Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy

Volume 21 Article 8

1-1-2007

Engaging Music - Essays in Music Analysis, ed. Deborah Stein reviewed

Gordon Sly

Review

Engaging Music: Essays in Music Analysis, **ed. Deborah Stein.**

New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Reviewed by Gordon Sly

Writing in 1971 about articulations of the musical surface that can inform analytical interpretation, John Rothgeb expressed surprise "that there have been so few attempts to specify procedures for the derivation of musical analyses."[1] He qualifies this remark in a footnote: "This is not to deny the existence of pedagogically valuable descriptions of musical structure, but only to observe that such descriptions almost never concern themselves with procedures by which an analysis can be derived or critically evaluated."[2] Were he writing today, that surprise would surely have grown to full-blown astonishment—perhaps colored by a little dismay—as he described a landscape that appears pretty much unchanged.

Rothgeb's remarks bring into focus what I would argue is the central issue in evaluating the usefulness to students of analysis papers purported to be exemplars for their work. Simply put, while any written analysis may have some qualities that can instruct students, what is most important is that its processes be transparent and intelligible rather than obscure and unfathomable. How was its analytical point of view developed? What informed analytical decisions? Which possibilities were rejected and which embraced, and why? What implications flow from those decisions? These are the things that students need to have illuminated.

This transparency of process can be achieved explicitly, of course, or more indirectly. However accomplished, analytical writings meant to serve as guides for students must begin with the premise that they need to know how and why decisions are made. By this measure, *Engaging Music* earns a modest grade. Some of its papers are successful; most are not.

---

[1] John Rothgeb, "Design as a Key to Structure in Tonal Music," *Journal of Music Theory* 15 (1971); repr., *Readings in Schenker Analysis and Other Approaches*, ed. Maury Yeston (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977): 73.

[2] Ibid. p. 73, n. 1.

In the preface, the editor, Deborah Stein, promises "a book of essays *about* analysis by music theorists" (emphasis is mine). A moment later we learn that "topics range from introductions to specific analytical approaches to a wide variety of essays that *model* different analytical techniques (emphasis, once again, is mine). On this latter score, I think the book succeeds: the essays model analytical techniques, and many do so wonderfully well. But "essays *about* analysis" pledges something more, and here the book falls short. As Rothgeb suggests, a basic distinction exists between writing up a completed analysis, even one that progresses step by step, and presenting a methodology, a strategy of approach, a process that students who work through the article will then be able to apply to other musical works. For the most part, *Engaging Music* presents analytical models, but not necessarily methodological or pedagogical models.

That said, there is much of value here. Several of the essays, though they may lack explicit procedural direction, are sufficiently deliberate that a methodology may be able to be extrapolated, either by a student alone or perhaps with a little guidance from a teacher. As well, a number of the articles are marvelously written, and students need all the models of good writing that we can possibly make available to them.

In the pages that follow I provide an overview of the volume and an assessment of its design and editorial organization. After that, I discuss a number of the volume's contributions, focusing particularly on papers that I believe have much to offer students as they work to develop their analytical and writing skills. Finally, I offer a suggestion for using this volume in analysis courses.

Overview

Let me begin by acknowledging that a collection of writings whose goals are to provide for "upper-level music students" (undergraduates and graduate non-specialists alike, we may assume) "models" of analytical writing about music that are tailored to their level of training and experience is most welcome. Professor Stein has managed to bring together twenty-one pieces for the volume. Five are reprints of work published previously, and a sixth is a condensed version of an already published paper, but still, the whole represents a substantial logistical undertaking that addresses a pressing need and deserves our gratitude.

The collection is organized into three broad sections: the first, dubbed an introduction, is devoted to analytical topics and techniques; the remaining two to model essays, first on text-music relations, then on instrumental music. The framing sections—each of which contains eight essays, compared to the middle part on text and music, which has five—are sub-divided by subject; these subjects differ between sections, though "pitch" and "form" appear in both.

The variety that the volume achieves in several dimensions is admirable: vastly contrasted analytical approaches are presented; composers represented range over four centuries; 20th-century music has a prominent place; studies of popular music are included; women composers are represented; and, having authored five of the twenty-one essays, women contribute significantly to the collection. At the same time, the division into introductory studies and model essays seems arbitrary; no significant difference exists between the papers that comprise the opening section and those that make up the following two. Far more importantly, the sub-category entitled "Form" in Part I is represented by Ramon Satyendra's study of Chick Corea's "Starlight," and John Covach's primer on form in rock music. Quite apart from the merits of these papers, when one considers the ascendant position occupied by form in students' analytical work, as well as the dearth of popular music study relative to that of 18th- and 19th-century European music that characterizes the overwhelming majority of music schools in the country, this is a bewildering editorial decision.

The whole is prefaced by William Marvin's three-page "Introduction to Writing Analytical Essays," which, given the central aim of the volume, may well be its most valuable contribution. It is well organized and cogently written. I particularly like the ongoing parallels that Marvin draws between the processes of presenting in writing one's ideas on a piece of music, on the one hand, and practicing one's instrument or preparing a piece for performance, on the other. If the goal of the volume is to hit students where they live, well, this is where they live. They understand that mastering an instrument takes many years of diligent study, and that the journey will involve both hills and valleys. They understand that preparing a performance takes hours of practice, day after day, week after week. Yet many seem to feel that, if they can't get that five-page paper on the Chopin Prelude written in an evening, something is wrong somewhere—with Chopin, with the assignment, with them. Marvin's frequent reference to these more familiar processes both

informs them, and repeatedly reminds them, of what analytical writing really involves.

The main difficulty with which all involved with this project have had to contend involves the limitations—in technical language, in treatment of ideas or constructs—imposed to accommodate the level of experience of the intended audience. The papers generally handle this challenge well, though some of the discipline's subjects cooperate with such cautions more easily than do others (more on this below). From an editorial perspective, this difficulty has given rise to some awkwardness. At the bottom of the opening page of each paper are found "some reminders" that let readers know that bolded words are defined in the glossary, that complete citations can be found in the bibliography, and that certain notational conventions may vary from paper to paper. This same message, then, is delivered twenty-one times. The editor's thinking, of course, is that a book like this is more likely to be read in bits and pieces than it is from beginning to end, so information needed for any one paper is needed for all. Still, these repetitions become tedious and underscore the fact that this same degree of care has hardly been applied uniformly: scores for works analyzed in eleven of the twenty-one chapters are provided following the last chapter and, beyond the table of contents, we aren't informed of this at all.

More significantly, while technical terminology has been kept to a minimum, it is sometimes unavoidable. To deal with such instances, the editor has developed the aforementioned glossary to define these terms. For entries such as "aggregate" and "inversion" this is a perfectly reasonable solution. But for others, a dictionary definition is futile and may even be counterproductive. Entries for the Schenkerian terms "foreground," "middleground," "background," "prolongation," and "structural levels," for example, all direct the reader to "Schenkerian Analysis." Here we find all of these terms (some in quotation marks, others not, some in bold, others not; but all here), but none is defined in any meaningful way. Certainly a student would know little more than he or she had before about any of them, nor about "Schenkerian Analysis" itself, for that matter, from this entry. It would have been far preferable to have excluded altogether definitions of such terms from a glossary and instead pointed students to those essays that treat these ideas. But this observation points up another problem: none of the essays treats these ideas at a level appropriate for students (more on this below, as well).

Other frustrating aspects of the editorial organization concern the suggestions for further reading and introductory materials, which seem utterly haphazard. Eleven chapters provide lists for "further reading" at their conclusion; ten do not. Part II on text and music is prefaced by an editorial introduction and an extensive "further reading" section; Parts I and III have neither. There should be consistency in both areas. In instances where authors were not forthcoming with suggestions for further reading, the editor should have supplied them. If Part II merits a preface, Parts I and III—certainly Part III, which parallels Part II—should have them as well.

Finally, the topics and techniques introduced in the introductory section, to each of which are devoted two essays, include: rhythm, meter, and phrase; pitch; form; and musical ambiguity. This last topic is an unexpected choice given the direction set by the first three. Musical ambiguity, however, is of particular interest to the editor; indeed, her own contribution to the collection appears here. It is, as well, a central idea in our discipline, and one that is rarely addressed directly. Moreover, it has countless pedagogical applications: from the time we introduce it in the form of the pivot chord in a diatonic modulation, musical ambiguity rarely leaves the stage, becoming increasingly important as harmonic vocabulary becomes more chromatic. While the first three topics may have struck any editor as obvious candidates for an introductory section, I doubt the fourth would have occurred to many beyond Professor Stein, and she ought to be commended for having included it here.

Noteworthy Contributions

Editorial wisdom is also much in evidence in the decision to lead off with the two articles that deal with rhythm, meter, and phrase, and particularly in the choice of Charles Burkhart's study of phrase rhythm in Chopin's A♭-Major Mazurka, op. 59/2, to open the book. Not only does this topic have a relatively broad appeal among music students, but Burkhart has a knack for striking a balance of authority and kindliness that sets a compelling and inviting tone for the volume—of inestimable importance considering the anxiety in students often engendered by our beloved subject.

Burkhart's essay is a wonderful example of what analytical writing for students can be. Every analytical decision is transparent. Alternatives are considered. His appeal is always to students' musical instincts. He involves his reader in the process, and

explicitly ties together analytical and performance issues: "Is this plausible?" he asks. "Audible?" "In any event, this extension (bars 17-20) is surely trying to 'tell a story' of some kind. . . . We can only use words in our attempt to suggest it. What might they be? More important, what strategies might the performer employ to convey this 'story' dramatically?" (p. 8)

At the same time, Burkhart's focus on students' musical intuitions and on performance questions lead him to provide only a cursory definition of "phrase." In one sense, this is probably a wise approach: a thorough discussion at this point of what can be a knotty topic could be tedious, and is unnecessary to Burkhart's argument. Still, upper-class undergraduates are likely to have a relatively weak notion of phrase—perhaps a modest grasp of the subject based on the work of Green or Caplin.[3] For a student who has sought out this essay specifically for a clarification of, say, distinctions among the terms subphrase, phrase, and period, and an explanation of how the smaller combine to form the larger, this language is more likely to confuse than to illuminate, and will have to be qualified by a teacher:

Imagine two phrases in succession. If the first is defined by a weak ending and the second by a strong, the total effect will be something greater than simply two phrases: the second ending, because it is stronger than the first, will create the effect of a *single* large phrase, comprising the two shorter ones. (We will call such short phrases making up one longer one "subphrases.") In other words, phrases not only exist one after the other, but also form a hierarchy in which the shorter ones are subsumed by ever larger ones, with the largest constituting a section of the work's form (p. 4; emphasis Burkhart's).

Burkhart's essay is paired with one by Harald Krebs, which uses the *Lieder* of Josephine Lang to introduce students to hypermeter. Both this music and the idea itself will be new to students, of course, and Krebs takes care to convey his sympathy for Lang's work as he leads his reader through its metric organization. Krebs's experience in the classroom is everywhere in evidence here. Ideas are well-ordered and their presentation well-paced. He frequently precedes

[3] Douglas Green, *Form in Tonal Music* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979); William Caplin, *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

his description of a musical event with remarks about what *could* have occurred in this place, what the composer might have done instead, which leads his reader to consider why compositional choices may have been made. Finally, he anticipates a potential point of confusion between a hypermeasure and a phrase, and carefully explains the important differences between the two. While his analytical writing may not bring the reader into the process to the same extent as does Burkhart's, Krebs's closing section, which deals with the expressive qualities of hypermetric irregularity, is compelling, and likely to whet students' appetites for further investigation along similar lines.

To introduce analytical techniques that directly address pitch relations in tonal music, Stein turns to an excerpt from Allen Forte's "Schenker's Conception of Musical Structure," which first appeared in the *Journal of Music Theory* in 1959. Of the thirty pages that comprise Forte's classic article, only seven appear here—those, specifically, that present his commentary on Schenker's reading of Robert Schumann's *Aus meinen Tränen spriessen*, the second song of *Der Dichterliebe*.

I am deeply ambivalent about the inclusion of this excerpt here. Constraints on length doubtless made it impossible to include the complete article. Still, though the section reprinted is relatively independent of what precedes and follows it, it is not entirely so, and the context of the full article would have been helpful. Consider, for example, that in the fourth paragraph Forte promises to explain the criteria by which musical details are "eliminated" in successively deeper levels of the sketch. He never gets the chance: that section of the article is not included in this excerpt.

Forte's article well deserves the status it holds in the field, and I am buoyed by the idea that a new generation of students will be exposed to it. Yet it is clearly not the most effective introduction to Schenker's analytical approach for undergraduates. As elegant as his guide through Schenker's reading of Schumann's song may be, it was intended for a professional readership, and is largely inaccessible to the uninitiated. Read through Forte's explanation of Schenker's interpretation of the C♯ in m. 2 as a consonant passing tone (p. 34).[4] In brief, the A in the bass is there to provide consonant

[4] Forte inadvertently indicates this as m. 3, an error that was reproduced in Yeston, and once again here. A typo in the second full paragraph on p. 32 ("m. 5" should read "m. 15") has had a similar history.

support for the passing tone. The tonic chord that results is not generated harmonically, but contrapuntally; it therefore has no harmonic status. This is a sensitive reading, and an excellent example of one of Schenker's truly remarkable and most fundamental ideas. It is also absolutely impenetrable to an undergraduate, at least the ones that I encounter. The inclusion of this excerpt was certainly well-intentioned, but for those intentions to be realized, students will require the curiosity to seek out the full paper and a competent teacher to help bridge the many gaps between their knowledge and the ideas presented therein.

Three of the most valuable contributions to Parts II and III of the book are William Rothstein's "Playing with Forms: Mozart's Rondo in D Major, K. 485," Janet Schmalfeldt's "In Search of Purcell's Dido," and Joel Lester's "The *Presto* from Bach's G-Minor Sonata for Violin Solo: Style, Rhythm, and Form in a Baroque *Moto Perpetuo*." Individually, they are engaging, wonderfully written, and transparent of process. Collectively, they make a powerful and inescapable argument for the importance of a broad frame of reference.

Rothstein's tone, pacing, and clarity are masterful. He is dealing with Mozart's K. 485, a piece marked *Rondo très facile*—probably by its publisher, who, as Rothstein points out, would likely have increased sales of the music by referring to the work as a "very easy rondo"—that is actually in sonata form. It is a monothematic sonata, one written "*in the style of a rondo*, in that the main theme sounds like a refrain and is treated like a refrain" (pp. 204-5; emphasis is his). Rothstein makes the most of the opportunity furnished by the confusion, leading his reader through the historic development of the rondo as seen through French, Italian, and German eyes of various eras, and detailing precisely what we should expect to find if the piece is to fulfill the requirements of the form as Mozart would have understood them to be. Students come to understand not only what they must expect of a rondo formally, but also what they might look for in terms of its character. Citing Koch, Rothstein points out that because of their frequent repetitions, "rondos are not well suited to the expression of lofty sentiments. Frequent repetition suggests naïveté, so rondos tend to be simple and naïve in style" (p. 204). This quality, very much in evidence in K. 485, provides students with another sense in which the piece is written "in the style of a rondo," and perhaps explains how Mozart's publisher may have seen it as a rondo after an only cursory examination.

Once it has been determined that this little "rondo" is, in fact, in sonata-form, Rothstein keeps the distinction between the two forms alive, pointing out at each formal juncture what a rondo would have required. This is, in and of itself, an invaluable lesson for undergraduates: in the study of form, the distinction between continuous (tonally open) and sectional (tonally closed) structures is a central idea—perhaps *the* central idea—that we must get across to students, since it is this distinction that implicates the two basic architectural strategies that underlie all musical forms, expansion and addition. Finally, in a preamble to his discussion of the development section, Rothstein explains that the central harmonic task of the section is to transform I/V into V/I. This simple step accomplishes two important things: it contextualizes the development by viewing it in terms of its role in the larger tonal drama; and it provides guidance and expectation for a section that is pervasively misunderstood by students.

Janet Schmalfeldt's paper is a condensed version of her excellent Purcell study that appeared in 2001.[5] It is essentially a search through the historical versions of the Dido character, leading to a carefully constructed image of Dido as seen through the eyes of librettist Nahum Tate and composer Henry Purcell. Already plausible, given what Schmalfeldt shows us that Tate and Purcell would have known of the historical character, this image is firmly established by the compelling argument Schmalfeldt sets forth based on the musical setting of the heroine's unforgettable farewell.

As any writer will hasten to point out, the importance of a strong opening paragraph can hardly be overstated. This truth is very much in evidence in student writing, as we all know, and must be confronted directly. Just as it is a useful exercise to have students develop an analytical "point of view" statement,[6] so it is to have them work through successive versions to refine an opening paragraph. It must seize its reader's attention, define its subject, and propose an argument. It must begin to establish a sense of trust in the writer, a sense that the reader is in good hands, that reading on will be well worth the investment. *Engaging Music* provides quite a number of very good opening paragraphs, and a few excellent ones; those by Mead, Schachter, and McCreless particularly stand

[5] "In Search of Dido," *Journal of Musicology* 18, no. 4 (2001): 584-613.

[6] This is described in my article, "Developing the Analytical Point of View: The Musical 'Agent'." *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy* 19 (2005): 51-63.

out. But Schmalfeldt's is peerless. Powerful, intriguing, concise. She begins by declaring that Purcell's setting of Tate's famous words "Remember me. . ." ensures that we will do just that, and then asks three simple questions: who is it, exactly, that we will remember; how did the composer want us to understand this Dido, and; how can an analysis of the music help us to answer these questions? Every word of the essay that follows explores one of these questions.

Another excellent example for student analysis and writing is Joel Lester's study of the *Presto* from Bach's G-Minor solo violin sonata. Like the movement by Bach itself, Lester introduces a single idea and relentlessly explores its implications. The piece unfolds in a constant sixteenth-note motion, calling to mind the perpetual-motion works of later periods. As Lester argues, however, the organization of that motion differs markedly in a Baroque work, influencing both local gestures and more far-reaching formal structures. The essay presents a close reading of metric ambiguity in the piece, focusing particularly on ideas of immediate and broad metric intensification as an architectural strategy of the music.

Closing sections dealing with questions of form and with implications for performance are especially valuable and can serve as well as springboards for class discussions or assignments as they can as models for analytical writing.

Two papers that I would judge to be of limited value as models for students, but would nonetheless recognize here are Edward Cone's "Attacking a Brahms Puzzle" and Patrick McCreless's "Isolde's Transformation in Words and Music." The former was not aimed at students, of course; it was intended for the urbane readership of *The Musical Times*, from which it was reprinted. It requires a frame of reference beyond the grasp of undergraduates, and it deals with Brahms, which is as difficult as tonal music gets, and more often than not proves overwhelming for students.

McCreless's paper *is* aimed at students, and makes the appropriate concessions in vocabulary and breadth of reference, but again, it's subject is difficult and the music dense. Only a student of exceptional ability and determination would be prepared to do the work necessary to follow the author through this music.

This said, both essays are beautifully written, and represent a musical sensitivity that is the very best the discipline has to offer. It would perhaps be best to work through these papers in class, directing students' attention to specific issues to guide their reading.

An Implementation Strategy

Despite my disappointment in the failure of many of its individual contributions to focus on methodological questions and on analytical decisions and implications, I do believe that the book can be put to good use in an analysis course. This is because one of its real strengths is the breadth of analytical perspective that it offers. The balance of my remarks will pursue this idea.

I have frequently found that the use of contrasting analytical approaches to the same piece can be helpful to students.[7] Simply the existence of an opposing viewpoint engenders a skepticism about any and all assertions made that is very largely absent without it. Contrasted views, as well, seem to free students to express their own ideas. While they would not dare offer an alternative to a single "expert" viewpoint, having two already at odds with one another seems to make a third reasonable.

In an analysis course I taught earlier this year (a graduate class comprised almost entirely of performers and conductors), I modified this basic idea so as to make use of *Engaging Music*. Opposing perspectives on the same piece are not presented, of course, but widely contrasting approaches, as well as a number of interestingly complementary approaches, to similar pieces are available. The first several classes were taken up with my own analytical presentations, which were designed to model what I was after from the students. During this time, they were to select a piece, and begin thinking about an analytical point of view and argument. I then met with students individually and had them go through their chosen pieces and ideas for analysis. Based on this meeting, I assigned each student three articles from *Engaging Music*. They were to read, summarize the essential viewpoints and arguments, and then prepare a proposal for their own analytical work that included an explanation of any influences that had come from their reading.

I was very pleased with the results generally, and the best of the work was quite beyond what I had expected. Below I summarize three examples of work that was especially strong. The pieces

[7] I address this idea directly in "Competing Analyses as Pedagogical Strategy and Hugo Wolf's *Das verlassene Mägdlein*," *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy* 14 (2000): 31-46.

chosen for analysis, an overview of the students' initial views, the readings that I assigned, and an explanation of what I hoped these essays might contribute to the students' work, are provided.

Piece for Analysis: Debussy, Syrinx

This Master's student in flute performance had an inchoate analytical viewpoint at our initial meeting, but she recognized the work's three-part design, and had identified whole-tone and pentatonic segments within the work's fully chromatic surface. She also sensed that B♭ and D♭ somehow played important roles in the piece. Finally, she emphasized that as a performer she connected to the dramatic nature of the piece, though she was unable to expound on that in any way.

The papers I assigned her to read included Andrew Mead's "Learn to Draw Bob Hope! Mort Drucker, Arnold Schoenberg, and Twelve-Tone Music", Ramon Satyendra's "Analyzing the Unity within Contrast: Chick Corea's 'Starlight'," and Charles J. Smith's "'Rounding Up the Usual Suspects?': The Enigmatic Nature of Chopin's C-sharp Minor Prelude."

The central message I hoped Mead's paper would convey to this student was to allow her ears to be her guide. Though undergraduates and non-specialist graduate students are reluctant to trust them, their ears are generally far more sophisticated, if you will, than are their eyes. Mead's chief appeal to students is that they engage twelve-tone music as music rather than as upside-down and backward puzzles. This essential message, conveyed first by Schoenberg himself and echoed by countless advocates of the music since, is, sadly, more necessary today than ever. Terrible misconceptions about most 20th-century music, not just serial music, remain rampant, and students seem, if anything, more conservative than they were a generation ago, and less inclined to give this music a fair hearing. Mead's strategy, like that of Rahn before him,[8] involves an overt appeal to students' ears. With nary a mention of row-forms or TTOs, he prompts them to *hear* the inversional symmetry in that most-analyzed of twelve-tone pieces, Webern's op. 27/2. This accomplished, he begins a twelve-tone primer, focusing still on aural qualities. He constructs a series of examples that illustrate relationships based on trichordal, tetrachordal, and hexachordal

[8] John Rahn, *Basic Atonal Theory* (New York: Longman, 1982).

invariance—relationships, it turns out, that Schoenberg has realized in the opening measures of his Fourth String Quartet.

Whether Mead's approach will provide the "hook" that will secure students' attention and interest in this music is an open question. Most will stay with him for part of the discussion, but I doubt that many can or will follow him through the combined trichord and tetrachord associations. A number of transforms of his example row-forms ("P" and "Q") that feature trichordal and tetrachordal invariance have been presented by this point, but, not having the space to explain just how these particular transforms were discovered (or whether the invariance is peculiar to just these), their selection remains a mystery.[9]

For my purposes here, the chief strength of Ramon Satyendra's paper is its clarity of process. He takes Hans Keller's view that unity between two contrasting passages derives from the latent presence of the former in the latter as the basis of his approach to Chick Corea's *Starlight*. Satyendra begins by making an argument for his analytical approach. This done, he leads students step by step through the analytical process, explaining his thinking as each decision is made along the way, and using sub-headings to identify and order specific tasks. As a kind of template for approaching a written analysis assignment, this paper is singularly effective within the collection. At the same time, the writing tends toward clumsiness at times, and is generally not to the level of many other of the book's contributions.

Charles Smith uses an extra-musical structure to define his analytical approach, proposing to "interpret the piece as having the narrative trajectory of a thriller—that is, presenting puzzles to be solved, raising our expectations only to thwart them, and then at the end unmasking a hidden central character who has secretly controlled the whole story" (p. 237). He presents the analysis as a string of episodes: features in Chopin's C-sharp minor prelude alternate with their counterpart events in Bryan Singer's film *The Usual Suspect*s. Some parallels are more convincing than others, as

[9] The book is generally quite free of errors, and I have not been concerned here with the minor ones that do occur. A labeling problem regarding example 4.4, though, ought to be noted. Mead's reference in the text uses the label "T11IQ," but this becomes "TeIQ" in the example ("e," of course, denotes "11," but it is unlikely that the connection would be intuitive to a student encountering this nomenclature for the first time).

one would expect, but overall it is a highly successful analysis and a very useful paper for students.

Each of these papers made a clear mark on the student's work. The analysis she presented drew a parallel between the performer working her way through the piece and one working one's way through a maze. To solve the maze of the piece requires connecting B♭ to D♭ in the context of a whole-tone scale. Essentially, phrases depart B♭—describing different trajectories and using different figurations—searching for D♭, but cannot achieve that goal without "jumping across" the closed whole-tone barrier from the even set into the odd set. This perspective was particularly effective in the middle section of the piece, where the source collection can be understood as a conflation of pentatonic sets on G♭ and D♭. These sets share four common elements, so their combination yields a six-pc set that Debussy first presents as an ascending scale G♭-A♭-**B♭ — D♭**-E♭-F. Note the two whole-tone segments, the first from the even set, the second from the odd, deployed symmetrically around the privileged B♭-D♭ dyad. This analysis also ends on a high note, as it were, as the music, having tried and tried in vain, finally admits defeat, climbs over the maze wall from B♭ to B♮, and emphatically descends the whole-tone scale to closure on D♭.

Piece for Analysis: Percy Grainger, "The Lost Lady Found" from Lincolnshire Posy

This student, working on a DMA degree in wind conducting, arrived at our initial meeting with a fully-formed analytical plan. The piece, a movement of a large work for wind ensemble, is based on a well-known folk song—so well known, the student suggested, that Grainger could "tell the story" with his instrumental setting alone, as the audience followed along with the text in their heads. What he had not worked out, beyond a few isolated correspondences between story and setting, was just how a composer could tell a story via an instrumental arrangement.

I asked him to read three papers that deal with music and text, and that address specifically the idea that the setting is an *interpretation* of the text: Carl Schachter's "Motive and Text in Four Schubert Songs," Lori Burns's "Meaning in a Popular Song: The Representation of Masochistic Desire in Sarah McLachlan's 'Ice'," and Janet Schmalfeldt's "In Search of Purcell's Dido."

Schachter's well-known study dealing with the connection between poetic imagery and motivic design is one of the five previously published essays that Stein has included. While the paper makes no attempt to instruct students, of course, I applaud its inclusion here, and think it works well: it is brief; the writing is concise; and it is divided into discreet discussions of four Schubert songs, each of which is closely focused on a single analytical idea. These ideas are generally accessible to an undergraduate. The one likely exception to this, the motivic elaboration shown in the sketch given as example 10.9, is aided by Schachter's explanation of the contrapuntal origin of this unusual passage in the following example and its commentary. Finally, it is Schachter: the subtlety of the relationships he illuminates and his unparalleled insights into their meaning are not otherwise available, and students ought to know about this work.

Lori Burns introduces students to the world of female sexual power and identity, masochistic desire, and sexual exploitation in her study of Sara McLachlan's song "Ice." Much of the discussion is devoted to Burns's reading of the text, which concludes that by depicting a specific sadomasochistic relationship between a man and a woman in which the latter, who is on the receiving end, recognizes the insidious nature of their mutual desire, McLachlan points to the broader societal problem of imbalanced sexual power as a manifestation of patriarchal culture. It is a thoughtful and sensitive reading that deserves praise on at least three counts. First, it deals with difficult issues directly and honestly without sanitizing any. Second, it provides an example of song text interpretation that carries two distinct levels of meaning, something students may have to address when dealing with texted works. And third, it demonstrates that analysis can be a remarkably creative enterprise, one that draws more on the analyst's experience, taste, interests, and creativity than on knowledge of arcane analytical techniques.

Burns's reading of the song as a whole attempts to show how the protagonist's ambivalence about this relationship is drawn by McLachlan's musical setting: essentially, passages of the text that are driven by passion are distinguished from those motivated by reason by means of vocal register and type of harmonic support. Burns supports this argument with a series of "voice-leading graphs."

It is unfortunate that students are provided no guidance regarding how they might go about constructing such voice-leading analyses. In a footnote, Burns explains that rock music shares certain conventions with common-practice tonality, but that its harmonic language "expands" to include modes and modal harmonies and to require certain accommodations in the area of dissonance treatment. If this is so, just what constrains interpretative decisions, and how might such decisions be evaluated?[10]

Schmalfeldt's paper, as noted above, deals with Purcell and Tate's image of the Dido character. My main interest here was the closing section of the paper, where Schmalfeldt explains how Purcell composes the nobility of that character into his musical setting.

The analysis of "The Lost Lady Found" was very successful, and extremely well received by this student's colleagues in the class. It asserted the idea of a collaborative performance between the instrumental ensemble, who played the "accompaniment," and the audience who silently performed the vocal part. His presentation projected the text of the story on a screen, along with a highlighted score and an analytical characterization of the music in "bullet points." Several of the parallels he drew between a given event or development in the story and its corresponding depiction in the music were remarkably convincing, and left little doubt that Grainger was also thinking along these lines.

Each of the papers had a clear influence on this work: Schachter's close motivic reading, Burns's idea that separate narrative streams can be depicted musically by contrasts in the setting, and Schmalfeldt's attention to details of setting that together capture the emotional tone of the text all found expression in this analysis.

[10] Burns also calls students' attention to "the debate over the use of reductive analytical techniques to popular music" (note 17, p. 141-2). This is an issue that reaches far beyond this paper, of course, and one that I believe ought to be treated with great care. It is difficult enough to teach students about Schenker's work in the best of circumstances. With ideas of expanded tonal language and relaxed dissonance treatment floating about, and uncertainty about whether this or that voice-leading graph is "real Schenker" or just "sort-of Schenker," students are utterly adrift. Whatever one's views of this issue, we should recognize that the use of Schenkerian notation or verbiage flatters those who use it in a subtle but potentially corrosive way. Its use pre-empts a level of respect or heightened consequence—and those who use it know this very well. Particularly when writing for students, we must be very careful about implied analytical claims.

Piece for Analysis: Lars-Erik Larsson, Concertino for Trombone and String Orchestra, op. 45, no. 7, 1st Mvt., "Preludium"

This music seems to derive from the manipulation of basic melodic cells, which are defined both by interval and by rhythm. This Master's student in instrumental music education, and trombone player, was interested in pursuing a motivic analysis, which he said he felt intuitively, having played the piece many times over several years. I required him to read the following: Joseph N. Straus's "Two Post-tonal Analyses, Webern, 'Wie bin ich froh!,' from *Three Songs* op. 25; Schoenberg, 'Nacht,' from *Pierrot Lunaire*, op. 21," Richard Cohn's "'This music crept by me upon the waters': Introverted Motives in Beethoven's 'Tempest' Sonata," and Roger Graybill's "Formal and Expressive Intensification in Shostakovich's String Quartet No. 8, Second Movement."

The combination of the Straus and Cohn studies I thought would help him both define "motive" for his purposes, and develop a strategy for parsing this non-tonal surface and relating melodic cells to one another. Straus deals with Webern's very angular surfaces, where the idea of interval class becomes central to identifying intervallic similarity. In his analysis of Schoenberg's "Nacht," melodic cells based on interval content are shown to shape the music over different spans or levels, thus assuming motivic significance, a technique that appears to be used by Larsson, as well. Cohn's study of the Beethoven sonata movement focuses on motivic organization at the musical surface. It also possesses a pedagogical strength in that it directly addresses how one might go about a motivic analysis. Graybill touches on formal, motivic, and extra-musical issues, but it was his wrestling with the difficult formal design of the Shostakovich movement that I hoped would be helpful to this student.

The analysis focused on motivic organization, but also presented a convincing account of the movement's form that tied in to the motivic design. Essentially, he saw the movement as being organized as a series of motions that issue from the main thematic idea, and, focusing first on one motive, exhaust its implications before returning to the opening theme and repeating this process with a new motive. The final idea so treated was presented as a kind of "Ur-motive," which carried the movement to closure in a poetic way.

Engaging Music, used *in toto*, and with some imagination, can be a valuable resource for teaching student analysis and writing. Its collective strength is in its breadth of approach, making it useful for undergraduate and graduate non-specialist analysis courses, as well as for graduate student performers needing to write analytical documents for degree requirements, or to prepare lecture-recitals for job interviews. It is the first of its kind; one hopes that it begins a trend.