Music in the Mirror: Reflections on the History of Music Theory and Literature for the Twenty-First Century, Edited by Andreas Giger and Thomas J. Mathiesen. Publications of the Center for the History of Music Theory and Literature Series, Volume 3. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002.

Review by Norman Carey

In some respects, music theory is among the oldest of disciplines, with roots that run back into antiquities. In the United States, music theory is arguably a very new field that has successfully struggled within the last half century to define itself as distinct from the fields of musicology and composition. Not surprisingly, the turn of the millennium prompted a number of American music theorists to reflect and to look forward: this very journal's 2000/2001 double issue (*Intégral* 14/15) featured the special theme, "Music Theory at the Turn of the Millennium." Millennial music theory finds a prominent voice in Kevin Korsyn's self-conscious *Decentering Music* (2003). Of all the volumes published in the field within the last fifty years, Korsyn's is the first whose topic is a critical view of the discipline of scholarly music theory itself. The discipline's self awareness has asserted itself in a variety of other forms as well. The Sibley Library at the Eastman School of Music now houses the archives of the Music Theory Society of New York State, allowing scholars access to historical information about the creation and propagation of the nation's first scholarly society of music theorists.

The volume we consider here also had its origins at a time when these reflective influences held sway. In 2000, the inauguration of the Center for the History of Music Theory and Literature (under the directorship of founder Thomas J. Mathiesen) prompted scholars at Indiana University to organize a conference entitled, *Music in the Mirror*. The papers presented are collected here and published in a fine edition put out by the University of Nebraska Press. In the current publishing environment, it is no small accomplishment getting conference papers published. The

University of Nebraska Press is to be commended for taking on this project.

The collection carries the subtitle, "Reflections on the History of Music Theory and Literature for the Twenty-First Century." Whereas quite a few authors realized that the occasion presented an opportunity to view their subjects with a wide lens, others kept the focus narrowed to that of the standard journal article. The apparent disunity of purposes and perspectives is offset by the overall high caliber of the contributions.

Dust jacket material tells us that in this volume, "thirteen distinguished scholars explore the concept of music, music theory, and music literature as mirror images of one another – whether real or distorted." With a nod to the *Speculum Musicae* of Jacob of Liège, the topic of mirroring or reflecting is deliberately invoked by many, if not all, of the contributing authors. A predictable device, it nevertheless helps to stand in for a unifying thread in a grouping whose topics range from *Musica Enchiriadis* to *Psycho*. The individual offerings in the collection will likely appeal to different readers according to their particular interests. It seems best, then, to provide at least some discussion for each of the thirteen articles: greater emphasis on one or another of them testifies, needless to say, only to the reviewer's interests and limitations. I also intend for this essay to provide a field in which the various articles might enter into dialog with one another.

§1

Thomas Christensen's essay, "Music theory in Cleo's mirror,"[1] serves to frame the collection overall. It is a version of the introductory chapter to Christensen's monumental *Cambridge History of Western Music Theory* (2002). With a nod to Carl Dahlhaus, Christensen problematizes the conception of a discrete history of music theory. He takes the reader on a tour through the variegated landscape of historical terms that, in one way or another, have served as antecedents or cognates for our modern term, "music theory." We are heirs to the entirety of this history, from Pythagoras to the present. In view of the series of notions that even,

[1] Giger and Mathiesen 2002, 1-20.

at times, contradict one another, Christensen reasonably concludes with the advice that "...we abandon any fixed definition of theory and allow instead for a flexible network of meanings" (16). Christensen's introductory essay re-focuses his thoughts regarding the problematics surrounding histories of music theory he also explored in 1993 and 2000. It also accomplishes the task of introducing and outlining a number of issues that other contributors raise, making for an ideal first chapter.

§2

In "'*Adhuc ex parte et in enigmate cernimus...*' Reflections on the closing chapters of *Musica Enchiriadis*,"[2] Calvin M. Bower writes, "I have come to view language about music as an epistemological enigma, and thus the present reflections emerge from an epistemology rooted in skepticism..." (21). He amplifies, "The basic problem posed by the passage is that of *knowing* music: what, and to what degree, can we *know* concerning this art?" (21). In order to explore these fundamental questions, Bower offers his own translation of a passage from the *Enchiriadis* treatise alongside those of Raymond Erikson (1995) and Jacques Handschin (1927). (Handschin's translation only covers part of the passage.) Here is Bower's translation of a key segment:

> Inasmuch as we can judge whether a melody is properly formed, we can discern the qualities of sounds and of modes and other matters of this art; likewise we can reduce the intervals of musical sounds or the consonances of pitches to a ratio of numbers, and we can reproduce these same ratios for consonance and dissonance. Yet how music maintains with our souls such a communion and union – even if we do know that we are joined with music through a certain likeness – we are not capable of explaining clearly (32).

The relationship between sound and affect has been debated throughout the history of Western music theory. In the formulation of the problem given above, it appears thus: granted that we have a way of associating consonances with whole number ratios, how does this explain the effect that music has upon us? The

---

[2] *Ibid.*, 21-44

nature of consonance and dissonance is often linked to this problem, as, for example, may be seen in Helmholtz's work. Helmholtz's aim was strongly tied to this very problem, but now restated in terms of overtones and beats. Bower goes on to suggest that the Pythagorean/Boethian rationalist tradition is being challenged in the passage in favor of a more mystical stance that he dubs "Pauline Platonism." According to Bower, the author of the treatise (a Carolingian monk) is telling us that "one learns music by hearing and singing it, not by knowing ratios and proportions, not by computing species of consonances to define modes, not by reckoning a pitch collection on a monochord" (35). Stated as such, the passage may provide a principled foundation for current performance/analysis studies: analysis that is uninformed by the sound and kinesthetics of performance keeps us "at arm's length" from musical reality. In this thoughtful exegesis, Bower answers the call for a broad overview of theoretic and philosophic issues and dares us to ask the fundamental question of music theory, what can it mean to say "I know" in connection to music? As Christensen asks, what kind of knowledge is music theory? So Bower asks, what are the limits on that knowledge? The question of limits, perhaps not surprisingly, is the substance of many of the remaining contributions, as we will see.

§3

Margaret Bent is the author of a great body of work on polyphonic music. Her article in this collection, "Sense and rhetoric in late-medieval polyphony,"[3] is a continuation of previous work concerned with establishing guidelines for the analysis of early music. Bent argues persuasively that we revise our infatuation with "authenticity" and to shift our concern from sound to sense. Musicians and scholars have been overly concerned with reproducing the sound world of older music, and yet the great number of contrapuntal treatises of the period that invoke analogies of grammar and rhetoric suggests that there exists an authenticity of substance, of meaning, that is more revealing and more compelling than the authenticity of style. Bent's paper seems to offer a useful

[3] Giger and Mathiesen 2002, 45-60.

counterbalance to John Walker Hill's "cognate music theory." (See §6, below.)

§4

Anthony Newcomb's "Marenzio and the '*Nuova Aria E Grata All'Orecchie*'"[4] explores the possibility that a form of "proto-tonality" was emergent in some late sixteenth century Italian madrigals, those of Luca Marenzio in particular. The texts of many of Newcomb's examples are sentimentally pastoral and light in tone. Newcomb concludes that, despite surface similarities, tonality per se is not actively asserting itself yet, and that the similarities are no more than coincidental. Although the forecasting of tonality might suggest appearances by both major and minor systems, the examples given indicate major mode only. It may be the case that text-setting issues have skewed the modality towards "proto-major" pieces, however, the very lack of counterexamples is itself worthy of attention. A clear hallmark of the arrival of "tonality" is the emergence of an uneasy equilibrium between major and minor keys. The lack of "proto-minor" pieces in these late-Renaissance works makes Newcomb's claim all the more convincing, however, it would be interesting to know whether his own research bears this point out. The article also serves as a warning that it is all too easy to filter all musical experience through what is familiar.

§5

Tim Carter's article, "The composer as theorist? Genus and genre in Monteverdi's *Combattimento di Tancredi e Clorinda*,"[5] is meant to be a companion piece to another (as yet unpublished), "In search of the text of Monteverdi's *Combattimento di Tancredi e Clorinda*." In this second article, Carter's aim is to show that published versions of the work actually "reflect different redactions of the piece, with the full-score being somewhat removed from the composer (77)." (Philip Gossett [§9, below] discusses the difficult issues that pertain to works with multiple versions.) Carter carefully

[4] Giger and Mathiesen 2002, 61-76.

[5] *Ibid.*, 77-116.

parses Monteverdi's discussion of the *Combattimento* and suggests a "forensic approach" (82) for solving a host of diverse questions relating to this unusual work, including its celebrated use of *stile concitato* as well as that of resolving its genre.

§6

John Walter Hill writes of the need for a "Cognate music theory," which phrase serves as the title of his contribution (117-194). Chasing the chimera of the historically accurate listening experience, Hill frames his goal as "...learning to experience music of the past—to follow its course as an expert listener—in terms that would have seemed comprehensible and significant to the best qualified of the participants in its creation: its most competent composers, performers, theorists, critics, patrons, and listeners" (117). The unqualified optimism implied here—and Hill's cognate theory project which flows from it—reminds me of the character Pierre Menard, in Jorge Luis Borges's (1962) short story. Menard, a surrealist, becomes obsessed with the idea of writing the novel *Don Quixote*—despite that it had already been written some three hundred years earlier. He strives to overcome the difficulty:

> The initial method he conceived was relatively simple: to know Spanish well, to re-embrace the Catholic faith, to fight against the Moors and Turks, to forget European history between 1602 and 1918, and to be Miguel de Cervantes. Pierre Menard studied this procedure ... but rejected it as too easy. Rather because it was impossible, the reader will say! I agree, but the undertaking was impossible from the start, and of all the possible means of carrying it out, this one was the least interesting.[6]

To Hill, the central point of musical studies is their role in enhancing the act of listening: "I would note that the ethnographer uses experience for the sake of understanding, whereas the musicologist uses understanding for the sake of experience." Hill may have been drawn by the rhetorical symmetry into an overstatement of his own position. Nevertheless, the point is axiomatic in Hill's methodology. Thus, his cognate theory would

---

[6] Borges 1962, 2.

aim to educate us as listeners. Hill is concerned that when we experience the music of the past, our listening is filled with anachronizing filters. (Tim Carter's article above spells out a case in point.) That would seem to suggest that he would prefer us to be guided only by the musical scholars of the period, but that approach has its pitfalls as well: "They do not tell us what we want to know; they cannot be used by themselves as the basis for a satisfactory experience or analysis" (118). Neither will the work of later musical scholars serve, because, as we have seen, their models are apt to be contaminated by musical idioms indigenous to their own times.

> To extrapolate from past writings while remaining faithful to their spirit and perspective, I need a "cognate music theory," which shares its fundamental basis, assumptions, and vocabulary with the theory of the period and which would thus be comprehensible to the musical participants of the past, but which answers to modern requirements for degrees of thoroughness, consistency, and precision that are generally not found in the theory of the period when viewed from the modern perspective (122).

Wye J. Allanbrook also expresses qualms regarding both modern and period theorists in her article (§9, below). Both authors advocate solutions in the form of an amalgam. In this case, Hill invokes the (originally ethnographic) terms "emic" and "etic" to mean, roughly, insider perspective and outsider perspective, respectively. His cognate theory would combine both. In the central part of the paper he outlines two types of cognate music theories: one that has developed in a fairly unbroken manner from original sources, the other (of more recent vintage) that is modern in outlook while making some use of appropriate sources. He critically examines six contemporary cognate theories taken from both types. Eva Linfield is taken to task in some analyses of Schütz for adopting a method of chordal analysis that Hill believes is more appropriate to later music. Part of the difficulty, we are told, is that there are significantly different tonal practices at work in the music of (for example) Schütz, Corelli, Haydn, and Brahms. He recommends Geminiani's figured bass treatise as a better original source, despite that fact that it too is only anachronistically applicable to Schütz. Hill does not explain how Geminiani's

encyclopedic classification scheme of figured bass modules might be adapted for the purpose. Hill surveys a number of other prospective cognate theories that deal with sonata form, modal theory, etc. By way of conclusion, Hill assures us that cognate music theories "... will benefit from a conscious recognition of the need to mediate between the mind-set and perspective of the insiders who created the music of the past and our needs as outsiders who seek to experience with understanding" (142). Bent's article (§3, above) would seem to offer another model. Rather than grafting on modern concerns onto an older theoretical bole, Bent suggests that—at least in the case of the literature in question—the old theory might be completely adequate by itself when the foliage is cleared away.

§7

Don Harrán[7] provides some insight into the *Estro poetico-armonico*, Marcello's eight volume collection of psalms that attempts to reconstruct ancient Hebrew music. Harrán lauds Marcello's work for its striking originality on at least four fronts: historical, stylistic, ethnographical, and compositional. Marcello provides exegeses for his own compositional practice in the prefaces to the various volumes of the *Estro*. Harrán points out that before Marcello's reconstruction of Hebraic musical principles, neoclassicism was exclusively associated with ancient Greek music. Further, Marcello is revealed as an ethnomusicological pioneer who is responsible for one of the earliest forays into musicological fieldwork with his transcriptions of authentic Hebrew melodies that he heard sung in Venetian synagogues.

§8

In "Theorizing the comic surface,"[8] Wye J. Allanbrook argues that a conflict exists between "surface" and "deep" analytical

---

[7] "The Hebrew exemplum as a force of renewal in 18th-Century musical thought: The case of Benedetto Marcello and his collection of Psalms," in Giger and Mathiesen 2002, 143-194.

[8] Giger and Mathiesen 2002, 195-216.

approaches. Allanbrook is passionate in her defense of surface analysis, even to the point of overreaching. She writes: "Should one really be disturbed to think that music could contain surfaces?" (195). I don't believe anyone *should* be so disturbed, but I'm not quite sure who is. Whereas it is true that analytical methods such as Schenker's—and Lehrdahl and Jackendoff's, for that matter—have "deep" aspects, it is not true that these are designed to *negate* the surface or even to dismiss it, but rather to explain it. It seems clear by now that reducing away a complex musical surface in order to unconceal "Three Blind Mice" one more time is simply not the point. Furthermore, the contemporary analytical approach that Professor Allanbrook adopts, a kind of topical or semiotic one, is not in need of the vigorous defense she gives it, in light of the rather vast and substantial recent work in this area. (Thus, Lewis Rowell in his essay (§13) remarks, "The enormous success of the discipline of musical semiotics, along with the trend away from structuralism and formalism, has already had an enormous impact upon analysis and criticism in their refocus upon meaning, representation, and content" [309].) However, Allanbrook feels that "surface" analysis still plays second fiddle and deserves another audition.

According to Allanbrook, "surface" analysis has gotten the bum rap of superficiality. She explains that the word "superficial" derives from the Latin, *superficies*, a term with "no pejorative significance" (195). Coincidentally, it is also the very first word of the excerpt from *Musica Enchiriadis* that Bower examines (§2, above), where he shows it to be a term heavy with implication. Bower tells us that, while the word will be used to mean "surface" or "area" in a geometrical sense, "the word takes on neo-Platonic philosophical connotations if read ... [following John Scotus Eriugena as a] sensual manifestation of a deeper, higher reality..." (36). Polar opposites have that unpleasant tendency to transform into each other.

The article focuses on Classical era piano sonata movements, but never quite fulfills the promise of its title. As far as "theorizing" is concerned, it is unclear what Allanbrook means. She warns, "[O]ne could argue that the need for something called 'theory' only arises when one has some reason to distrust or condemn the surface" (201). This is apparently not the case here. Theorists of the

period—Allanbrook cites Kirnberger, Mattheson, Riepel, and Koch—did not so condemn the surface, as they were concerned, says Allanbrook, only in providing practical advice for composers: "They did not feel the need for a cosmos-articulating theory—a Boethian *musica mundana* and *humana*—to drive their musical practice" (201). To the extent that they were concerned with larger issues, "they clung to the notion of 'unity in variety'" (203). Therefore, Allanbrook takes on the task of "...theorizing for the theory-less pedagogues of the late eighteenth century..." (215). That Kirnberger, et. al., were "theory-less pedagogues" will not be a view shared by all.

Allanbrook coins the term "comic surface" to indicate the "exuberant thematic superfluidity" in Classical works. However, considering Mozart's works in particular, I'm hard-pressed to find an example of thematic stinginess; but surely it can't be maintained that *all* of his works are comic. Allanbrook asserts that Charles Rosen associates unity with the tragic. This is not in itself very controversial, except if it be meant to claim the converse, that disunity is a hallmark of the comic. If so, there are two problems with such a claim: first, the passage cited in *The Classical Style*[9] doesn't support it, and second, Rosen himself provides a counterclaim: Mozart's achievement of overall unity in comic opera is the result of great creative effort and is of paramount significance in the understanding of these works.[10]

Then what means, "theorizing the comic surface?" Allanbrook leaves off discussion of theory and concentrates on analysis, offering some topical readings that are meant to counterbalance the prevailing depth obsession. The main piece considered here is the Haydn E-flat Major Sonata, Hob. XVI:52. There is also some discussion of the first movement of the Mozart F Major Sonata, K.332.[11] The topical readings are perfectly valid and nicely done, detailing, as they do, the rapid changes in affect in these works.

---

[9] Rosen 1971, 92.

[10] *Ibid.*, 298ff.

[11] A very private quibble: I have always found another Mozart F Major sonata much funnier: K.533/494. The first movement is a sustained *superlatio* with phrases outlandishly prolonged, and a massively hyperbolic closing arpeggiation. In 1791, a previously published Rondo (K.494) was appended to the other two

Allanbrook has a contagious enthusiasm for "surface" analysis. There is, however, no reason that Allanbrook should need to be defensive about it, nor need she be concerned that the method needs protection against an onslaught of the Purveyors of the Deep. Whereas she limns the shortcomings of "depth" analysis, Allanbrook nevertheless fails to detail the limits of her own "surface" technique. But any theory, any analytical technique—anything that can be defined—has limits. There is no need for—and less possibility of—writing the last word on the pieces that we analyze. Any perspective is a limited perspective. Every mirror has a frame.

§9

Philip Gossett, in his "Editorial theory, musical editions, performance: 19th-Century fault lines from a 21st-Century perspective,"[12] reports on state-of-the-art matters regarding the editing of musical works at the turn of the present century. Beyond providing very useful information regarding contemporary editions of Beethoven, Schumann, Chopin, Rossini, Verdi, and others, Gossett raises important questions about the nature of the musical artwork. It has become much more common with critical editions, when competing versions exist, to reproduce them all, much to the consternation of some performers. (This is a particularly difficult decision in the case of Chopin's music in particular.) Lewis Rowell (§13, below) finds himself concerned with this topic as well in his essay. He writes, "What now appears to be developing is a repertoire in which musical "texts" are more flexible, less self-contained, more process-oriented, tending to exist in multiple versions, and linked in numerous ways with other musical texts—comprising, in a word, what we might call a 'field' rather than a set of individual objects" (304). Previously, performers were

---

movements of K.533 to complete the three-movement sonata. Mozart inserts a substantial chunk of new material to the end of the Rondo (now *Finale*). I'm convinced that this long insertion, featuring a *fugato* that piles unending entrances one upon the next, was added to the Rondo in order to provide some comic reference (and rivalry) to the first movement.

[12] Giger and Mathiesen 2002, 217-32.

able to profess a simple faith in the accuracy of the well-researched *Urtext*, whatever that term may have actually meant. Gossett remarks, "The irony is that fearful performers are not worried that these new critical editions will tie their hands to some 'scholarly' text; they are afraid the new editions might untie their hands" (229).

§10

Lee Rothfarb, in "Music and mirrors: Misconceptions and misrepresentations,"[13] examines the ways in which the individual perspective of the musical analyst gets inextricably intertwined in his or her analysis. He considers the works of a number of nineteenth- and twentieth-century German theorists involved with developing methods of musical hermeneutics. Reviewing contributions by Hermann Kretzschmar, Arnold Schering, Paul Bekkmer, August Halm, and others, Rothfarb's thoughtful article is a significant contribution to the recent literature on musical metaphor, following upon works by Guck 1994, Maus 1988, and others.

§11

William Pastille (1984) once argued that Schenker might not have been the organicist he might have wanted us to believe. Robert P. Morgan performs a similar feat on Schenker the traditionalist in "Schenker and the Twentieth Century: A modernist perspective."[14] According to Morgan, despite Schenker's reactionary invective, his musical project conceals a clearly modernist agenda. To Morgan, modernism is expressed first in the acknowledgement of an unbreachable historical divide. Schenker erects the barrier at the death of Brahms, whereas the outbreak of World War I marks the divide for most modernists. Schenker's blatantly structuralist stance is another strong tie, as structuralism is a preeminently modernist technique. Among other examples, Morgan shows significant correspondences between hierarchies

[13] *Ibid.*, 233-46.

[14] *Ibid.*, 247-74.

defined by Schenker and Ferdinand de Saussure. Morgan also proposes some sympathetic resonance between Marx and Schenker, but I believe that any such similarity is explained by the fact that Hegel serves as a kind of deep middleground for both.

During Schenker's lifetime, Vienna became a focal point in the development of modern psychology, as formulated in the works of Freud, Jung, and exponents of the Gestalt school. Morgan underscores the similarity between Schenker and Freud in their shared interest in revealing the hidden, the secret. In the field of art history and art criticism, Morgan finds a voice sympathetic with Schenker's in Viennese art historian Alois Riegl's "structuralist turn" as well as in a number of other Viennese art theorists. Further support for the relationship between Schenker's theory and theories of painting was the topic of Hedi Siegel's 1998 keynote address to the Music Theory Society of New York State.[15] Morgan writes, "For all his individuality, then, Schenker was not working in a vacuum; his theory fits comfortably within one of the major intellectual currents of the early modern period" (260). Morgan's effort to frame Schenker's thought in its appropriate cultural and intellectual backgrounds is an important contribution and builds upon works by Pastille (1984), Korsyn (1993), Federhofer (1985), Snarrenberg (1997), Peles (2003), Schachter (2001), and others. Also, and importantly, Morgan mentions that at around the time he was working on this paper, he discovered that Nicholas Cook (1999) was working on his own treatment of the same topic. The two works complement one another nicely. The intellectual history recounted in Morgan's work is greatly revealing. The unasked question in all of this is whether Schenker's modernism is not somehow dependent upon the mere fact that he was born in modern times. The irony becomes this: that Schenker's modernism is confirmed by his railing against it.

§12

In his "Film theory and music theory: On the intersection of two traditions,"[16] David Neumeyer provides us with a comparative

[15] Siegel 1998.

[16] Giger and Mathiesen 2002, 275-94.

review of a number of writers who analyzed Bernard Hermann's score to Hitchcock's *Psycho*. Neumeyer pays particular attention to the work of Fred Steiner, film composer turned musicologist. Professor Neumeyer recounts a difficulty in the form of a divide that exists "between formalist-aesthetes and traditional historians, on the one hand, and ideological critics and culturally conservative scholars on the other" (278).

§13

Lewis Rowell's contribution, "New temporal horizons and the theory of music,"[17] is unabashedly prophetic. The article presents a theoretical framework for considering the times of music, and moves from there to a thought-provoking discussion of music (and music theory) of the future. Rowell is inspired by recent work by Ludwik Bielawski (1981) and others on time and the cognition of time. Bielawski proposes a set of seven hierarchical time "zones" that range from the very brief to the very long. His first (and briefest) zone is that of visible light. The three specifically musical time zones follow, and are the 1) "zone of musical pitches," defined by oscillation periods, 2) "zone of [the] psychological present" that range from the shortest rhythmic values up to that of the phrase, 3) "zone of compositions and performances." Three more zones follow, a zone of ecological time (from about an hour to about a year), a zone of sociological time and shallow history (from a year to about a hundred years), and a zone of full history and tradition (from 100 up to about 50,000 years) (296-7). Rowell speculates on the ways in which musical experience might engage the longer time zones. The topic of style would seem to naturally arise in this context. Rowell proposes two projects that might move in this direction, however a more literal experiment is already underway: on February 5, 2003, in the now abandoned St. Burchardi Church in Halberstadt, Germany, the first note of John Cage's piece, *As Slow As Possible* was played. The work will take 639 years to complete, and is scheduled to finish in the year 2642.

Rowell also takes on the topic of time in order to make predictions about the nature of music making and music

[17] *Ibid.*, 295-312.

scholarship in the future. With regard to music scholarship, Rowell speculates that obsessive concerns for system building will give way to more diversified methodologies. This is, in some measure, a response to the fact that new music seems to produce "an infinite catalog of individual cases" (309). Musical analysis and musical criticism are challenged in this environment in that their main task is "...to *generalize* and to seek out understandings that shed light on groups of musical works more than to discover the particular secrets and internal rules of individual works" (309). The pedagogical aims of music theory will remain much the same, however, Rowell believes that the practice of model composition is in some jeopardy. He ascribes this to the easy temptation of time saving and mechanistic methods, however, another reason derives, again, from the lack of a unifying musical style: there will be just too many models. In speaking of music making, Rowell's most ambitious forecast is that music will not be an exclusively aural art form. Details are lacking about this projection, but his allusion to "seeing and thinking music" is striking.

This work, then, brings together the efforts of a number of major scholars at an important point of music-historic retrospection. Rowell's article is the ideal conclusion to this collection; informative and thought provoking, its speculative character is exactly what the subtitle of the book has promised. Given the great variety of its offerings, readers of *Intégral* will be well rewarded by a tour through *Music in the Mirror*. There have been relatively few collections that have treated history of music theory topics, and fewer still that are as comprehensive as this one. Several authors, as illustrated above, have taken on the task of seriously examining the enterprise of music scholarship at the turn of the twenty-first century. Those authors with less ambitious aims have, nevertheless, contributed ably and meaningfully. The editors, Professors Giger and Mathiesen, are to be commended for this volume, an important contribution to the ongoing work of music theory and its histories.

References

Bielawski, Ludwig. 1981. "The Zones of Time in Music and Human Activity." In *The Study of Time*, Vol. 4, ed. J. T. Fraser, N. Lawrence, and D. Park. New York: Springer.

Borges, Jorge Luis. 1962. "Pierre Menard, Author of *Don Quixote*." In *Ficciones*, trans. Anthony Bonner. New York: Grove Press.

Christensen, Thomas. 1993. "Music Theory and its Histories." In *Music Theory and The Exploration of the Past*, ed. David Bernstein and Christopher Hatch, 9-39. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2000. "Music Theory and the Mainstream." *Intégral* 14/15: 11-14.

———., ed. 2002. *The Cambridge History of Western Music Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cook, Nicholas. 1999. "Heinrich Schenker, Modernist: Detail, Difference, and Analysis." *Theory and Practice* 24: 91-106.

Erickson, Raymond, trans. 1995. *Musica enchiriadis and Scolica enchiriadis*. In *Music Theory Translation Series*, ed. Claude V. Palisca. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Federhofer, Hellmut. 1985. *Heinrich Schenker: Nach Tagebücher und Briefen in der Oswald Jonas Memorial Collection, University of California, Riverside. In Studien zur Musikwissenschaft*, vol. 3. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.

Giger, Andreas, and Thomas J. Mathiesen, ed. 2002. *Music in the Mirror: Reflections on the History of Music Theory and Literature for the Twenty-First Century*. Publications of the Center for the History of Music Theory and Literature Series, vol. 3. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Guck, Marion. 1994. "Analytical Fictions." *Music Theory Spectrum* 16/2: 217-230.

Handschin, Jacques. 1927. "Die Musikanschauung des Johannes Scotus (Erigena)." *Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 5: 331.

Korsyn, Kevin. 1993. "Schenker's Organicism Re-Examined." *Intégral* 7: 82-118.

———. 2003. *Decentering Music: A Critique of Contemporary Musical Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maus, Fred. 1988. "Music as Drama." *Music Theory Spectrum* 10: 56-73.

Rosen, Charles. 1971. *The Classical Style*. New York: Norton.

Pastille, William H. 1984. "Heinrich Schenker, Anti-Organicist." *19th-Century Music* 8/1: 28-36.

Peles, Stephen. 2003. "Infertile Intervals and Criminal Cats: Aspects of the Scientific Context of Schenker's Biology." Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the South Central Society for Music Theory, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Schachter, Carl. 2001. "Elephants, Crocodiles, and Beethoven: Schenker's Politics and the Pedagogy of Schenkerian Analysis." *Theory and Practice* 26: 1-20.

Siegel, Hedi. 1998. "Looking at the *Urlinie*: Schenker and the Visual Arts." Keynote address delivered at the annual meeting of the Music Theory Society of New York State.

Snarrenberg, Robert. 1997. *Schenker's Interpretive Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.