analysis, the first movement of Beethoven's Sonata op. 2, no. 1; discussion of this makes up the bulk of the short first chapter. As in many later analyses, the observations about motivic aspects of the music are often welcome and revealing: the descending sixth-line at the climax of the first phrase, for example, is seen to recur in a variety of musical contexts and spanning a variety of time intervals in the remainder of the movement. At the same time, however, some elements of this discussion might seem puzzling or arbitrary to a neophyte Schenkerian. The authors suggest that the falling-sixth motive necessitates the dominant harmony with which the second theme begins, because "a sustained tonic will not support the literal repetition of C falling to E [natural]" found in the second theme in the recapitulation (10). On the previous page, however (their Example 1.4), an abbreviated version of the motive, spanning only the fifth from C to F, is postulated to have some relation to the original; why, the observant student rightly wonders, should the "fifth" motive be an acceptable variant in one context but not in another?

A more serious objection to this preliminary example might be that, for all the emphasis on motivic parallelism, there is no discussion of anything like prolongation or structural levels; as a first exposure to the Schenkerian approach, therefore, this analysis

way: it uses a "generative" approach, working from the background but tempering initial difficulties by limiting the early chapters to analysis of the bass and softening the threatening abstractions by a tight connection between background figures and patterns of formal design. We feel that the validity of a generative approach has since been corroborated by Schenker's interchange with Felix-Eberhard von Cube, as reported in William Drabkin, "Schenker, the Consonant Passing Note, and the First-movement Theme of Beethoven's Sonata Op. 26," *Music Analysis* 15/2-3 (1996): 149-189.

is potentially misleading. It is also, as it turns out, a harbinger of things to come. Prolongation and structural levels are touched upon only briefly in chapter 2 in melodic contexts. Harmonic prolongation is treated more fully in chapter 3; there is no extensive discussion of structural levels until chapter 5. The notion that each level, reading (as the authors generally do) from foreground to background, is a subset of the preceding is implicit throughout, but rarely explicit. Multi-level graphs in proper vertical alignment are discouragingly rare until late in the book, even when space is not an issue (as in their Examples 4.5, a–c [82]).

These comments notwithstanding, writing style, graphing technique, and production standards of the book are generally laudable for their clarity and straightforwardness. The discussions are easy to follow, if occasionally a bit long-winded. The authors clearly project their reverence for the subject—some might occasionally wish for a little less!—and are not afraid to describe the music they are discussing with words like “beautiful” or “poignant.” The graphs are easy to read, both visually (noteheads are admirably large and clear) and conceptually. Typographical errors are few, and mostly harmless.

On the other hand, the handling of footnotes and references is less than satisfactory in several ways. First, the notes are collected at the end of the book, where few students are likely to consult them. This out-of-the-way location is especially unfortunate because many of the notes make significant points not covered in the main text. Note 15 of chapter 4, for instance, explains that the first and last notes of a linear progression are generally consonant with either the beginning or the ending harmony of the passage. Several important points about normalization of register are relegated to note 13 in chapter 7. The four-page bibliography that follows the notes is divided into five sections, which is not a bad idea in principle but makes locating a specific reference difficult, especially since some authors are inevitably represented in several of the sections.

There are also occasional lapses of logic or continuity, some with possibly serious pedagogical consequences. Hooked tonic-to-dominant slurs, unfolding symbols, motivic brackets, and

diagonal lines indicating displacements all make appearances in graphs well before they are presented and explained in the text; the use of the unfolding symbol, in fact, is *never* actually explained (although there is a nice conceptual discussion of unfolding as a prolongational technique in chapter 6). Many graphs show apparent parallel fifths (*e.g.*, Example 2.7) or octaves (Example 6.2b), presented with no apparent qualms about contrapuntal propriety—this despite a *précis* of species counterpoint in chapter 2. Certainly students (and instructors!) can expect an explanation of the circumstances under which parallels may appear in graphs.

Interruption structures are graphed in several quite different ways: compare, for instance, their Examples 7.8, 9.15d–f, and 12.13. In the first of these, a schematic representation of an interrupted line from $\hat{5}$, each “branch” is beamed separately in bass and soprano; all noteheads are stemmed and open. In Example 9.15d–f, also schematic representations, in this case for interruptions as laid out in rounded binary forms, the soprano beams of the first branch have developed wings at the end, stretching out beyond the last stem, and in the bass the note expressing an extension of V into the B-section is included in the beam for the first branch. Finally, Examples 12.13a–b, still another schematic (now for the special circumstances of the minor key), reproduce *Free Composition*, Figures 26a–b, with their single beam covering the entire soprano and a single beam in the bass for the first branch and the final bass pitch (the other two bass tones are attached to the latter via a subsidiary beam).

Note 13 in chapter 2 justifies describing the neighbor notes in a four-note double-neighbor figure as *complete* neighbor notes on the grounds that they become complete if an imaginary central fifth note is added; the conclusion may be valid, but the reasoning is clearly specious, since *any* incomplete neighbor note can be made complete by the addition of an extra note—and anyhow, just a few pages later, in Example 3.1, an inner-voice double-neighbor figure is labeled “IN.” Note 16 in chapter 6 makes a nice point by way of explaining why two pitches in Example 6.15c should not have stems; unfortunately, in the

actual graph the notes in question *do* have stems. The first example given of the phenomenon of “reaching-over” is the C in the first measure of the second movement of Beethoven’s Sonata op. 10, no. 1 (Example 6.14b), but when the same passage is graphed again in Example 7.14a, the same pitch is interpreted differently. An occasional explanation reads like a tautology, as in this extract from page 132: “Frequently the melody will move from an established top-voice tone into an inner voice through a linear progression, a technique that is referred to as *motion into an inner voice*.” (This definition is all the more disconcerting for being almost an exact restatement of the explanation on page 114.)

Example 1. Ternary-form middlegrounds.
 (a) Cadwallader and Gagné’s Example 10.26d;
 (b) Cadwallader and Gagné’s Example 10.26e.

(a)

Diagram (a) illustrates a ternary-form middleground. The notation shows a sequence of notes in the treble and bass staves, with pitch classes indicated by numbers above the notes. The sequence is labeled A¹, B, and A². The notes are connected by lines, indicating a linear progression. The notation includes a double bar line and a repeat sign.

(b)

Diagram (b) illustrates a ternary-form middleground. The notation shows a sequence of notes in the treble and bass staves, with pitch classes indicated by numbers above the notes. The sequence is labeled A¹, B, and A². The notes are connected by lines, indicating a linear progression. The notation includes a double bar line and a repeat sign.

Similarly, Examples 10.26d–e, reproduced here as Example 1a–b, are potentially confusing in several ways. The intended distinction between these two representations of characteristic middleground patterns for ternary forms is that the first A section closes in the dominant in Example 1a (their 10.26d), but in the tonic in Example 1b (their 10.26e). The added note G \sharp and diagonal arrow in Example 1b, however, suggest an entirely different origin for the F in this graph. The issue of what is or is not acceptable as the genesis of a “seventh” in a case such as this is not addressed here or elsewhere, except briefly in a footnote (note 9 in chapter 7). To make matters worse, the positioning of the label “(=n.n.)” near the $\hat{2}$ could mislead students into assuming that the D is interpreted as a neighbor note to the E—a reading quite at odds with the interrupted 3-line that is intended. Finally, this notation for a neighbor note differs from the single capital letter N used more frequently (including two graphs on the opposite page). This discrepancy is apparently deliberate, but is not explained until a footnote in a later chapter (note 17 in chapter 12).

The last subject for analysis in chapter 10 is Haydn, Sonata in D Major, Hob. XVI:37, third movement. Cadwallader and Gagné’s reading of this rondo is spread across several graphs: an early middleground graph (a “structural synopsis”) of the entire movement (Example 10.25—see Example 3), along with more detailed middleground graphs showing the opening sections A and B (Example 10.22), section C (Example 10.23), and the final modified return of A (Example 10.24—see Example 2). The discussion below will concentrate on the deepest levels of structure as reflected in Example 10.25, referring to the previous graphs only as necessary.

Section A in itself is seen as an interrupted 5-line. This structure is detailed in Example 10.22 and summarized in the first segment of Example 10.25 (see Example 3), where, however, the interrupted line is clearly subordinated to the prolongation of the pitch A \sharp that extends through most of the piece. The same configuration may be assumed to occur at the central reprise of section A (mm. 41–60), here labeled A 2 and represented by a

Example 2. Structure of the final modified return in the third movement of Haydn, Sonata in D Major, Hob. XVI:37 (from Cadwallader and Gagné's Example 10.24).

94 111 122

I IV V₄₋₅ I

122 111 94

I IV V₄₋₅ I

Example 3. Structure of Haydn, Sonata in D Major, Hob. XVI:37, third movement (from Cadwallader and Gagné's Example 10.25).

13 21 41 61 94 122

A¹ B A² C A³

I I' I IV I V I

tonic triad with inner voices D5 and F#5. In the final reprise (A³), Haydn writes out the internal repeats with an elaborated accompaniment, and it is in this section that the true descent of the fundamental line occurs (see Example 2 and the final segment of Example 3); that is, the structure of section A³ becomes the governing structure of the entire movement.

Or does it? Except for the more active accompaniment, A³ is identical with A¹; surely its internal structure should be the same. The interruption identified at m. 12 recurs just as surely in m. 113 (and again, in the final repetition, at m. 125). But no interruption is shown in section A³ in either of our examples; the re-establishment of $\hat{5}$ in m. 114 is not noted, and in the latter graph the notes of the interruption's first branch are not even shown. Rather, Example 2 should show an interruption structure identical to Example 10.22, and this interrupted 5-line—not a simple descending 5-line—should in fact govern the tonal structure of the movement. (Judging from the measure numbers in our Examples 2 and 3, Cadwallader and Gagné apparently worked from an edition in which mm. 110–121 are shown within repeat signs, so that the movement ends at m. 122 [=134]. The implications of these formal repetitions on the structure will be ignored here.)

A lesser objection may be raised concerning the bass line shown in section A¹ in Example 3. No connection is shown between D in m. 1 and D in m. 13, unless one can somehow be inferred from the interruption symbol above the treble staff. Moreover, the bass notes A–D in mm. 19–20 are absent from Example 3; these are the deepest-level tonic and dominant in section A¹, and their omission seems unjustified. (A notational purist would go further and claim that since all notes of both branches of the interruption are shown in the upper voice, all the supporting notes should likewise be shown in the bass.) Resolving these issues presents an opportunity to use subordinate beams to great advantage; in fact, the many interruption structures on various levels in this movement offer several such opportunities.

Section B is also an interruption form, this time read from $\hat{3}$ in D minor. Its bass line, as shown in Example 3, could be judged

incomplete for the same reasons as noted above in conjunction with section A¹. The connection between sections A¹ and B also deserves our attention. As the authors explain in their text, the fundamental line of section B is actually an inner voice of the larger structure, going through a pattern of mixture ($\hat{3}-\flat\hat{3}-\hat{3}$) under an implied prolongation of $\hat{5}$; in Example 3, this figure is completely lost, its only (faint) echo sounding in the dashed slur from F \sharp (m. 19) to F \flat (m. 21). It is interesting to note that the slur over the descending fifth-line had to be moved beneath the noteheads in order to avoid a collision—the notion of mixture in an inner voice would have been better served by reversing these, keeping the fifth-line's slur where it belongs and placing the dotted slur below the noteheads. The actual F \sharp and F \flat in the score are not even in the same register, but, nevertheless, the slur in question is a meaningful one. It shows, first of all, that F \flat arises by chromatic alteration of the third scale degree. In addition, it may be intended to show a motivic relationship: the close affinity between the descending arpeggiation of a D-major triad in m. 19 of the score and that of a D-minor triad in mm. 20–22, which undoubtedly creates a strong perceptual continuity between sections A¹ and B.

We are left with the second episode, section C, in the subdominant. Here the head note of the fundamental line of the section, B5, arises as an upper neighbor to the prolonged $\hat{5}$. A striking characteristic of Cadwallader and Gagné's detailed graph of this section (their Example 10.23) is the abundance of interruption figures, all notated in such a way that it is very difficult to sort out the different structural levels at which they operate. Some of these figures disappear at the deeper levels—only one is shown in Example 10.25—but how exactly they are related is not completely clear, especially since neither of two adjacent interruptions (mm. 72 and 76) shows a complete descent to G ($\hat{1}$).

What is decidedly more bothersome is the authors' decision to omit the transition (mm. 81–93) from section B to A³ (Example 3). Instead, a direct connection is shown from G to the return of D at m. 94. This is, in fact, the only connection indicated

Example 4. Revised graph of Haydn, Sonata in D Major, Hob. XVI:37, third movement

The image displays a musical score for the third movement of Haydn's Sonata in D Major, Hob. XVI:37. The score is written for piano, with a treble and bass clef. The key signature is D major (two sharps). The music is in 3/4 time. The score is divided into two systems. The first system contains measures 1 through 8, and the second system contains measures 9 through 16. Above the staff, harmonic analysis is provided for each measure. The analysis is as follows:

Measure	Harmonic Analysis
1	A ¹
2	ŝ
3	B
4	A ² =A ¹
5	C
6	ŝ
7	A ³
8	ŝ 4 3 2 1
9	ŝ 4 3 2 1
10	ŝ 4 3 2 1
11	ŝ 4 3 2 1
12	ŝ 4 3 2 1
13	ŝ 4 3 2 1
14	ŝ 4 3 2 1
15	ŝ 4 3 2 1
16	ŝ 4 3 2 1

The analysis uses the following symbols: A¹, A², A³ for triads; B, C for dyads; ŝ for a single note; and 4, 3, 2, 1 for a four-note chord. The notes are indicated by a sharp sign (#) for D and a natural sign (n) for A.

between this G and the larger structure of the movement. In any event, though, G is the subdominant, D the tonic, and the excised measures unequivocally state the dominant—in Example 10.23, the dominant is shown *within* the subdominant-to-tonic slur. A large-scale I–IV–V–I progression, subsuming all of section C, is surely the more musically convincing interpretation here.

Our Example 4 rewrites Cadwallader and Gagné's Example 10.25 along the lines of the critique above. Apart from some minor differences of notational style, the primary changes are clearer representation of the interruption figures and the bass arpeggiations; the mixture in section A¹, B, and A²; elevation of the dominant in m. 87 to middleground status; and inclusion of the interruption figure in section A³.

* * *

To close, we return to Rothstein's insight that Schenkerism in America may be stuck on a fundamental contradiction between fixed ideological principles and the compromises needed for more general acceptance. Perhaps we should call this "Rothstein's paradox"—trapped in it, no textbook can be successful. Cadwallader and Gagné have produced a perfectly usable volume based on a reasonable syllabus for an introduction to Schenkerian analysis, a syllabus no doubt based on considerable classroom experience. But neither they nor any of the rest of us who have written Schenker textbooks or proposed Schenkerian teaching programs have come close to finding the right curricular voice for the method, to resolving Rothstein's paradox.

It may simply be that the venture is hopeless, that the contradiction really expresses an exceedingly poor fit between Schenkerian ideology and the needs of a training curriculum for musicians. The fascination about Schenkerian theory is its connection to—and ideological co-opting of—certain Austro-German traditions of counterpoint, voice leading, and harmony. The theory extends, in a sophisticated and subtle way, these historical traditions and so would seem to find a convincing place

in upper-level undergraduate course lists.¹⁰ But the more concrete its applications, the more pedagogically useful Schenkerian interpretation becomes; that is, its real force, its deepest appeal, coincides neatly with Rothstein's proposal that it would be sufficient if "most students and non-theorists generally are taught only how to interpret the foreground."

Such a move doesn't resolve the paradox, however: it only conceals it. Although it is undoubtedly true that "backgrounds and even middlegrounds are not for everybody," they are for *somebody*; and, so long as the *Ursatz*—the heart and soul of Schenker's ideology—remains, the specter of compromise will hover over every practitioner and pedagogue. The only solution is to reject the assumptions that gave rise to the paradox in the first place: either abandon the *Ursatz* or abandon the notion that Schenker's method constitutes a theory. Or, to restate these two options in positive terms: either accept complexity and potential multiplicities in hierarchical design or accept that Schenker's first priority was cultural ideology.

We might, for example, maintain the idea of hierarchical structure but allow that higher levels may prioritize larger metric and rhythmic, affective, and stylistic features over pitch connections. The *Ursatz* is not a fact of nature but a cultural construct. Tonal space (as derived from the harmonic series) is a fact of nature (at least in the major mode); what we do with that space is culturally determined. Another option might be to retain the system of Schenkerian analysis whole but "demote" it to the status of voice leading in a more complicated hermeneutic project:

The position of the large-scale 'will' of tonal completion is not...such a privileged one that it has the power fully to 'contain' the imaginative hearing of 'gesture' or 'voice' in the melody. The relationship of tonal structure to gestural features is not one of containment, but of suggesting a context.... A completion of linear processes...does not constitute a full synthesis of the experience of [a]

¹⁰Gagné makes a similar statement in "The Place of Schenkerian Analysis," 33.

phrase. A fully characterised 'persona' requires that there also be an ordering in memory of the experiences of other dimensions, including those of affect.¹¹

Thus the late Naomi Cumming, in her celebrated essay on the introduction to an aria from the St. Matthew Passion.

On the other hand, we might decide that, rather than trying to ignore, suppress, or hide driving cultural ideologies, we should openly celebrate Schenkerism as ideological, not scientific, as interpretive practice, not theory. Seen through the prism of current debate in fields like literature or cinema studies, Schenkerian theory is not theory at all; it is the clothing draped about an interpretive (analytical) practice.¹² This is (more or less—and to a decidedly different ideological purpose than we shall put it) what Eugene Narmour said twenty years ago. Music historians' denigrating comments about "Schenker charts" assume a formalist or positivist bent that has little if anything to do with Schenkerian practice (though it did briefly figure in Schenkerian research in the 1970's).¹³ It is ironic—but to the point here—that the one adaptation of Schenker which can claim some grounding in scientific models, Lerdahl and Jackendoff's prolongational

¹¹Naomi Cumming, "The Subjectivities of 'Erbarne Dich'," *Music Analysis* 16/1 (1997): 5–44. The citation is from page 34. To their credit, Cadwallader and Gagné do acknowledge that a graph "primarily depicts the harmonic/contrapuntal structure of a composition, but such an analysis is not intended to be complete," yet they promptly retreat into an outdated formalist simile which undermines the promise of their first statement: "Higher levels of structure may not be immediately perceptible; like deeper structures in language and literature, they serve rather to guide and shape the music as heard." (vii) To their credit again, a sensitive reading of a Schubert song ("Wandrer's Nachtlied," 207–214) shows real potential for development in the direction charted by Cumming.

¹²Cadwallader and Gagné offer a brief, unsatisfactory discussion of the relation between theory and analysis at the beginning (361–362) of their misnamed chapter 12 ("A Theoretical View of Tonal Structure"), which is really a hodgepodge of (mostly) middleground topics that did not find a place in earlier chapters.

¹³This is by no means to imply that Schenkerians can escape the accusation of formalism entirely: indeed, a paradox more fundamental than Rothstein's is that which juxtaposes Schenker's rejection of scientific models against the pseudo-objective formalisms of his analytic method.

reduction, has achieved no success at all, to judge from adoption of its methods in the literature (outside of Lerdahl himself). The first co-reviewer taught Lerdahl and Jackendoff's method to graduate students over a period of several years: the care of its grounding and the logic of its method are matched only by its aridity as an interpretive practice.

When the "theory" is presented as a mode of interpretation based on a (surprisingly) small set of assumptions, students will be able better to grasp intellectual contexts and make the informed decisions we expect of upper-level undergraduates or master's students. They will, for example, be able to tackle questions about the status of Schenkerian analysis as a reflection of cognition: on appearances, it is an extraordinarily difficult mode of hearing, simultaneously very demanding and very fussy, whose cognitive underpinnings are questionable at best (or at least almost wholly unproven). Or these students could address questions about the method's use as a way of preparing performances (Schenker's own ideal, apparently), which is almost universally ignored—one may speak all one likes of Murray Perahia, but doing so only uncovers the unspoken (and absurd) suggestion that Pavarotti, Salonen, etc., are not "really" musicians. Or they could consider ways to meet the needs of twentieth-century (and shortly twenty-first-century) musicians for competent interpretive tools for *all* the tonal musics of the century: Delius and Reger, Pfitzner and Weill, Ravel and Korngold, Milhaud and Waxman, Gershwin and (Paul) Simon, Stravinsky and Glass.

Schenkerians, however, have tried to position themselves, especially in the past decade, in a way that ignores rational criticism, in order to protect the strongly held belief that they have happened on a mode of interpretation that is fundamentally correct: a "musical" mode of interpretation of music that could be said to be parallel to a "literary" mode of interpretation of literature, the unchallenged, unchallengeable deep mode of "reading" literature that goes back to the historical foundations of the humanities, and which some assume is more fundamental to the humanities (because it is reading) than either philosophy or history. Challengers like Narmour and Lerdahl and Jackendoff

have been caught in the no-man's-land between the sciences and the humanities, as they try to gain control of modes of interpretation while relying on the methods of the cognitive sciences. Among an array of alternatives available now, the best come from David Lewin and some of his followers, especially Henry Klumpenhouwer, Brian Hyer, and Richard Cohn. Lewin's readings of Debussy and Wagner are already striking, but his mode of analytical criticism as well as neo-Riemannian tonal theory are rapidly developing to the point that listener/analysts can engage interpretation of large-scale tonal works efficiently (the imagination and artistic intuition are already there). Thus, the limited Schenkerian mode of analysis may become as outdated as the earliest forms of classical pitch-class set theory. Already some of the conceptual underpinnings of a curriculum are emerging.¹⁴

In the meantime, Rothstein's paradox stands, and the curricular conundrum posed by Schenkerian analysis continues.

¹⁴Richard Cohn, "Music Theory's New Pedagogability," *Music Theory Online* 4/2 (1998).