International Journal of the Dutch-Flemish Society for Music Theory

Volume 4, # 1 – APRIL 2017

MUSIC THEORY & ANALYSIS

LEUVEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

COLOPHON

Music Theory & Analysis (MTA)
International Journal of the Dutch-Flemish Society for Music Theory
VOLUME 4, NUMBER 1, APRIL 2017

EDITORS
Pieter Bergé (University of Leuven), Nathan John Martin (University of Michigan),
Markus Neuwirth (École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne)

ADVISORY BOARD
David Brackett (McGill University)
Vasili Byros (Northwestern University)
Mark Delaere (University of Leuven)
Felix Diergarten (Schola Cantorum Basiliensis)
Julian Horton (Durham University)
Henry Klumpenhouwer (Eastman School of Music)
John Koslovsky (Conservatory of Amsterdam)
Christian Leitmeir (Oxford University)
Danuta Mirka (University of Southampton)
Thomas Noll (Escola Superior de Musica de Catalunya)
Alexander Rehding (Harvard University)
Michiel Schuijer (Conservatory of Amsterdam)
Lauri Suurpää (Sibelius Academy)
Christian Thorau (Potsdam University)
Barbara Titus (University of Amsterdam)

Music Theory & Analysis (MTA) is a peer-reviewed international journal focusing on recent developments in music theory and analysis. It appears twice a year (in April and October) as an online journal with a print edition. MTA takes a special interest in the interplay between theory and analysis, as well as in the interaction between European and North-American scholarship. Open to a wide variety of repertoires, approaches, and methodologies, the journal aims to stimulate dialogue between diverse traditions within the field.
MTA is the official journal of the Dutch-Flemish Society for Music Theory (Vereniging voor Muziektheorie). It is the successor to the *Dutch Journal of Music Theory* [*Tijdschrift voor Muziektheorie* (Founding Editors: Barbara Bleij & Henk Borgdorff)].

EDITORIAL ADDRESS
Music Theory and Analysis
Leuven University Press
Minderbroedersstraat 4
3000 Leuven
Belgium
email: mta@lup.be
Editorial guidelines: mtajournal.be

ADMINISTRATION AND SUBSCRIPTION
Leuven University Press
Minderbroedersstraat 4
3000 Leuven
Belgium
tel: +32 16 32 53 45
fax: +32 16 32 53 52
email: orders@lup.be

Online journal with a print edition
Biannually (April/October)
Print ISSN: 2295-5917
Online ISSN: 2295-5925
Online available via ingentaconnect.com

For more information, visit the website www.mtajournal.be

© Leuven University Press / Music Theory & Analysis

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

Book Reviews

Abstract

David Huron. *Voice Leading: The Science behind a Musical Art*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016. ISBN 9780262034852. 272 pp.

David Huron's book on voice leading is *the* state-of-the-art account of the psychological principles that govern the perception of individual voices in a piece of music. [...]

David Beach. *Advanced Schenkerian Analysis: Perspectives on Phrase Rhythm, Motive, and Form*. New York: Routledge, 2012. ISBN 978-0415892148. 316 pp.

In the early sixteenth century, Baldesar Castiglione introduced the neologism *sprezzatura* for the persuasive nonchalance of the ideal courtier, and in later usage that of the Renaissance master, who has learned "to avoid affectation in every way possible" and "to conceal all art," making "whatever is done or said appear to be without effort." [...]

Keywords

Book review, Huron, voice leading, science, Beach, Schenkerian analysis, phrase rythm, motive, form

MUSIC THEORY & ANALYSIS

International Journal of the Dutch-Flemish Society for Music Theory

VOLUME 4, # 1, APRIL 2017, 119–144

book reviews © Fabian C. Moss, Yannis Rammos, and Leuven University Press

https://doi.org/10.11116/MTA.4.1.7

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

David Beach. *Advanced Schenkerian Analysis: Perspectives on Phrase Rhythm, Motive, and Form*

New York: Routledge, 2012. ISBN 978-0415892148. 316 pp. $59.46.

In the early sixteenth century, Baldesar Castiglione introduced the neologism *sprezzatura* for the persuasive nonchalance of the ideal courtier, and in later usage that of the Renaissance master, who has learned "to avoid affectation in every way possible" and "to conceal all art," making "whatever is done or said appear to be without effort."[1] If art consists in the hiding of art's presence, then by a similar token David Beach's Schenker textbook, written in large and confident strokes, represents theory hiding theory's presence. To appropriate William Rothstein's comparison of Schenkerian discourses, if Schenker's own voice is that of "a prophet," Jonas's that of "a poet," Salzer's that of "a kindly authority," and Forte's that of "a cool taxonomist," then with Beach, whose lifelong contribution to the field warrants the comparison, we witness a master craftsman at work.[2] Indeed, both the strengths and the weaknesses of Beach's text may be construed as opposing manifestations of the *sprezzatura* that pervades his analytical practice and his writing. On the one hand, it is the spontaneous conviction of his analytical argumentation and the inevitability of his enlightening readings that make the book not merely readable but uncannily engrossing.

The potential pitfall of this attitude, on the other hand, is captured in a phrase that appears in one of his earlier studies and acquires a special if unintended significance when repeated, as in all fairness is done here, outside its original context: "Schenker's theories," Beach has written, are "perfectly complete in themselves and thus require no modification."[3] Taken at its word, not only is such a position patently wishful (even if one conceded that Schenker's edifice is a *theory* proper, whether a formal or an empirical one,[4] it would default to being "incomplete" precisely for that reason). But in addition, Schenker's "systematic" theorizing and "applied" analyzing were always in progress and never perfectly reconciled, especially with regard to two of Beach's chosen areas of emphasis: motivic parallelism and form. Whether feigned for rhetorical and pedagogic

1 Baldesar Castiglione, *The Book of the Courtier*, ed. Daniel Javitch, trans. Charles S. Singleton (New York: W. W. Norton, 2002), 32.

2 William Rothstein, "The Americanization of Heinrich Schenker," in *Schenker Studies*, ed. Hedi Siegel (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 199.

3 David W. Beach, "The Current State of Schenkerian Research," *Acta Musicologica* 57/2 (1985), 289, https://doi.org/10.2307/932747.

4 For a discussion of Schenkerism's epistemological status, see Mark DeBellis, "Schenkerian Theory's Empiricist Image," *Music Theory Spectrum* 32/2 (2010), 111–20, https://doi.org/10.1525/mts.2010.32.2.111.

© Yannis Rammos and Leuven University Press | https://doi.org/10.11116/MTA.4.1.7
Reprint from MTA, Volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

purposes or motivated by deep aesthetic convictions, this otherwise masterly impression of inevitability in analysis can therefore become a double-edged sword.

Beach does not offer us a selective compilation of his teaching materials in fragmentary form, but a seamless and smoothly progressive seminar in two long parts: "Concepts and Terminology" and "Applications." In the course of five chapters, and following a brief introduction to basic Schenkerian premises such as melodic fluency and the *Stufe* (chapter 1), the first part examines musical units of increasingly larger proportions and formal complexity, beginning with antecedent-consequent phrases (chapter 2) and concluding with extensive ternary forms (chapter 5). In contradistinction to other Schenker textbooks, this ordering does not reflect the common typology of Schenker's content- and form-generating techniques. Rather, one is left with the impression that a subset of these techniques is introduced incidentally as they are encountered in the chosen examples (the relatively fundamental "auxiliary cadence" is defined no earlier than in the penultimate chapter, for instance). The momentous implication, and for a more theoretically inclined Schenkerian a somewhat provocative one, is that form emerges as a container for tonal content *prior* to that content. It is no longer a second-class citizen, a derivative of diminution, as Schenker's visionary if systematically problematic *Formenlehre* grapples to demonstrate. Meanwhile, bisecting this first part, chapter 3 makes a pithy detour to aspects of phrase rhythm— that is to say, the conjunction of phrase structure and hypermeter—focusing especially on several cases of phrase expansion, both external (e.g., extended upbeats and cadential extensions) and internal (by means of repetition, cadential evasion, parenthetical insertion, or composed-out deceleration).

Part 2 of the book ("Applications") moves on to entire movements. These range from simple Baroque forms (chapter 6) to sonata forms (chapters 8 and 9), which Beach analyzes both in terms of middleground prototypes (chapter 8) and in search of "hidden" motivic repetitions at multiple levels (chapter 9). The final chapter of the textbook is dedicated to the vocal music of Mozart, Schubert, Schumann, and Brahms. The "suggested assignments" concluding each chapter come with appropriately minimal and helpful guidance; they are also exemplarily answered in a downloadable instruction manual. But to describe this additional booklet as an extended endnote of sorts would not do it justice, for it is a nearly self-sufficient and highly valuable resource in its own right—a generous seventy-page transcription of Beach's analytical reasoning, rich in musical and pedagogic insights addressed to student and instructor alike.

Given that *Advanced Schenkerian Analysis* represents the distillation of decades of classroom practice, its cohesiveness is in itself an authorial feat. It is only the choice of examples on a few isolated occasions that might give the impression of lecture notes in disguise. Beach's Example 5.2, the opening of the *St. Anthony Chorale* (attributed to Haydn),

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

presents exactly the same measures as Schenker's Figures 42.2 and 138.3 in *Free Composition*, and the interpretations, tonal and hypermetric, are practically identical—undoubtedly a sound topic for classroom discussion, but a questionable one given the high premium demanded by page space. One might also be disappointed to find in chapter 1 yet another introductory discourse based on the First Prelude from Book I of Bach's *Well-Tempered Clavier*, and indeed via a reading which, like that of Allen Cadwallader and David Gagné,[5] does not depart from Schenker's own in the iconic *Five Graphic Analyses*.[6] The time seems ripe for considering alternative rituals of initiation into an analytical technique that is already suspected, justifiably or otherwise, of remaining confined within too narrow a repertoire, chronologically and stylistically. Among several more imaginative alternatives, for instance, there is no reason a simple song would not make at least as lucid, inspiring, and indeed instructive an introduction to Schenker as the canonical Bach Prelude, with "music and text relations" unabashedly harnessed—to transgress a contemporary taboo—as a "hermeneutic" impulse toward the Schenkerian interpretative experience. This is in fact how the late Steve Larson opens his tragically unfinished textbook.[7] Likewise, Tom Pankhurst's introductory gesture in *SchenkerGuide*, while not song based, has the laudable audacity to link Schenkerian theory at the outset, as a system of tonal signification, with more explicit questions of musical "meaning."[8]

Beach's *sprezzatura* is most immediately evident in his graphing style. Notation might seem like a somewhat fetishistic point of entry into an assessment of a music-analysis textbook. But to take Larson's "strict analytic notation" as an eloquent exemplar, each graphing technique promotes particular patterns of analytical reasoning and hearing, as well as work habits; and in this primarily pedagogic context, notation inevitably acquires a significance that exceeds its main communicative function. It is needless to stress that Beach's graphing is not lacking in concision, eloquence, and sharp focus on the musical argument at hand. But neither would it be unfair to trace in it an un-theoretical air of the experienced practitioner's nonchalance. His preference for lowercase roman numerals over thoroughbass notation for minor sonorities, to risk reading too much into a subtle feature, is not only uncommon in the Schenkerian literature but, arguably, also indicative of a tendency to minimize the analysis of the inner voices, as long as they are not *obbligato* or essential to the argument at hand.

---

5 Allen Clayton Cadwallader and David Gagné, *Analysis of Tonal Music: A Schenkerian Approach* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 56–62.

6 Ibid.; Heinrich Schenker, *Five Graphic Music Analyses (Fünf Urlinie-Tafeln)* (New York: Dover, 1969).

7 Larson's first chapter was posthumously published in draft form as Steve Larson, "Expressive Meaning and Musical Structure," chapter 1 of *Schenkerian Analysis: Pattern, Form, and Expressive Meaning*, *Music Theory Online* 18/3 (2012), http://mtosmt.org/issues/ mto.12.18.3/mto.12.18.3.larson.html.

8 Tom Pankhurst, *Schenkerguide: A Brief Handbook and Website for Schenkerian Analysis* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

More generally, Schenker would use the less sterile and more expressionistic word *Bilder* (images) for his graphs, and in accordance with that spirit Beach's graphing is devoid of formalism for its own sake. Different instructors will respond differently to this liberty. While by far most of his graphs are tight-knit, a few might appear somewhat underdetermined, at least at first glance. This can be an intentional strategy, as is the case for instance in his Example 1.8b, "an initial attempt at representing the voice leading." Indeed, such an incomplete graph imbues the analytical narrative with a lively sense of process and is a refreshing departure from the unfortunately widespread practice of describing the comprehensive analysis as a finished product. Yet at points like this the instructor might feel inclined to explicitly underline the intentional tentativeness of such notation, which runs counter to the fundamental principle stated by Beach himself on page 24: "The first principle to note—one that must always be observed—is that no note is left unattached. Every note is part of some larger unit, and these units are indicated by slurs."

In a few other cases, however, the *final* graph itself is so sparsely notated as to hinder the instant visualization of the rapport between levels. And in such cases, it imposes a demand on the readers to infer the hierarchical relationship between certain tones on the basis of either another more fully notated part (Example 10.8) or of the layering of roman numerals below the staff, or of a deeper-level graph of the same material (Example 7.13). Incidentally, a greater number of multi-level graphs, with their measures precisely aligned on the same page, would have been welcome. This is not only because such graphs encourage a sane analytical practice in general, but also because they are the most efficient way to indicate the tonal rhythm at deeper levels of structure, especially when Schenker's diagonal "displacements" are involved.[9] This is an especially relevant consideration given Beach's heightened attention in the textbook to phrase rhythm.

Beyond notation, Beach's *sprezzatura* is manifest in his Example 9.7 (mm. 40–44), reproduced here as Figure 1, where two strictly speaking contradictory prolongations are indicated simultaneously. In his prose, Beach elaborates on this uncommon condition (252) without any theoretical qualms or grand revisionist intentions. As long as the musical intuition invites such a local deviation from the sovereign hierarchy, it is implied, the constraint of well-formedness may exceptionally recede.

Even more striking is a transgressive feature in the analysis of Schubert's Impromptu in G-flat major, Op. 90 No. 3 (Beach's Example 7.17, reproduced below as Figure 2), where the melodic progression of an ascending fifth across mm. 9–12 is, on a closer and more tightly

9 Rothstein's commentary on the issue is pertinent; see William Rothstein, "Rhythm and the Theory of Structural Levels" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1981), 80.

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

Figure 1: Excerpt from Beach's analysis of Beethoven's Op. 110

Figure 2: Excerpt from Beach's analysis of Schubert's Impromptu, Op. 90 No. 3

hierarchical examination, only apparent, inasmuch as it conflicts against the reading of the bass. This appears to be indeed a genuine lapsus and not a typographical error because it propagates to the deeper middleground graph as well. But crucially, it is a "misreading" that eloquently captures an unmistakable musical intuition, swayed by the forceful if deceiving parallelism between mm. 63–64 and 65–66.

The present review is not the place for comparisons between alternative interpretations, of course. And instead of nitpicking about Beach's rare violations of strict syntax, the instructor might find in them the opportunity to encourage an analytical practice that grants the final say not to the codified rules of a tonal generative grammar, but to the well-educated intuition and to the particularity of the score—that is to say, to a practice more closely allied to Schenker's *Synthese*, which was gradually rigidified after *Der Tonwille*.

It is thus not so much doubt in the face of complexity as it is self-assurance that motivates Beach's freehand analytical outlines. And as has indeed been suggested in other, excellent reviews of this textbook, his tone of voice, while welcoming and far from

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

"authoritarian," tends to give the impression of a graphic etching-in-stone of immutable intuitions. It is of course all too common in Schenkerian scholarship for the prose to tautologically transcribe the content of graphs. In this case, though, the prose is not merely declarative. In all its persuasive and unpretentious *élan*, it acts as a rhetorical force masking more abstract theoretical considerations that could complicate or qualify the analyst's reasoning. This un-theoretical attitude, which in a more practical sphere could be taken as proof of sheer unmediated musicality, is characteristic of Beach's output in general. In an early article on the cadential 6/4 as support for $\hat{3}$ of the *Urlinie*, Beach claims to prefer a "context-driven" approach, one that depends on "what actually happens in the music," to a "theory-driven" approach, effectively suppressing the theoretical problematics of the issue, as Cadwallader suggests in a critical response.[10] And in a comparative study written before the publication of Beach's textbook, Matthew McDonald has suggested that "unlike [Matthew] Brown, who seeks to buttress the foundations of Schenkerian theory by re-establishing its basic principles, Beach seems to regard Schenkerian theory not only as without need of defense, but in fact barely deserving mention at all."[11]

Unsurprisingly then, Beach sustains the *élan* of his textbook by cutting down on technical jargon, and instructors seeking to circumnavigate Schenker's verbal thicket will appreciate the periphrastic and informal descriptions. But on occasion the terminological liberty is taken too far. "Cadence," for instance—a term that Schenker polemically resisted—is employed with significant license to include rather weak or even questionable closures. It is employed, to give a few examples, in the absence of a root-position dominant (44 and 296), or indeed with one that does appear in the foreground, but only within an overarching linear intervallic pattern and as a result of a rather coloristic "casting out" of the root (V) from the inner voices (18).

The same informal approach to analysis and its conceptual tool kit is represented in a number of chord series, which are unconvincingly termed incomplete "progressions" and smack of the roman-numeralism that Schenker discourages. Such an incomplete I–ii (lowercase) "progression" figures on p. 186, for instance, followed by a checkmark sign to indicate its premature termination; some would argue that it would instead suffice to speak of an "illusory key of the foreground" in that vicinity, a nuanced and authentic Schenkerian concept that is unfortunately avoided.[12] Even more insouciantly, in several

---

10 Allen Clayton Cadwallader, "More on Scale Degree Three and the Cadential Six-Four," *Journal of Music Theory* 36/1 (1992), 187, https://doi.org/10.2307/843914.

11 Matthew McDonald, "De-Composition? Schenker (and His Corpus) Today," *Music Analysis* 26/1–2 (2007), 219, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2249.2007.00254.x.

12 Carl Schachter, "Analysis by Key: Another Look at Modulation," in *Unfoldings*, ed. Joseph N. Straus (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 134–60.

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

examples (e.g., p. 265) Beach posits "parenthetical insertions" of material that is "a varied repetition" (Example 8.8) or a completion of a previously evaded cadential gesture on second attempt (Example 10.2). Left at that, these "insertions" risk leaving too much to be inferred by the student. Neither are they hypermetrical insertions proper (in the sense of measures that could be omitted without distortion to the phrase rhythm), nor does Beach raise the question of continuity: is the voice leading technically cut off from the preceding or following harmonies (in the sense of a Schenkerian interruption or a divider)?[13] In general, the instructor working through this book with theoretically inclined or detail-minded students will need to be prepared to address such issues.

This brings us to an assessment of the textbook's two major claims: namely, that it aims at an "advanced" level of instruction and, less explicitly stated, that its emphasis on phrase rhythm, motive, and form is original. Of course, borrowing John Rothgeb's two design criteria for the music-theory curriculum,[14] we might observe that Schenkerian analysis is less concrete and less autonomous a discipline compared to its prerequisite disciplines—pure counterpoint, harmony, figured bass—and in that sense always "advanced." One possible compass for understanding Beach's intentions is his own early study on Schenker pedagogy, a remarkable and indispensable guide for the instructor, and one that Beach, with characteristic self-effacement, avoids citing.[15] On the basis of the ideas in that study, in fact, the textbook appears aligned with his model of *intermediate*-level instruction—references to the secondary Schenkerian literature are characteristically scarce, for example—except that techniques of prolongation and graphic notation are now assumed to be familiar and no longer in need of systematic introduction. Of course, it is easy to make a straw man of the catchword "advanced" in a review of the book, even though at least one other commentator has also found its appearance in the title hyperbolic.[16] But I wish to dwell on that word nonetheless, not least because it pulls a thread that is as pedagogically pertinent as it is inconspicuous: the subtle distinction between advanced *theorizing* and theorizing on advanced *repertoire*. Indeed, Beach clarifies at the outset (p. 28) that "advanced" in this instance refers to his chosen musical material—to passages, that is, of increasing harmonic richness and formal proportions, enabling a richer comprehension of the potential of the analytical approach.

---

13 Berry voices a similar concern in his own review of the book; see David Carson Berry, review of David Beach, *Advanced Schenkerian Analysis: Perspectives on Phrase Rhythm, Motive, and Form*, *Intégral* 26 (2012), 170.

14 John Rothgeb, "Schenkerian Theory: Its Implications for the Undergraduate Curriculum," *Music Theory Spectrum* 3 (1981), 142–49, https://doi.org/10.1525/mts.1981.3.1.02a00100.

15 David W. Beach, "Schenker's Theory: A Pedagogical View," in *Aspects of Schenkerian Theory*, ed. David W. Beach (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983), 1–38.

16 Berry, review of Beach, *Advanced Schenkerian Analysis*, 160.

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

At the same time, some readers might find this understanding of the contentious adjective too narrow. They might be disappointed to discover that the textbook remains within a range of rich, eloquent, and beautiful but ultimately unproblematic examples. In all fairness, Felix Salzer's *Structural Hearing* was the first and last book-length work—a textbook, it is worth recalling—to simultaneously advocate Schenkerian analysis *and* put it through its paces by applying it, for example, to the apparent "simplicity" of Dunstable's medieval chansons or to Monteverdi's madrigals.[17] The anxiety of this opposition between the "complex" (repertoire) and the "complicated" (theory) may be discerned between the lines of Beach's aforementioned study on pedagogy: "In some respects the teaching of Schenker analysis at the intermediate and advanced levels is easier than at the introductory stage. Later it can be assumed that the students are acquainted with the important concepts and terminology."[18] It is indeed a testament to the tremendous subtlety of the aesthetics of organicism that these "concepts and terminology" that Beach feels entitled to take for granted at the "advanced" level can be especially challenging and problematic when applied to the "simplest" of materials (a rudimentary Czerny exercise, for instance).[19]

That Beach himself is aware of this non-linear complexity of Schenkerian pedagogy is manifest in his perceptive and unconventional decision to discuss Classical interrupted forms (chapter 5) before uninterrupted Baroque forms (chapter 6).[20] What he is not willing to acknowledge, even implicitly, is an entire range of genuinely advanced issues at the intersection of theory and analysis—a missed opportunity for us readers, perhaps, given the magnitude of his experience. (Remarkably, he cites only two [!] of his own studies from no less than four decades of highly influential and prolific output.)

It is of course a common pitfall for a reviewer to judge a book by what it is not. And I must confess that I am susceptible to frustrated fantasies of an unabashedly advanced Schenker textbook that would widen the scope of the standard pedagogic agenda. Such a textbook could cover, to cherry-pick only a tiny number of possible topics, the difficulties posed by "naked" motivic repetition (as in ostinatos), the Schenkerian analysis of invertible counterpoint in fugue (a form conspicuously absent from Schenker textbooks), the textural inferences necessitated in analyzing *Fortspinnungstypus* materials or free fantasias, the recalcitrance of harmonic oscillation to hierarchical hearing, directionality and dual-

17 Felix Salzer, *Structural Hearing: Tonal Coherence in Music*, 2 vols. (New York: Dover, 1962).

18 Beach, "Schenker's Theory," 29.

19 Czerny comes to mind thanks to the relevant article of Richard Littlefield and David Neumeyer, "Rewriting Schenker: Narrative-History-Ideology," *Music Theory Spectrum* 14/1 (1992), 38–65, https://doi.org/10.1525/mts.1992.14.1.02a00030.

20 Kraus has pointed out this idiosyncratic ordering in his own review of the book. See Joseph Kraus, review of David Beach, *Advanced Schenkerian Analysis: Perspectives on Phrase Rhythm, Motive, and Form*, *Music Theory Online* 20/4 (2014), 159–97, http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.14.20.4/mto.14.20.4.kraus.php.

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

Figure 3: One of Schenker's patterns of unfolding (*Ausfaltung*), extracted from *Free Composition*

key movements, complicated distinctions between *obbligato* and filler voices, or even a "model analysis" of a highly chromatic piece on the threshold of common-practice tonality.

Not all of my unfulfilled expectations are so fanciful, though. Surprisingly, for instance, nowhere does Beach mention the crucial distinction between "leading" and "following" linear progressions, despite several opportunities to do so in his chosen examples. This is a momentous omission, as his Example 6.10 illustrates. The graph indicates, and the prose confirms, an upper-voice fifth-progression from the third (G♯) to the seventh degree (D♯), even though that interval is unrelated (dissonant) with both the tonic harmony at the origin and the dominant harmony at the destination. It would be more accurate to identify this "fifth" as subordinate to a genuine linear progression, in parallel motion from E to B. To give another example, a striking case of overlapping spans in Mozart's K. 280 Sonata (Example 8.8), via what Napthali Wagner has termed "alternate unfolding,"[21] is discussed as if it were an exclusive feature of the movement, rather than being identified as an instantiation of a fascinating and somewhat puzzling type of Schenkerian unfolding (Figure 3 of *Free Composition*, reproduced here as Figure 3). Neither does Beach find it necessary to point out the "double voice exchange" (between first and third as well as between second and fourth chords) that here, as is typically the case, gives rise to this phenomenon. Instead he simply invites his reader to ruminate on those intriguing measures—"think about it."

To state the overarching concern directly, then, can an advanced-level Schenker course be so un-theoretical? In pondering this question, we might heed Jonathan Dunsby's words: "What students need from a textbook, whether or not it is cloaked as research-informed, is guidance on ways to do things, not ways to worry about philosophical or indeed pedagogical issues."[22] But taken on face value, this judicious remark does not

21 Napthali Wagner, "No Crossing Branches? The Overlapping Technique in Schenkerian Analysis," *Theory and Practice* 20 (1995), 149–75; the issue is also addressed in Adam Ricci, "Non-Coinciding Sequences," *Music Theory Spectrum* 33/2 (2011), https://doi.org/10.1525/mts.2011.33.2.124.

22 Jonathan Dunsby, "The Idea and Value of 'Book': A Comparative Review of *Sound in Motion: A Performer's Guide to Greater Musical Expression* by David Mcgill and *Deepening Musical Performance Through Movement: The Theory and Practice of Embodied Interpretation* by Alexandra Pierce," *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy* 23 (2009), 17.

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

necessitate that such guidance be entirely example based to the exclusion of the systematic reconstruction or "explicitation" (to borrow a term from linguistics) of the master analyst's creative art. It remains true, of course, that an *approach* (not quite a method) like Schenker's is still taught mostly by osmosis—some of the finest Schenker pedagogues still ask their beginning students to copy model graphs by hand. Like Castiglione's iconic courtier, who acquires his own *sprezzatura* by faithfully imitating the best practices of his master, Beach invites his reader to a traditional Schenkerian pedagogy, one that relies on rote, imitation, and extrapolation.

Yet the dialectics at work are crucial: what enables such an inductive pedagogy in the classroom is precisely its more or less *systematic* traversal of Schenker's repertoire of voice-leading transformations via progressive practical exercises. Beach's textbook, however, departs from this conventional "red thread" in favor of three dimensions that belong less in the sphere of craftsmanship and more in that of contemplation. Hidden repetition, phrase rhythm, and form are inherently more abstract than the basic materials of tonal music—counterpoint, harmony, and figured bass—that are instead emphasized in the more conventional pedagogic narrative. And at the heart of this revisionist project therefore lurks the threat of a certain mismatch, or at least a tension that the instructor may welcome as a challenge, between form ("textbook") and content.

Beach's triple claim to originality is a bold gesture in any case. While his textbook is no longer the only pedagogic text to emphasize phrase rhythm—Carl Schachter's more recent *Art of Tonal Analysis* includes a thirty-five-page chapter (or "lesson") titled "Rhythm, Hypermeter, and Phrase"[23]—such a level of attention to hypermeter is indeed novel and welcome. In line with points raised earlier in this review, some readers might wish that the terminology on phrase expansion were defined more thoroughly and explicitly, perhaps even presented in the schematic or tabular format that students have now come to expect in textbooks. That said, it is difficult to imagine a pithier, more substantial yet readable introduction to the key concepts of phrase rhythm than the one offered here (61ff.). Others might wish that Beach had more emphatically distinguished phrase length and hypermeter, of which only the latter is periodic.[24] While he does clarify that hypermeter is "the regular recurrence of strong and weak measures, most frequently in multiples of two" (136), this fleeting statement is the only word that I could find on this distinction. It is also important to note that Beach's analyses are limited to hyperbeats at the one-measure level, with higher levels of pulses not discussed.

---

23 Carl Schachter, *The Art of Tonal Analysis: Twelve Lessons in Schenkerian Theory*, ed. Joseph N. Straus (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2016, https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190227395.003.0010).

24 Rothstein, "Rhythm and the Theory of Structural Levels," 77–91.

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

In general, his discussion of phrase expansion is in line with his seductively untheoretical but potentially perilous nonchalance. His analysis of the second movement of Schubert's "Trout" Quintet, for example, indicates an expansion from four to five measures even though the passage features as many middleground elements as there are measures (namely three measures to accommodate a descending third). This does not qualify as an expansion in the strict Schenkerian sense, and while Beach does acknowledge his terminological license in a footnote, he does not quite justify it. The same liberty is taken earlier in his analysis of the first movement of Mozart's K. 310.

Beach's emphasis on phrase rhythm is not coincidental, as one might expect, with a corresponding emphasis on rhythmic reduction or the issue of "rhythmic normalization,"[25] which clarifies the relationship between tonal structure and tonal rhythm. Without any doubt, the rhythmic reasoning is sophisticated and thorough; if there is room for a valid objection here, it is that so much of it remains tacit. On page 18, to give a representative example, Beach draws a distinction between slurs that *delay* and *lead to* a higher-level tone (for example, from a preceding incomplete neighbor) and slurs that *prolong* and *depart from* a higher-level tone. Beach's advice is very well taken, especially when, from the standpoint of well-formedness, the two relationships are not mutually exclusive. Yet he seems to relegate the final decision to *ad hoc* reasoning, missing the opportunity to reap the rewards of a more generalizable formulation in terms of species counterpoint and rhythmic normalization (or imaginary continuo). He understates, that is to say, the essential nature of the problem, which is as rhythmic as it is tonal. In their own textbook, by comparison, Forte and Gilbert allocate an entire inset on the matter under the prominent title "Cautionary note #2" (from which the indicative Figure 4 is reproduced below).[26]

As for hidden motivic repetition, Beach admits to a "fascination" with the phenomenon, and most Schenkerian analysts will readily sympathize. Although his emphasis on the matter is only as strong as that of other textbook authors— and therefore his claim to originality less convincing here than in the domain of phrase rhythm—the motivic findings in his analyses are delightfully revelatory and replete with insight. Still, this is an area in which the letter of Schenkerian theory and Schenker's own practice come into conflict. And one might be troubled by Beach's apparent disregard for Schenker's *Satzprobe*,

25 William Rothstein, "Rhythmic Displacement and Rhythmic Normalization," in *Trends in Schenkerian Research*, ed. Allen Clayton Cadwallader (New York: Schirmer, 1979), 87–114.

26 Allen Forte and Steven E. Gilbert, *Instructor's Manual for Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1982), Example 13.

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

Figure 4: Slurs "from" and slurs "to," reproduced from Allen Forte and Steven E. Gilbert, *Instructor's Manual for Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1982), Example 13

translated by Richard Cohn as the "test of the whole,"[27] which stipulates that a motive is genuine only when the entire diminutional pattern is repeated alongside the intervallic content—that is, only when the motive is an incidental side effect of the composing-out. As is well-known, this constraint is very strict and in practice ignored by most analysts.[28] My concern is not that Beach departs from the *Satzprobe*, but that he does not acknowledge those departures, which Cadwallader and Gagné describe as "non-structural motives."[29]

Beach's third and final claim to originality is considerably stronger, and it does not hinge on any vague allegations of "neglect" of outer form in other Schenker textbooks. Beach's formal sensibilities rather take the shape of a precise separation between design, form proper, and tonal structure. This classification enables fine and unambiguous distinctions: a movement that, by virtue of its repeat markings, is commonly referred to as a "rounded binary" form (‖:A:‖:BA:‖) is also, from a Schenkerian perspective, a ternary design (ABA) with a binary structure (AB\\A). Unconcerned with the repeat marks, the structure is "binary" because of the interruption, which allows the *Ursatz* to close only

27 Richard Cohn, "The Autonomy of Motives in Schenkerian Accounts of Tonal Music," *Music Theory Spectrum* 14/2 (1992), 153, https://doi.org/10.1525/mts.1992.14.2.02a00020.

28 The debate between John Rothgeb and Carl Schachter in Schubert's Op. 94 No. 1 is characteristic ("Another View on Schubert's Moment Musical, Op. 94/1," *Journal of Music Theory* 13/1 [1969], 128–39, https://doi.org/10.2307/843217).

29 Allen Clayton Cadwallader and David Gagné, *Analysis of Tonal Music: A Schenkerian Approach*, 3rd ed. (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 217–18.

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

on second attempt. In principle therefore, to briefly reconstruct Beach's formulation, there are three pertinent points of articulation: the repeat mark (hence "rounded *binary* form"), the moment of interruption at the very end of the middle section (resulting in a "binary structure"), and the onset of the recapitulation (hence "*rounded* binary form" and "*ternary* design"). While the value of this initially dizzying taxonomy, which attempts to settle a long-standing terminological problem, may be more evident to the seasoned analyst than to the beginning student, its clarity in communicating ideas is strongly welcome, especially at a time of methodological pluralism, in which form-theoretical and Schenkerian discourses are routinely combined. The reader will also find Beach's Figures 5.1–5.4 particularly helpful and eloquent, as they summarize these distinctions with succinct diagrams.

While practitioners of William Caplin's theory will feel, a few debatable theme classifications aside, on familiar ground, readers inclined toward Hepokoski and Darcy's work might find sonata-theoretical concepts conspicuously absent. Yet in several ways, Beach's Schenkerian approach resonates strongly with Hepokoski and Darcy's. The point of departure for his two chapters on the sonata principle is a set of middleground "structural prototypes" (Example 8.1) in reference to which the sonata zones may be easily located; these prototypes are similar with the sonata voice-leading patterns that Cadwallader and Gagné provide, in a less synoptic view, in their chapter 12. Of course, Beach's project would ideally be served by a coverage of form theory (or theories) in greater depth. That this tall order is not filled cannot be grounds for criticism— textbook space and scope are far too limited—but might be taken on by the instructor as an opportunity to branch out into the area with supplementary material and follow-up.

The intersection of Schenkerism with form theory is always a delicate affair, for intrinsic and institutional reasons alike, and Beach's tone is remarkably balanced, in line with the pluralism of contemporary scholarly discourse. Yet against the grain of this *Zeitgeist*, I wonder whether the waning of Schenkerism's original polemics, for all the undeniable merits of scholarly dispassion, always maximizes the musical payoff. After all, in opposition to the perceptual immediacy of form-theoretical concepts, a degree of sheer faith is still essential if the deeper levels of a large-scale work—the "drama of the *Ursatz*," to borrow Schachter's words borrowed from Schenker[30]—are to be fully experienced. The rhetorical playing ground between the two music-analytical discourses therefore cannot be level. As Beach explains in his introduction, what interests him with regard to form is "the clear dichotomy between Schenker's conception of form and that expressed in traditional

30 Carl Schachter, "Structure as Foreground: 'Das Drama des Ursatzes,'" in *Schenker Studies* 2, ed. Carl Schachter and Hedi Siegel (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511470295.016), 298–314.

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press

texts on the subject, like William Caplin's" (vii). It is, however, a *reconciliation* at least as much as a dichotomy that emerges from this textbook, and it is ceded more by Schenker than the other way around. This is largely the result of Beach's even-handed judgment: in the end, his position along the spectrum between, say, Charles Smith, who considers form as "essentially synonymous with structure,"[31] and Peter Smith's "dimensional counterpoint,"[32] whereby form and structure are in principle independent, remains unclear. Not that it matters, but Schenker would cringe at an inclusive egalitarianism between form and structure. It would of course be unreasonable to demand that a textbook dwell in the fundamental aporias of Schenker's *Formenlehre*. My point is instead that, if form theory enjoys the advantage of reigning in the sphere of musical common sense and its immediacy, then Schenker's tonal structure derives much of its power from its potential to stage a *revelation*—a productive opposition that an entirely nonpartisan discourse risks neutralizing, to the benefit of diversity but perhaps not always to that of an analysis-based musical criticism.

It is a privilege finally, after four decades of important articles, to have access to a book-length document of David Beach's analytical and pedagogic acumen.[33] The reader who values musicality and analytical insight above formal rigor will keep returning to this book with admiration, gratitude, and enduring enthusiasm.

YANNIS RAMMOS

About the author

Yannis Rammos has appeared as pianist across Europe and in the United States. Formerly a visiting scholar in the Theory Department of the Sibelius Academy and resident at the A. Glazunov State Conservatory, he recently completed a Ph. D. at New York University—where he also served on the adjunct piano faculty—with a dissertation convolving Schenkerian analysis and Roland Barthes's textuality. He studied tonal analysis extensively at the CUNY Graduate Center. In addition to writing on Schenker and post-war critical theory, he has published on curriculum development in higher education. His current research focuses on analysis-informed instrumental training.

31 Charles J. Smith, "Musical Form and Fundamental Structure: An Investigation of Schenker's *Formenlehre*," *Music Analysis* 15/2–3 (1996), 279, https://doi.org/10.2307/854065.

32 Peter H. Smith, *Expressive Forms in Brahms's Instrumental Music's Instrumental Music: Structure and Expression in His "Werther" Quartet* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 31.

33 All the qualities and features of Beach's approach are manifest just as eloquently, but with a subdued pedagogic impulse, in his monograph *Aspects of Unity in J. S. Bach's Partitas and Suites: An Analytical Study* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2005).

Reprint from MTA, volume 4.1 – © Leuven University Press