

Journal of Music Theory over the Years

Content Analysis of the Articles and Related Aspects

Yosef Goldenberg

Abstract Bibliometric tools and especially content analysis of all 393 articles published in *Journal of Music Theory* (up to issue 48/1) help to investigate the development of the content of this journal. The articles were classified according to their type, the theoretical aspect, the period of repertoire discussed, and major composers or theorists they were devoted to. Among the major findings, one can trace in a precise manner the centripetal process toward focus on Schenkerian and set theories (and the more recent opposite process), the almost total separation of discussions of tonal and posttonal music, the more recent inclusion of neo-Riemannian theory, the para-academic nature of some earlier areas of interest, the correlation between an established method and the repertoire discussed, the general solid focus on hard-core theory with very few glimpses to interdisciplinary studies, and the slow and partial change that involves metatheoretical approaches. Other aspects include the growth of the journal, its importance, and its editors and contributors.

Introduction

CELEBRATING THE JUBILEE of *Journal of Music Theory* (henceforth: *JMT*) offers a good opportunity for retrospective investigation of the fairly large body of research in music theory this journal has published over almost fifty years.¹ Whereas anniversary issues often include surveys of the “state of the art” with personal flavor and occasional reminiscences (e.g., Dunsby 2002 in the twentieth-anniversary issue of *Music Analysis*) or reveal editorial secrets (e.g., Hatch 2005 in the fortieth-anniversary issue of *Current Musicology*), my aim here is to study the entire corpus of articles in *JMT* using a more systematic method.

While preparing this study, I had no access to informal material concerning the history of *JMT*, such as inner controversies among members of the editorial board, unfulfilled ideas, material unaccepted for publication, or the editing process of accepted articles. Rather, the methods of the present study are drawn from bibliometrics, a field in the discipline of library science, which makes a “quantitative analysis of the bibliographic feature of a body of literature.”²

¹ The material investigated in this essay ends with issue 48/1, the latest issue to appear until April 2007. Unless otherwise stated, all database searches were made during April 2007.

² For a recent survey of bibliometrics, its definitions, and its differences from scientometrics and infometrics (or informetrics), see Hood and Wilson 2001.

Bibliographic and Bibliometric Tools for the Examination of *JMT*

Bibliographic and full-text databases. *JMT* is indexed in *International Index of Music Periodicals (IIMP)*, *RILM Abstracts of Music Literature* (since 1967), and *Music Index* (since 1975). Only *IIMP* goes back to 1957, and even it lacks abstracts and indication of document types for *JMT* items up to volume 38.³ *RILM* entries include articles alone (reviews are indexed only under the reviewed item).⁴ *Music Index* aims at a more comprehensive indexing, including references to separate works discussed in a single article. This has been done sometimes by separate indexing of each reference; in the most extreme case, a single article (Clarkson 1984) is indexed in *Music Index* sixteen times. Since other items are indexed with multiple keywords under a single bibliographic record, and yet other items lack comprehensive indexing, this inconsistent indexing policy prevents any significant results of counting items in that database. Other problems in the indexes include insufficient indication of document types and simple indexing errors.⁵

JSTOR provides searchable full-text access to all issues of *JMT* until “the moving wall,” which stood by April 2007 on volume 45/2 (inclusive). The 1,186 *JMT* items in *JSTOR* include 489 whose type is indicated as “article” (the other options being review/editorial/other), but some of them are not really articles: six of thirteen letters to the editor are indexed as “articles,” as well as most items from the short forums in the early issues of *JMT* (see below). Searches in *JSTOR* provide some general statistical sense, as one may count the documents that result for a certain query, but there is no way to count the appearances of a certain word in a document.

3 In *IIMP*, the articles are indicated with document type “research and analysis.” Among 773 *JMT* items, 620 appear when the search asks to “exclude reviews,” but these results do include reviews before the document type was in fact indexed. By April 2007, *IIMP* is updated only to issue 44/1. It does not skip any previous article.

4 Out of 340 *JMT* entries in *RILM*, 334 have “document type” = “Article-in-a-periodical.” The exceptional six items include the Neo-Riemannian issue 42/2, which receives an additional record as “Book-entire-periodical,” and several reviews, whose inclusion in *RILM* forms an exception in the indexing policy of that database: one is indicated as “review-of-facsimile” (Fowler 1978), three as “Review-of-book” (Godzich 1978, Morris 1982, and Walters 1982 [that actually reviews facsimiles]), and one “Review-of-translation” (Atkinson 1980). *RILM* also indexes several exceptional items that it indicates as articles, such as the conference report Browne 1995.

5 *Music Index* includes 833 entries for *JMT* items, among which 594 are indicated as articles in their “publication type.” There are 236 entries that appear as “printed material review,” but 124 reviews are indexed as “publication type = article.” The remaining three items are two obituaries—Forte et al. 1977 on Oster and Yeston 1980 on Waite (another obituary, Burkhart 1997 on Krahenbuehl, is listed as an “article”)—and one item (Strunk 1999) that is erroneously indicated as “performance.” In *RILM*, errors are less numerous (but the coverage is more partial). Smoliar 1976 has duplicate indexing in *RILM*.

An important searching tip in both *RILM* and *Music Index* is to exclude items from *Dutch Journal of Music Theory* (= *Tijdschrift voor Muziektheorie*) and *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy*. In principle, this should be done by searching for *JMT*’s ISSN (0022-2909). However, in *RILM* this only gives the 163 records that appear under the journal name “Journal-of-music-theory,” which is used for vols. 11–12 and from vol. 33 forward (search performed on April 7, 2007). The 177 records from vols. 13–32 appear without ISSN and under the journal name “Journal-of-music-theory-USA.”

Of course, neither *JSTOR* nor the bibliographic databases were designed especially in order to enable statistical examination of journal articles. For that purpose, queries in existing tools may be useful to a limited extent only.

Citation analysis and content analysis. Much of the field of bibliometrics is engaged with statistical analysis of little pieces of data (e.g., citations) where each single item has little importance. Citation analysis looks attractive for its apparent ability to measure the academic significance of authors and journals objectively. This method is the basis for the statistical tool *Journal Citation Reports* (*JCR*), which exists for science and the social sciences only.⁶ Another tool by the Institute of Scientific Information (ISI, currently known as Thomson Scientific), *Web of Science* (*WOS*), searches for citations of existing articles and also includes *Arts and Humanities Citation Index* since 1975 (science and social sciences indices exist since 1965). Thus, *JMT* articles appear as records in *WOS* since 1975, but *WOS* also indexes citations of earlier items cited since 1975, or items cited in science or social sciences journals since 1965. For each record it indexes the cited references and its own citations.⁷

“Cited Ref Search” in *WOS* offers some very general insights: the most cited article in *JMT* is Lerdahl and Jackendoff 1977, cited sixty-two times; only thirteen articles are cited more than thirty times; twenty-six articles are cited more than twenty times; and seventy-four articles more than ten times.⁸ *JMT* articles (as defined in this study; see below) are cited 2,309 times in total.⁹

However, *WOS* also has severe limitations. The database is incomplete and does not include pertinent journals such as *Theory and Practice* and *Integral*, and it never searches for citations in books. Also, *WOS* does not deal well with journals without a separate reference list. The indexing of cited references in *JMT* since 1975 until this journal had separate lists of works cited

6 The social sciences edition of *JCR* includes some music journals: *Computer Music Journal*, *Journal of Music Therapy*, *Journal of Research in Music Education*, and *Music Perception*, as well as *Acustica*, *Acta Acustica*, and *Journal of the American Acoustical Society*. The science edition of *JCR* includes *Computer Music Journal*, the acoustical items, and *Journal of New Music Research*. *JCR* includes various factors and can measure the success of specific authors and journals, the average number of citations per item, impact factor, and the age of the median citation

7 *WOS* found 171 citations of *JMT* in science journals, 209 in social sciences journals, and 305 together (seventy-five citations appear in journals that are indexed in both editions). An ordinary search for *JMT* items in the nonhumanities editions of *WOS* should provide no results, but a single *JMT* article (Polansky and Bassein 1992) is selectively (and probably by error) indexed in the social sciences edition.

8 Although it is possible to automatically sort the “cited ref search” results by times cited, the outcome is misleading. Not only are all citations of pre-1975 articles, which have no

independent records in *WOS*, absent from such a search, all inexact citations are absent too (approximately 15 percent of the entire population of citations). For example, out of the sixty-two citations of Lerdahl and Jackendoff 1977, only forty-eight appear under the correct record. In that search, Tenney and Polansky 1980 arrive at first place with forty-nine citations (with only three incorrect citations). Inexact citations include references to incorrect page numbers and to variants of author names, which are very common when authors have middle names. *WOS* itself advises one to look for variants. Occasionally, errors occur as when Dahlhaus 1975 has a record cited ten times, but since it is indexed under journal abbreviation “J MUSIC THEORY SPR” instead of “J MUSIC THEORY,” the Cited Ref Search offers only four inexact citations of that article.

9 This information is not available from *WOS* alone. It does not include citations of reviews. *WOS* includes 257 records of articles and 509 records of all types from *JMT* (since 1975), many of which are never cited in the sources *WOS* indexes.

(since 1990, vol. 34) is only selective, and some items misleadingly appear with “cited references: 0” (e.g., Clough 1979).¹⁰

Citation analysis has also general shortcomings. The most cited item from *JMT*, after all, is mostly included in the authors’ later book (Lerdahl and Jackendoff 1983), and thus to a certain extent its importance is diminished. No automatic tool indicates which items were later included in books, or whether some material in the articles is unique and does not appear in the later book,¹¹ or (in other cases) in a possibly earlier Ph.D. dissertation.¹² More importantly, statistical data analysis cannot differentiate between various roles of citations and does not give sufficient weight to those citations that are drawn upon more extensively. Deeper understanding of the development of a field requires analysis of the content itself, inasmuch as this is possible for large amounts of articles. Such studies are quite rare, no doubt due to the larger effort they require and to the lack of automatic assistance.

Content analysis in particular requires professional knowledge in the analyzed field. It seems to have been applied to music research only in the field of music education: Yarbrough (1984, 2002) studied research methodologies in *Journal of Research in Music Education*, and Schmidt and Zdzinski (1993) analyzed the content of the twenty-six most cited descriptive or experimental articles from six journals in music education. In other bibliometrical studies on music education and therapy, Standley (1984) identified the most productive authors and institutions as well as the most cited authors in three music education/therapy journals; Brittin and Standley (1997) studied scholar eminence in the field; Hamann and Lucas (1998) studied journal eminence in the field via analysis of all citations in six journals during a six-year period (1990–95); and Gold and Rolvsjord (2006) studied citations of *Nordic Journal of Music Therapy*.

In probably the only bibliometric study of noneducation music journals, Longyear (1977) has studied article citations and “obsolescence” in six music journals in the period 1973–75 (*Acta Musicologica*, *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, *Music and Letters*, *Musica Disciplina*, *Musical Quarterly*, and *Music Review*). None of these journals is devoted to theory, although most of them include occasional theoretical items. Longyear has studied the frequency of journal article by period, percentages of English and foreign-language citations by journal, inter citations among the six journals, and journal citations by

¹⁰ In vols. 10–16, some articles had separate lists of references. Unlike today’s author-date system, these references were usually based on acronyms of cited titles. See, for example, Rothgeb 1966.

¹¹ From Lerdahl and Jackendoff 1977, the most prominent material to remain outside the 1983 book is a complete analysis of Schumann’s “Wehmut” from *Liederkreis*, op. 39. The balance in such cases varies from author to author. For example, Lambert’s 1997 book on Ives incorporates most of the ideas of Lambert’s 1990 *JMT* article, but several of

the article examples were not reproduced in the book. Lambert’s other *JMT* Ives article (1993) does not even appear in the book’s bibliography.

¹² When articles are based on chapters of Ph.D. dissertations, their publication often serves as substitutes for publishing the dissertations in a book format. For a *JMT* article based on a doctoral dissertation, see Hook 2002, which “represents a considerable condensation of chapters 1–6 of the author’s dissertation” (119).

decade or period. The practical conclusion of the last aspect was that it would be undesirable to weed out these periodicals.

Studies more similar to the present undertaking were applied to the field of bibliometrics itself, examining the journals *JASIS* (*Journal of the American Society for Information Science*) (Lipetz 1999) and *Scientometrics* (Schoepflin and Glanzel 2001). These studies examined only selected issues: one volume from each decade of *JASIS* and three sample years of *Scientometrics*. The limited size of the samples decreases the reliability of the entire projects: there is a danger that the sampled issues are not representative; single exceptional items might have too large an influence on the image of entire fields; the variety of aspects in the field is not sufficiently present in any single volume; editorial policy might bring together articles with a common approach even when specific issues are not intended to be special issues devoted to a single topic; and overly large gaps of time between the selected issues might prevent thorough explanation of the processes of change over time. Small samples may perhaps be tolerated for journals in library and information science, where each volume includes many issues and each issue includes many short items, but not for a humanities biannual publication with few articles per issue, like *JMT*.

The Database of the Present Study

This study is based on an independent database of the entire population of articles in *JMT* up to issue 48/1 (the last issue to appear by April 2007), produced in Microsoft Access. The completeness of the database is exceptional in studies of content analysis of all disciplines.

The database includes all 393 articles *JMT* published until issue 48/1 (inclusive). Other types of documents, such as book reviews, forums, and letters to the editor, are assumed to have a less significant impact than the articles themselves and have been excluded from the studied body of literature. The price of this decision is leaving some classical items outside the corpus. For example, Travis 1959 is included in the database, but the reply by Oster (1960), “a classic in the polemics of music theory” (Rothstein 1986, 12 [1990, 200]), is not.

The source for counting published items as articles was their indication as articles in the issue’s table of contents, either explicitly (until vol. 19) or by putting them directly under the heading “contents” (since vol. 20, with two exceptions).¹³ This results in a set that is similar but not identical to the corpus of articles found in *JSTOR* and *RILM*. Occasionally it is not clear-cut as to whether a document should count as an “article” or not. In one issue (43/1 [1999]) the table of contents contained no indication of document types. More importantly, the tables of contents over the years were inconsistent:

¹³ Issue 41/2 indicated “articles” in the table of contents since they were preceded by an obituary. Issue 42/1 again indicated “articles,” although nothing preceded them, prob-

ably copying the format of the table of contents from the previous issue.

- (1) Four responses to former articles appear among the articles (and two more “responses” [Rothgeb 1969; Schachter 1969] are actually part of analysis symposia; see below). Among these, two (Friedmann 1987; Straus 1997a) are very short and do not differ essentially from other responses appearing under the category “forum” (e.g., Lerdahl and Jackendoff’s 1985 reply to their reviewers Peel and Slawson [1984], and the reviewers’ reply [Peel and Slawson 1985]) or as letters to the editor (Bernard [1991] responding to a review [Marvin 1990] of a book of his). On the other hand, one reply article is indeed a full-length independent article: Beach 1988, which responds to an article in another journal (Neumeyer 1987). One more fully independent article (Larson 1997) responds to a much earlier article (Straus 1987). When Straus (1997a) and Lerdahl (1997) respond to Larson 1997, the result is a kind of “forum” ten years after the original article appeared.
- (2) Twice, the hybrid format of a “review article” is listed in the table of contents as a separate category (Berger 1994, Scotto 2002). One more “article/review” (Morgan 1999) is described thus in its title. It appeared in issue 43/1, whose content lacked division into document types. (These three items are excluded from my database). Some additional reviews relate to more than one book (e.g., Clarkson 1968), thus representing essentially the same type of document; Tischler 1982 was designed as a review of both one article and one letter to the editor in other journals (Treitler 1979; Sanders 1980) but was alone in occupying the category of “theory forum” (compare below).
- (3) *JMT* occasionally included analysis symposia (eight in total, discussed below). The four earlier ones (in vols. 10, 12, 13, and 15) were listed as a single entry by two or three authors, although in fact each contributor worked alone. The fifth symposium included two contributions listed as one entry in volume 18 and an additional contribution in volume 19. This gives three items in total that appear in the table of contents as two entries. Later symposia (in vols. 22, 27, and 43) are counted more correctly as separate articles. Together, the eight symposia consist of twenty-three articles but appear as sixteen entries in the table of contents.
- (4) One pedagogy forum was listed among the articles (McGaughey et al. 1974). This explains the exceptional feature of having eight authors for one item. Similar items appeared as a “forum,” especially in the journal’s early years.¹⁴

¹⁴ *RILM* and *IIMP* index the pedagogy forum as seven separate entries (the last entry is by two coauthors), and so it also appears in *JSTOR. Music Index* does not cover 1974.

- (5) Three articles (excluding the symposia) were divided into two or, in one case, four parts (in separate, not necessarily consecutive, issues): Lenneberg 1958a, 1958b; Daniels 1965a, 1965b; Meyers 1964a, 1964b, 1966, 1967. Another article (Fay 1974) is presented as a “companion” to a former article (Fay 1971). I have counted each part separately.

Several of these problems could be corrected by adjusting the borders of the examined corpus, but I found it preferable to adhere to an objective criterion for inclusion in the studied population (i.e., the table of contents), in order not to open the Pandora’s box of selecting items for the database. Although statistical calculations are slightly inflected by the inconsistency in the status of symposia, their rate in the general population of articles is low and the statistical effect is thus marginal.

Classification of Articles

The database classifies each of the 393 articles in *JMT* according to several parameters. These include the following, in addition to practical indications such as volume and issue location, author identification, and number of pages:

(1) *Type of article.* Only 351 out of the 393 items that are listed among the articles in *JMT*’s tables of contents are actually articles in the accepted sense. I have called these “essays,” a subclass of the general category “article.” Articles that are not essays include bibliographies, translations, reports, responses, and analysis symposia.

(2) *The theoretical aspect.* This field in the database combines the theoretical approach (e.g., metatheory, history of theory) with the subject matter (e.g., contour theory, set theory). Although the phenomenological status of the entries in this field is somewhat heterogeneous, the various aspects are too interdependent to enable splitting the field. For example, Schenkerian theory can be viewed as both a branch of music theory and a system of looking at harmony and voice leading. I permitted every article to possess up to three aspects (519 aspect/subject records for 393 articles). This procedure has the disadvantage of creating more statistical weight for multivalent articles but is necessary in order to describe faithfully articles with multiple methods, especially articles with historical or philosophical aspects. For example, Dubiel 1990 is described as both “metatheory” and “Schenker,” and no single aspect could cover it sufficiently. In principle, statistical calculations could be based on equal weight for every article, where the score of an article with more than one subject would be divided among its subjects. Nonetheless, the results of this procedure might be misleading. For example, Dubiel’s article might have received a 50 percent score as metatheory and a 50 percent score as Schenkerian theory, but in fact, both aspects of this item relate to the entire article.

I have devised near but distinct codes for related approaches in order to enable queries relating to both the wider and narrower approaches. For example, (unordered) set theory had the code 80, and theory of ordered twelve-tone music was designated as 82. This enables searches for the range “>79 and <83” when required.

(3) *The period of repertoire discussed.* I have followed the accepted periodization of Western art music, so that the periods are not of equal size. A separate code for discussions of tonal music in general enabled having a maximum of two periods per article. Special period codes indicate non-Western music repertoires. For many theoretical abstract articles, this field was irrelevant.

(4) *Composers.* I have indexed the discussed composers in articles that discuss a single composer, or mainly a single composer. Such articles often analyze specific pieces. With articles dealing with two composers, I have indicated the composers only when they are very salient (e.g., when both are indicated in the title, as in Suurpää 2000).

(5) *Theorists.* For some articles, especially those devoted to the history of theory (including translations), the true subject of the article is not a specific composer, but rather a specific theorist. For composer-theorists, such as Schoenberg, it is useful to distinguish articles concerning their theory (e.g., Boss 1994) from others that concern their music (e.g., Hyde 1980). This number does not contain all existing articles relating to Schenker. Since Schenker’s theory became so paradigmatic for the analysis of tonal music, I preferred to identify “Schenker” as a discussed theorist only for articles devoted specifically to Schenker’s theory or writings. However, the borders between theoretical discussion and analytical application of Schenkerian theory are ambiguous (e.g., Burkhart 1978).

* * *

For a more general view of *JMT*, I also counted documents other than articles (e.g., reviews) per issue and took special note of rare types of documents, but I did not examine the content of those other documents.

The data I have gathered has been subjected to mathematical operations enabled by the Microsoft Access application: articles selected according to various parameters could be counted effectively and averages of various results (and their standard deviations) could be found. For the purpose of tracing changes over the years, I divided the 47.5 volumes of *JMT* included in the study into five decades (the last one incomplete). In certain contexts, however, I recognized less arbitrary points of change.

Journal of Music Theory and *Journals of Music Theory*

As is well known, *JMT* was a pioneer in the specialist study of music theory. It was the first journal in English to be specifically devoted to music theory. (In German, there were the short-lived, Schenkerian forerunners *Der Tonwille*

Table 1. Growth of *Journal of Music Theory* over the years

<i>Volumes</i>	<i>Total Pages</i>	<i>Average Pages/Volume</i>	<i>% Growth</i>
1–10 (1957–66)	3,000	300	
11–20 (1967–76)	3,085	308.5	2.83
21–30 (1977–86)	3,405	340.5	10.37
31–40 (1987–96)	3,880	388	13.95
41–48/1 (1997–2004)	2,938	391.7	0.96
but: 41–47/1 (1997–2003)	2,648	407.4	5.00

[1921–24] and *Der Dreiklang* [1937–38].) The institution of *JMT* was a milestone in the establishment of music theory as an independent discipline.¹⁵ Since 1957, *JMT* appeared with remarkable steadiness twice a year, albeit with some delays, notably in the last decade (vol. 47 bears the date of 2003, but as the copyright indication reveals, it actually appeared in 2006). Each volume consists of two issues, except for four volumes (vols. 15, 16, 35, and 46) that included only one double issue.

Despite the steady number of issues, *JMT* grew considerably and fairly constantly over the years, at least until very recently. This is evident in the number of pages per issue.¹⁶ The first volume is the shortest of all (235 pages; the single shortest issue, however, was 14/2, with 106 pages), and the longest volume is among the latest (vol. 44, which has 502 pages, with each issue having more pages than did the entire first volume). The largest issue is vol. 46/1–2 (375 pages), which is both recent and consists of a double issue. The other double issues are only slightly larger than the largest single issues (266 to 298 pages). The first issue to pass 200 pages was 10/2. Table 1 presents the average number of pages per volume, divided into five decades. The two last issues, 47/2 and 48/1, published after a long break in actual publication of *JMT*, are considerably thinner than the norm in recent volumes, with 144 and 146 pages, respectively. Only eighteen past issues of *JMT* were thinner, most of them in the early years and none later than 34/1. The growth in the page count of *JMT* volumes began slowly, but then accelerated. Even though the growth is not entirely consistent—for example, vols. 39–43 (1995–99) were

¹⁵ For information and evaluation concerning the foundation of *JMT*, see the editorial introduction to the first issue (Krahenbuehl 1957), quoted and discussed in his obituary (Burkhart 1997) and reproduced in this issue. See also Forte 1998, 11.

¹⁶ The numbering I calculate here is derived from the table of contents: the page number of the last item (usually the index or contributors list, which occupies a single page) minus the number of the first page in the issue. When the last item in the issue is longer, I have actually looked at the

last page. This number does not include pages of advertisements. Until vol. 19 (inclusive), articles usually began on even pages and their titles occupied more than half of the first two pages. This means that these articles were in fact shorter than later articles that occupy the same number of pages. Whenever an article ends on an odd page (since vol. 20) or on an even page (until vol. 19), a blank page is inserted between them, formerly filled in with tailpieces. My calculations based on the table of contents add this page to the preceding article.

smaller than the preceding volumes and included only 1,820 pages (averaging 364 pages per volume)—the trend is absolutely clear.

The growth of *JMT* is only the tip of the iceberg in the growth of the literature on music theory. Most of the growth in the field was realized by the rapid emergence of additional periodicals. A clear “periodical boom” occurred in the late 1970s and early 1980s, whereas in the last two decades new periodicals are few and usually less significant. Most significant are *Music Theory Spectrum* (founded 1979, vols. 1–10 annual, since 1989 biannual) and the British *Music Analysis* (since 1982, triannual), but notice also *In Theory Only* (1975–92), *Theory and Practice* (1976), *Indiana Theory Review* (1977), and *Intégral* (1986), as well as the German *Musiktheorie* (1986) and the French *Analyse Musicale* (1975–95). By contrast, the 1990s added only the electronic *Music Theory Online* (1993), and even encountered a certain decline (with the non-official close of *In Theory Only*). Although some of these journals only indirectly overlap with *JMT*, and despite the existence of other publishing venues in the field in earlier years—most notably the book series *The Music Forum* (1967–80), which ceased publication precisely with the great boom—the existence of an impressive and rather sudden “periodical boom” is indisputable. The boom is even more extreme than the given list of periodicals suggests since additional periodicals where analytical and theoretical articles are occasionally published started to appear in the same period (*Nineteenth-Century Music* since 1977, triannual; *Journal of Musicology* since 1982, quarterly).

A partial explanation for this sudden growth is the establishment of the Society for Music Theory (1977).¹⁷ On the direct level, the society publishes *Music Theory Spectrum* (and *Music Theory Online*); on a more general level, the establishment of the society both reflected the desire for specialization in music theory and promoted it. A more complete explanation might have to consider general trends in the humanities, as well as financial issues.

A different kind of periodical specializes in more specific aspects of music theory. Two journals of this kind were initiated in 1987: *Theoria: Historical Aspects of Music Theory* and *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy*. Since both historical investigation and pedagogy may be applied to any branch of music theory, these journals might attract a wide range of scholars. Two newly founded journals, *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* (vol. 1, 2005) and *Journal of Music and Mathematics* (vol. 1/1, 2007), might signify a new phase of more specialized periodicals in subfields of music theory. Recently, it has also been possible to trace an opposite approach of despecialization, as the conferences of the Society for Music Theory have been combined with those of the American Musico-

¹⁷ The establishment of the Society for Music Theory was preceded by two “National Conferences on Music Theory” in 1975 and 1976 and a plenary session in the 1976 joint meeting of the American Musicological Society and College Music Symposium. See Schachter 1977 and Browne 1979.

Table 2. Comparison of the status of the leading journals in music theory as of May 19, 2007

	<i>Journal of Music Theory</i>	<i>Music Theory Spectrum</i>	<i>Music Analysis</i>
WOS: All document types since 1984	339	435	457
WOS: Articles since 1984	182	207	248
Citations of all document types since 1984	502	564	581
Ratio of citations to number of items	1.48	1.30	1.27
Ratio of citations to number of articles	2.76	2.72	2.34

logical Society in joint meetings every other year since the mega-conference “Musical Intersections” (Toronto, 2000), which combined fifteen additional societies.

It is possible to measure the status of *JMT* in relation to other music journals in *Web of Science* (*WOS*) *Arts and Humanities Index* (*A&HI*). The coverage of *WOS* includes five journals devoted to music theory: *JMT*, *Music Theory Spectrum*, *Music Analysis*, *In Theory Only*, and *Musiktheorie*.¹⁸ I have searched for citations (in all editions of *WOS*, including science and the social sciences) of the three covered music theory journals in English with continued publication.¹⁹ Table 2 shows the results. Data concerning the entire amount of citations have been divided in the number of items of all document types and in the number of articles as found in *WOS*. The search has been limited for items since 1984, when *WOS* started indexing *Music Theory Spectrum*.²⁰ The items of *JMT* are found to be (on average) the most cited of the three journals. According to this criterion, *JMT* preserves its status as the leading journal in its field.

Editors and Contributors

Up to issue 48/1, *JMT* had seen fifteen editors. Two editors edited fourteen issues each: Allen Forte edited vols. 4/2 to 11/1, and Martha McLean Hyde edited vols. 25–31. The other editors edited up to eight issues.²¹ The most influential editor is no doubt the second one, Allen Forte, whose scholarship

¹⁸ It is impossible to browse the *WOS* sources by topic. Searching in the titles list of *WOS*, one finds sixty-eight periodicals whose titles include “music,” twelve with “musik,” and two with “musique.” Additional covered music journals do not have these words in their titles, for example, *Clavier*, *Strings*, *Journal of Jazz Studies*, and *In Theory Only*. The sources list also includes journals in the science and social sciences editions of *WOS*. Some journals whose titles include “music” are not in the *A&HI*, for example, *Biological Foundations of Music*.

¹⁹ Dunsby (2002, 7) acknowledges the similarity—and a difference—between these three journals as he writes in *Music Analysis* of “the estimable pages of our nevertheless so politically correct sister (or should that be ‘sibling’?) publications *Music Theory Spectrum* and *JMT*.”

²⁰ It is best to count articles in *WOS* itself, in order to have it compatible with the citation counts. I preferred not to use *JSTOR* for this purpose, in order to include the recent volumes. *RILM* only indexes *Music Analysis* since 1987. The multiple entries per item in *Music Index* make it less appropriate for this purpose. “Cited ref search” in *WOS* enables search by document type but this feature refers to the citing sources, not to the cited ones.

²¹ Issue 4/1 bears no name of editor, but only a list of editorial staff, with Luther Noss appearing first “ex officio” and David Krahenbuehl chairman.

“had largely defined the scope and direction of the field of music theory over the past decades” (Baker, Beach, and Bernard 1997, 7).

The 393 articles were written by 304 different contributors; 351 are by a single author, thirty-seven are by thirty-four different teams²² of two coauthors (including three symposia, where each author worked alone), four articles are by three coauthors (including two symposia), and one is the pedagogy forum (McGaughey et al. 1974) by eight authors, which actually consisted of seven independent contributions, the last of which was coauthored by two writers. Of the 304 authors, few used *JMT* extensively: Leading are David Beach (thirteen articles), David Lewin (twelve), Allen Forte (ten), John Clough (eight), Robert Morris (six), and John Rothgeb (five). Seven authors had four *JMT* articles, nine had three articles, fifty-four (17.8 percent) had two articles, and 229 (75.3 percent) had a single article in *JMT*.²³

The most famous figures among *JMT* contributors seem to be the composers—George Rochberg, Milton Babbitt, Donald Martino, Thomas DeLio, and Broadway composer Maury Yeston. Some other authors are also known principally as composers (e.g., Margaret Vardell Sandresky), and some major theorist-authors (notably David Lewin) are also composers. No composer has written in *JMT* on his own music, but Martino appears also as a subject of another article (Rothstein 1980).

Female authors are a small minority among the authors of *JMT* articles: thirty-eight out of 304 article contributors (12.5 percent) participated in forty-one of 393 articles (10.4 percent).²⁴ Thirty-four of these are represented by a single article in *JMT*, and none have more than two articles. Among the 351 articles by a single author, only thirty-two (9.1 percent) are by female authors. In two cases, married couples contributed articles together: Brender and Brender (1967) and Becker and Becker (1979); in one case, both coauthors are female (Etzion and Weich-Shahak 1993).

Document Types in *Journal of Music Theory* and Related Topics

Readers well acquainted with the ordinary balance between items in *JMT* in the last decades may be struck by the different balance in the early volumes of *JMT*. The changes in this balance might well reflect changes in editorial policy, but I shall refrain from attempting to ascribe specific decisions to specific editors.

²² The recurring coauthor teams are Boomslicer and Creel, Lerdahl and Jackendoff, and Knopoff and Hutchinson. Clough and Douthett coauthored one article alone (Clough and Douthett 1991) and one article together with a third coauthor (Clough, Cuciurean, and Douthett 1997).

²³ Automatic count of article amount per author is dangerous, as its indexing in the table of contents is inconsistent: Some names appear only sometimes with the initial of the

middle name (e.g., Robert D. Morris), and *JMT* contributor Lejaren Hiller is not the father of Lejaren A. Hiller Jr. but the same person. *JSTOR* also lists among the authors some composers whose music is brought in in examples and at least in one case the translator (of Winckel 1963).

²⁴ The identification of the authors' sex was based on private names and/or web photos. I believe I have identified all authors.

Table 3. Number and length of articles and reviews per volume in *JMT* 1–48/1

Volumes	Total Article Page Count	Total Volume Page Count	Article Percentage	Number of Articles	Average Page Count/ Article	Average Articles/ Volume	Number of Reviews	Average Reviews/ Volume
1–10	2,178 (1,867 essays)	3,000	72.6 (62.23)	80 (69)	27.225 (27.06)	8 (6.9)	108	10.8
11–20	2,500 (2,106)	2,783	89.83 (75.67)	87 (75)	28.74 (28.08)	8.7 (7.5)	54	5.4
21–30	2,389 (2,102)	3,405	70.16 (61.73)	79 (69)	30.24 (30.46)	7.9 (6.9)	91	9.1
31–40	2,759 (2,681)	3,880	71.11 (69.10)	78 (75)	35.37 (35.75)	7.8 (7.5)	70	7
41–48/1	2,488 (2,331)	2,938	84.68 (79.34)	69 (63)	36.06 (37)	9.2 (8.4)	24	3.2

Each issue of *JMT* includes articles and virtually always reviews, in varying proportions. No consistent trend is found in the percentage of the whole volume occupied by articles (see Table 3). However, a modest increase can be detected in both the number of articles per volume and the average length of the articles. These two factors together contribute to the growth in the page count of *JMT*. The articles in *JMT* do not have abstracts: these were added twice, in issues 34/1 and 43/2, but discontinued in the following issues until the present one.

In order to facilitate comparison with the double issues, it is better to count articles per volume, rather than per issue. The number of articles per volume lies between four (vol. 16) and twelve (vol. 10), with one exception (sixteen articles in vol. 42) that results from the special character of issue 42/2 (see below). The average is 8.19 articles per volume, and the standard deviation is 2.04; without the exceptional volume, the average is 8.02 and the standard deviation is only 1.70.

The number of reviews per volume differs more greatly, from none at all in five issues (5/2, 36/1, the special 42/2, and two of the three latest issues, 47/1 and 48/1) to no fewer than twelve reviews (1/2; 1/1 has eleven and the maximum after vol. 1 is ten reviews in 11/1). The general curve of the number of reviews is complementary to that of the number of articles: it begins high, descends, ascends, and descends again. The appearance of so many reviews in the thin early volumes points to their relative shortness. The fall and new rise in the evaluation of reviews is evident not in their amount alone but also in their place in the table of contents: In the first three volumes, under the editorship of David Krahenbuehl, reviews were listed in the table of contents, as is done today. However, in vol. 4 they were removed, as is perhaps appropriate with library-oriented, multiple short descriptions as in *Notes*, but less so in a scholarly journal. The recovery of respect for reviews began with the inclusion of reviewers' names (without reviewed titles) in the table of con-

tents (since issue 21/1) and was only completed in issue 28/1. However, the fall and new rise do not correspond exactly to the number of reviews: during the seventeen volumes where reviews were not indicated in the table of contents, there appeared 118 reviews (6.94 average reviews/volume), that is, more reviews/volume than in the second and the (incomplete) fifth decades of *JMT*, although in the latter the tables of contents do indicate reviews.

The precise count of reviews is, like that of articles, slightly problematic. Occasionally, one review addresses several books together (e.g., the aforementioned Clarkson 1968), and in a single case, a review symposium (Schachter 1981, Epstein 1981, Benjamin 1981) is dedicated to a single book—*Free Composition* (Schenker [1935] 1979). This special honor, given to a translation of an older book, no doubt reflects the book's special status in music theory. Volume 45 included a "Schenker Symposium" of reviews: issue 1 included no fewer than six reviews, and issue 2 included three more reviews. The table of contents of issue 2 declared these three reviews to be part 2 of 3, but that is all that has been published. Some recent issues of *JMT* were published with a serious delay and with few or no reviews at all.

Table 3 sums up the numbers of articles and reviews per volume in each of the five decades and calculates the average number of pages per article and the percentage the articles occupy in a volume.

The first six volumes of *JMT* also included a category called "forum" that consisted of shorter contributions and replies. Two issues (3/1 and 4/1) even included both a forum on practical issues and a "theory forum." This kind of forum has no equivalent in today's *JMT* or in other American music periodicals, but it follows closely the German tradition of *Kleine Beiträge*, which can still be encountered, for example, in *Die Musikforschung*. The forum's task of shared thought is fulfilled today to a certain extent by the discussion list of the Society for Music Theory, but its omission predated the electronic revolution by many years.

Later volumes of *JMT* only very occasionally included forums. Examining the forums reveals a situation familiar from musical terminology (e.g., with "sonata"): one title indicates various kinds of items, while similar phenomena appear under various names. Series of responses appeared as a forum three more times after vol. 6 (26/2 continued in 27/2, 29/1, and 36/1), but other times they appeared without that title (e.g., the aforementioned Larson 1997, Straus 1997a, and Lerdahl 1997); vol. 16/1–2 includes a "symposium" on music theory in the seventeenth century (Cohen et al. 1972), which resembled such constructs as the early "forum" on pedagogical issues (Krahenbuehl et al. 1959); issue 33/1 offered a very extraordinary metatheoretical "theory colloquium," which consisted of a full-length article (Brown and Dempster 1989) with a series of four responses. This special event was even announced on the cover. An editorial introduction to the colloquium (Hasty, van den Toorn, and Marshall 1989) promised to "enliven the pages of this journal" with further projects of this kind, but such projects never did take place.

The omission of forums from the usual later issues seems to reflect a desire to concentrate, within a scholarly journal, on larger studies that present more than a preliminary idea. The later forums actually create partly special issues. Other partly special issues include the eight analysis symposia (see below) and a series of four articles on electronic music that appeared in 7/1 and continued in the three following issues with five more articles, whereas no single article on electronic music appeared after vol. 11.²⁵ Issue 42/2 (1998) is a relatively recent exception. This is a special issue that is not only devoted to one subject (neo-Riemannian theory), but actually results from a single conference and has features of a “conference proceedings” volume, such as prefacing acknowledgments that resemble a short editorial introduction (Clough 2002) and a unified bibliography for all articles. The work on the articles was even prepared in collaboration, as is evident from the mutual references. These exceptional procedures explain why this issue includes twelve articles and no reviews at all.²⁶

Instances of other content types appear in *JMT* only occasionally: thirty issues include one or more letters to the editor. These are spread over the years (vols. 1–47), with several gaps, the largest of which embraces nine years (from vol. 8 to vol. 17), but despite this gap the average volume number with letters to the editor is slightly early (22.4). Less frequently appear conference reviews (six times, between 31/1 and 39/2), corrigenda (four times, between 30/1 and 36/2), editorials (in the three first issues, and on three more occasions), and obituaries (twice only).²⁷ The first obituary (Forte et al. 1977) was dedicated to Ernst Oster, the famous Schenkerian student of Oswald Jonas and translator of *Free Composition* (Schenker [1935] 1979). This obituary was a series of no fewer than ten contributions, most of which had a personal flavor (Schachter was the only contributor to include a truly analytical point in his contribution). The second obituary (Burkhart 1997) was dedicated to *JMT*’s first editor, David Krahenbuehl, and was on the border between memories and historiography of the modern field. One might have expected additional obituaries, for example, on the occasion of Felix Salzer’s death in 1986. Hindemith, an important figure not only as a composer but as a theorist as well, received no obituary on his death in 1963, but later two articles were devoted to his role in music theory (Thomson 1965, Forte 1998), of which the later one in particular resembles in nature the obituary for Krahenbuehl.

More marginal items include announcements of future events in twenty-four issues, the earliest in 21/1 (average volume 29.5), and advertisements for books and journals in fifty-six issues, the earliest in 15/1–2 (average volume

²⁵ The series of articles on electronic music had already been announced before its inception, in *JMT* 6/2.

²⁶ Interestingly, *Music Theory Spectrum* had in 2002 a special issue for the first time (issue 24/2). However, that special issue did not result from a conference, and the editorial introduction (Harrison 2002) almost apologized for betraying

the journal’s usual diversity (as the “spectrum” in its title indicates) and promised it would not be a constant feature of that journal.

²⁷ Another short obituary message, Yeston 1980 on William G. Waite, had been included in the front matter.

30.5).²⁸ Until 40/2, every issue included a list of recent books and articles (with two exceptions: 21/2 and 29/2). For one issue, the list of books was referred to with the more general name “publications received,” and then (vols. 37–40) it continued to appear for four more years as a “list of books received.” All issues of *JMT* include the list of contributors, and every last issue per volume includes an index of the entire volume. The earliest indexes appeared bound separately and perhaps slightly delayed (the index of vol. 3–4 was made together, and, as far as I could verify, it was published with issue 5/1).

Before we turn to the content of the articles, I have some remarks concerning the external format of *JMT*.²⁹ The covers of the first issues appeared in a solid style, occasionally with drawings. Subsequently, there followed a period of four years (vols. 5–8) during which *JMT* looked considerably more experimental, using color covers with very unequal sizing of title letters. Such covers seem to express a certain zeitgeist, especially when appearing in such a rigorous journal such as *JMT*. Elements of nonpractical design were preserved until vol. 19 (inclusive), as the tables of contents were spaced on two pages, as were also the article titles, which appeared midpage. Starting in 1995 (vol. 39), *JMT* used a logo that was slightly more attractive to the eye than the ordinary covers it had most of its years. On several occasions, *JMT* had special covers, most notably in issue 25/1, which celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of *JMT*.

Content Analysis of the Articles

JMT's Leading Subjects: Schenkerian Theory and Set Theory

I ascribed 465 subjects to the 351 items I called “essays” (487 subjects to 365 items including analysis symposia, 519 subjects to all 393 articles). The results are presented in Table 4.

The most common methods discussed in *JMT* are clearly Schenkerian theory and set theory. According to the narrow definitions of these subjects, they comprise seventy-three articles (fifty-four essays) and sixty-five articles (sixty-four essays), respectively. With related subjects (detailed description below), they comprise eighty-eight and eighty-five articles, respectively. Although overlaps between Schenkerian theory and set theory are possible (since I have enabled more than one subject per article), in fact only one essay (Parks 1985) combines both methods directly, so that the total of 137 references represents no fewer than 136 articles (34.9 percent of the total 393

²⁸ I have not counted the amount of advertisements, but I have noticed a gradual increase until 39/2; after 40/1, which had none at all, there is a certain decrease.

²⁹ Two issues bear wrong identifications: the cover of 5/1 indicates issue 5/2 (the covers for issues 5/1 and 5/2 are absent in *JSTOR*, an exception probably due to that confusion), and the table of contents of 28/1 erroneously indicates 27/2.

articles).³⁰ In the complete population of articles, Schenkerian theory passes set theory since it was involved in most symposia.

The counting is based upon my independent indexing. Browsing Schenkerian bibliographies reveals slightly different results: Berry 2004 includes eighty-three *JMT* articles (updated to 45/2), excluding the Schenkerian bibliographies. Six items are missing (e.g., McNamee 1985 and Forte 1988), but many marginal items are included, due to Berry's wise policy "to err on the side of inclusion" (Berry 2004, 1). Ayotte 2004 is considerably less complete and includes fifty-eight *JMT* entries (excluding the bibliographies) but also at least one irrelevant item—Forte 1992 on Hindemith.³¹ A *JSTOR* search provides 133 *JMT* articles with "Schenker" until 45/2, but these do include letters to the editor and some communications.

Examining the growth and/or decline of Schenkerian theory is especially interesting since contradicting impressions were expressed in relation to it in about the same period: Kerman, who is skeptical toward Schenkerism, claimed that "Schenker's prestige and influence are sinking, though not without dignity, in the United States" (although they are emerging in Britain) (1985, 88), whereas the devoted Schenkerist Rothstein (1986, 5 [1990, 193]) claimed to the contrary that "the Schenkerian empire is still in its expanding phase."³² As in politics, every party claims it is going to win (and perhaps truly feels it is going to win). Equipped with bibliometric tools, I am prepared to bring more objective findings. At least as far as *JMT* is concerned, Rothstein was much more aware than Kerman of the recent literature in the field of music theory. In the 1980s, Schenkerian theory in the United States was only beginning its real flourishing. The particular point of change can be traced to the English translation of *Free Composition* (Schenker [1935] 1979), which received, as we have seen, a special review symposium.

Schenkerian theory was introduced into *JMT* in an early and general article (Forte 1959).³³ Due to its nature, that article can still be read today by less professional readers than would be required for most articles in the field; on the other hand, it is perhaps unnecessary to get acquainted with Schenkerian theory via such an article today, when Schenker's main books are translated into English and especially when good textbooks exist. The appearance of such an introductory discussion in *JMT* is exceptional and is reserved for presentations of young fields, most notably Cohn 1998 on neo-Riemannian theory.

30 Forte 1992 and Nolan 1995 also include aspects related to Schenkerian theory and set theory and thus are counted twice among the larger groups of eighty-eight and eighty-six items. McNamee 1985 does not appear in that calculation due to its more eclectic character, but it, too, combines both methods as when it claims (68) for "middleground occurrences of set 4–26." Rothgeb 1966, mainly related to set theory, also mentions Schenker, but mainly suggests the premature state of the art then.

31 Ayotte (2004, 74) explains that "Forte also discusses the influences of Schenker and Babbitt, which served to effectively undermine the influence of Hindemith's ideas."

32 Rothstein in his consistent observations has added recently, "Schenker vit" (Rothstein 2001, 224).

33 Berry (2004, 60) lists in his Schenkerian bibliography an even earlier *JMT* item (Reynolds 1958), where "the author's commentary borders on Schenkerian at times."

Table 4. Distribution of subjects in the essays of *Journal of Music Theory*

Subject Code	Subject Name	Total	Essays		Volume							Larger Topics	Percentage of Topics	Percentage of Articles	Avg. Vol.	St. Dev.
			+ Symp.	Alone	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-							
1	History of theory	51	45	45	13	12	12	10	4	51	9.8	13.0	21.2	12.5		
2	Metatheory	17	17	17	1	3		6	7	28			34.2	11.9		
3	Philosophy as object	8	8	8	1	6			1				1.5	2.0	18	13.0
5	Hermeneutics	3	3	3				3					0.6	0.8	36.3	3.5
7	Psychology/cognition	6	6	6	3	1	1		1	6	1.2	1.5	18.5	14.2		
10	Acoustics	26	25	25	16	5	1	4		29	5.0	6.6	13.6	11.0		
12	Tuning	3	3	3	1	1	1	1			0.6	0.8	25.3	9.1		
20	Pedagogy	5	5	5	1	3	1			5	0.9	1.3	16	10.2		
30	Schenker	73	65	54	5	15	16	19	18	88	14.1	18.6	29.1	12.4		
32	Hierarchy	15	15	14		1	4	5	5		2.9	3.8	34.4	9.9		
40	Harmony	31	29	27	10	5	7	5	4	56	6.0	7.9	21.3	15.1		
42	Tonality	15	15	15	1	5	1	6	2		2.9	3.8	27.1	12.1		
44	Modality	8	8	8		4	2	2			1.5	2.0	23.6	9.8		
46	Scales	2	2	2		1			1		0.4	0.5	30	22.6		
50	Melody	5	5	5	1	1	1	1	1	9	0.9	1.3	24.4	15.9		
52	Contour	4	3	3			1	3			0.8	1.0	31.75	3.0		
60	Counterpoint	17	14	14	4	2	5	1	5	19	3.3	4.3	25.9	15.9		
65	Fugue	2	2	2		2				23	0.4	0.5	16	2.8		
68	Forms	21	21	20	1	5	7	5		21	4.0	5.3	26.8	11.0		
70	Neo-Riemann	24	23	23			3	5	16	25	4.6	6.1	39	6.6		
72	Riemann	1(2)	1	1				1			0.2	0.3	33			
80	Set theory	64	64	63	9	10	18	18	9	86	12.3	16.3	27.1	12.0		
82	Dodecaphony/serialism															
		20	19	18	1	5	7	5	2		3.9	5.1	27	11.0		
84	Symmetry	2	2	2			1	1			0.4	0.5	34.5	6.4		

100	Rhythm	17	16	16	5	7	3	5	2	17	3.3	4.3	23.5	15.1
120	Texture	1	1	1	1			1		1	0.2	0.3	4	
130	Organology	1	0	0	1					1	0.2	0.3	5	
140	Timbre	1	1	1					1	1	0.2	0.3	45	
150	Technical/ electronic	12	9	9	10	2				26	2.3	3.1	9.1	3.7
152	Software	13	13	13	3	9	1				2.5	3.3	14.7	5.8
160	Notation	1	1	1	1						0.2	0.3	9	
190	Prosody	2	2	1		2				2	0.4	0.5	16	1.4
200	Motives	6	6	4		2	1		2	6	1.2	1.5	29.7	14.4
230	Sketches	3	3	3			2	1		3	0.6	0.8	30	8.7
240	Performance	5	5	5			1	4		5	0.9	1.3	33.4	3.6
290	Information	11	11	10	6	3	2			11	2.1	2.8	11.2	8.2
300	Linguistics	3	3	3		3				8	0.6	0.8	13.7	1.5
304	Rhetorics	3	3	3	2		1				0.6	0.8	8.3	11.0
310	Narrativity	1	1	1					1		0.2	0.3	47	
312	Movement	1	1	1				1			0.2	0.3	40	
800	General/eclectic	8	6	5			4	3	1	8	1.5	2.0	33.875	7.1
810	General— bibliography	2	0	0	1	1				2	0.4	0.5	8	7.1
900	Other	5	5	5		2	1	2		5	0.9	1.3	26.6	11.4
	Total subjects	519	487	465	97	113	105	118	86	519	132.4			
	Total items	393	365	351	80	87	79	78	69	393		100		

Table 5. Distribution of Schenkerian essays according to subfields

<i>Average Volume</i>	<i>Number of Essays</i>	<i>Subfield of Schenkerian Theory</i>
4.5	2	Introductory
12	1	Translation
18	2	Bibliography
28.7	26	Analysis
27.7	12	Theoretical aspect
32.25	4	Schenker's writings
31.1	17	Expanding the repertoire
38.9	7	Relation to other fields
33.25	20	Specific configurations
33.3	6	Philosophy

A close-up content analysis of the Schenkerian articles reveals some changes in the subfield. Two complementary shifts in emphasis can be seen in relatively recent volumes of *JMT*. These can be inferred from Table 5, which shows subfields of Schenkerian theory and corollary studies on hierarchy, with the number of articles and the average volume. The table is organized according to the latter factor. One direction dwells on the detailed ramifications of the theory, exploring specific configurations on the ground of the well-studied terrain. Some configurations are problematic for the method as a whole (e.g., Smyth 1999; Everett 2004), but others are not necessarily so (Beach 1983). The other direction is para-Schenkerian studies, most notably metatheoretical studies (e.g., Zbikowsky 1997), which reflect the influence of the “new musicology” that appeared in *JMT* since the appearance of the “theory colloquium” in 1989 (more on this trait below). Evidence as to the metatheoretical change influencing Schenkerian theory can be found in comparing the definition of “prolongation” in the first edition of *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* (Drabkin 1980) with the same author’s revision in the second edition (Drabkin 2000). The revision replaced “the generation of the substance of a tonal piece” with “the generation of the harmonic and contrapuntal substance,” accepting additional, perhaps less purely musical, aspects of a piece’s “substance.”³⁴ There is a certain contradiction between the two directions, but both seem emblematic for an advanced state of knowledge.

Set theory was similarly introduced to *JMT* with an early general article (Babbitt 1961), and with even earlier related items concerning serial music (Rochberg 1959). It, too, flourished mainly in the later decades of *JMT*, with a certain decline in quantity more recently. The specialization in set theory is even clearer than in Schenkerian studies, while metatheoretical discussions of it remain outside *JMT* (but exist elsewhere, as in Davis 1995 and John Rahn 2001).

³⁴ Rothstein (2001) observes many more changes in a similar spirit between the editions of the *New Grove*. The detail I mention here is not cited by Rothstein.

Set theory is of course based on mathematical foundations, albeit mostly on combinatorics and not directly on mathematical, axiomatic, set theory. A succinct letter to the editor (Kaarela 1992) even complains: "I am wondering why you are persistently turning the journal into a *Journal of Mathematics* which, really, is of little long term significance, rather than returning to real music." Several contributors, most notably the late David Lewin, possess mathematical expertise.³⁵ Many articles (e.g., Agmon 1996) require mathematical knowledge not only from the author but from the reader as well. It is only very recently that *JMT* included an essay (Satyendra 2004) that offers less mathematically oriented music theorists an "informal introduction" to the work of David Lewin without mathematical formulations.

One might answer the quoted complaint that high music theory, especially of posttonal music, indeed involves mathematical elements. Moreover, even elementary theory is often objected to by undergraduates as being "too technical" without "getting at the heart" (Poirel 1998, 72). Just as we see roman numerals and hear the harmonic degrees behind them, we should learn to hear the pitch-class set-classes behind Forte numbers (albeit these are wanting in intuitiveness, as Maegaard 1985 argues convincingly). Even analyses of specific works (e.g., the ear-opening Forte 1988) might be drawn in mathematical presentation. Indeed, nonmathematical observations in older contributions (e.g., Fuller 1975 on features of the diatonic scale) might seem today as ineffective presentations of private cases of set relations. It is indeed noteworthy that *JMT* includes seven articles (the earliest Demske 1988, the latest Buchler 2001) that concentrate on the mathematical aspects and do not refer explicitly to the musical application. One reason that such articles were submitted to *JMT* rather than to journals of mathematics may be that they are based on naive rather than axiomatic set theory and study particular problems of interest largely to musical set theorists.³⁶

Other Current Theoretical Subjects in *JMT*

Both Schenkerian theory and set theory are well-defined methods, and despite a certain variability in their application, they are more than general subjects of interest. Other subdisciplines that are similarly "tight" arose relatively recently: contour theory (three essays and one reply) and especially transformational

³⁵ Although mathematical articles need not be short, the extreme brevity of Lewin 1976 (four pages) no doubt results from his use of mathematical formulas. (By the way, this article is missing in *RILM*.) As Lewin himself says elsewhere (Lewin 1987, 89) of another contribution by himself (Lewin 1959), "Its style, unfortunately, makes few concessions to a non-mathematical reader."

³⁶ Citations of *JMT* in articles that do not concern music are extremely rare. Most of the 171 citations of *JMT* in sources that appear in the Science Index Expanded edition of *WOS*

refer either to items from journals with relevance to music (75 items) or at least music-oriented articles in nonmusic journals (83 items, e.g., Silverman and Wiseman 2006). The thirteen exceptions include at least three errors. See, however, the discussion of maximally even sets in *Journal of Mathematical Physics* (Krantz, Douthett, and Doty 1998) and a citation of DeLio 1980 in *Fibonacci Quarterly* (Wilcox 1986).

(neo-Riemannian) theory (twenty-four articles, sixteen of which are in the latest period, including twelve in the special issue 42/2). (Notably, traditional Riemannian theory is absolutely absent from *JMT*.)³⁷ Such tight theoretical alternatives differ from the scattered experimentations that appeared in *JMT* in the 1960s along with Schenkerian analyses, in the analytical symposia (e.g., Palmer's contribution within Beach, Mintz, and Palmer 1969, 207–17).

In contrast to the tight methods, wider topics such as harmony, rhythm, counterpoint, and form must be considered looser aspects that indicate the studied musical parameters while leaving space for a larger variety of methods. Such general subjects form the main undergraduate curriculum. Their relatively limited space in current advanced theory as represented in *JMT* reflects an arguably growing distance between practical theory and analysis, and the high theory (see below). The latest issues of *JMT* (vol. 47 and issue 48/1) show a remarkable shift that is more tolerant to the general theory studies. For example, Harrison 2003 studies sequential patterns based on harmony and counterpoint in their straightforward sense. Even Pearsall 2004, using set theory, studies surface motives in a way much removed from the most abstract set-theoretical studies.

Earlier Areas of Interest

Readers familiar with *JMT* since about the late 1970s might wonder what had been included in this journal before Schenkerian theory and set theory became its standard methods. After all, in the earliest decade only fourteen of eighty articles (17.5 percent) were engaged with these theories.

Indeed, several topics and methods that were prominent in *JMT*'s early periods were totally abandoned later. One such specific methodology is the application of information (or communication) theory to music (eleven items, six of which are in the earliest decade). The reappearance of articles on that method in 1981 and 1983 (Knopoff and Hutchinson 1981, 1983) might look puzzling, but eventually the authors conclude that information theory has little value for the study of music.

Other early articles addressed issues that are not truly musical. All *JMT* articles on electronic music were engaged with technical aspects and might have had practical interest more for composers than for theorists. This is true also for items that discuss technical aspects of sound production of nonelectronic music (e.g., Truax 1976). True analytical investigation of electronic music is possible (as in Simoni 2005) but has never been performed in *JMT*.

³⁷ In a study of non-transformational aspects of Riemann's theories, Waldbauer (1989, 333) still claims "the neglect of Riemann continues," but Ian Bent's comment quoted there that "it is in his theory of phrase structure . . . that Riemann has most to offer" remains an offshoot. Riemann's theory is discussed in *JMT* in historical and metatheoretical perspectives (e.g., in Hyer 1995), and some translations

of Riemann's work appear (Wason and Marvin 1992; the nontransformational Mooney 2000), but Riemannian harmonic symbols are not used in *JMT* even once. By contrast, German periodicals such as *Musiktheorie* continue to use Riemannian *Funktiontheorie* as the standard tool for analyzing tonal and even extended tonal music. See, for example, Brauneiss 1996 on Britten.

Another topic that is not academic in essence is the survey of music software. Thirteen articles, all of them in vols. 9–20 except for one much later item (Brinkman 1986), deal with aspects of encoding and representation of musical notes on computer. Only some of them discuss (in various degrees) software that is specific for analytical or theoretical purposes (e.g., Erickson 1968), but even these must only count as descriptions of tools that might assist analysts. None of them showed an original analytical output.³⁸

Similarly, articles on acoustics or tuning appeared mostly in the early periods (fifteen articles in the earliest decade, ten in all later periods, and nothing after Carey and Clampitt 1996).

A very different direction that was present only in *JMT*'s early periods is pedagogy. Almost every music theorist teaches theory, but pedagogical problems seldom illuminate truly theoretical or analytical points. *JMT* included four articles on pedagogy, one of them actually a pedagogy forum (along with two "pedagogy forums" described as such), and among these only one (the latest of them, Maegaard 1985, on set theory) discussed aspects of the theoretical apparatus itself. The establishment of a separate journal, *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy*, provided a separate platform for the discussion of pedagogical issues.

Remote Disciplines

Beyond the mathematical foundations of set theory (and acoustics), music theory as reflected in *JMT* is a very inward-looking (or "inside-looking") discipline.³⁹ Nontheoretical aspects of musicology rarely penetrate the articles, although the scope of the reviews is apparently wider and occasionally even includes reviews of books that are intended for the wider public (e.g., Whittenberg 1969). A few isolated articles discuss aspects such as sketches and performance. Historical aspects of music enter *JMT* almost exclusively through a strict theoretical perspective, and biographical discussions are virtually absent in *JMT*.

Nonmusical disciplines are invoked in *JMT* even more rarely. Their selection might be surprising if one expects to find disciplines traditionally thought of as related to music: nothing at all on visual arts; a single and recent article on narrativity (Almén 2003); a single semiotic review/essay (Berger 1994 review of Agawu 1991);⁴⁰ a single article on movement, but not in its

³⁸ The concentration on technical issues and software in a certain period of *JMT* is evident in the low standard deviation of volume number for these subjects (3.65 for the former, 5.75 for the latter, 3.64 for the latter without the latest item), exceptional among subjects with more than a handful of articles.

³⁹ An inward-looking discipline is a discipline where the cited sources come mainly from within the discipline itself. This feature has been studied, for example, by Peritz and Bar-Ilan 2001.

⁴⁰ As the bibliography of Almén 2003 suggests, other journals in music theory included narrativity articles much earlier.

artistic manifestations (Saslaw 1996); and three articles that relate music to linguistics. The topic of linguistics was an important subject in music theory in the 1980s, mostly due to *A Generative Theory of Tonal Music* (Lerdahl and Jackendoff 1983), but the linguistic aspect is not discussed in the authors' related article in *JMT* (Lerdahl and Jackendoff 1981), the review of the book (Peel and Slawson 1984), and the debate following the review (Lerdahl and Jackendoff 1985; Peel and Slawson 1985).

The preference of "tight" disciplines seems to reflect philosophical positivism (Davis 1995, on atonal theory). Maus (1993, 265) even claims, and perhaps overstates, that "*omissions* that characterize much contemporary theoretical writing reflect the desire to avoid *discourse that might seem unmanly*." Interestingly, while some female authors do participate in the paradigmatic "manly" discourse (e.g., Nolan 1995), it is notable that only twelve of the forty-two articles authored (or coauthored) by women concern either Schenkerian theory, set theory, or serial music (28.6 percent of the articles by female contributors), a significantly lower percentage than that in the general population of articles (43.8 percent).

Considering *JMT*'s practice of having stronger relations with mathematics than with other fields in the humanities, it is reasonable to situate music theory (as practiced in the journal) as a discipline at the periphery of the humanities. It hardly ever influences the main disciplines of the humanities such as literary and historical studies, and it is slow (and occasionally reluctant) to borrow their influence. For example, no article in *JMT* invokes gender studies, which are today ubiquitous in general musicology. But gender studies have been undertaken by music theorists. For example, the sessions of the Society for Music Theory in the 2000 Toronto mega-conference "Musical Intersections" included five papers in feminism/gender studies (out of eleven proposed) (Jay Rahn 2001). Their total absence from *JMT* (at least from the articles) is emblematic of the journal's conservative interest in the "nuts and bolts" of music theory and of the looseness of its connection with the mainstream of humanities.⁴¹

Postmodernism, a broader trend in the humanities, is more a general approach than a field of knowledge, and as such it has wider applications than gender studies. Since Joseph Kerman's famous complaint that musicology ignores postmodern thought (Kerman 1985), postmodernism has penetrated music scholarship (as in Kramer 1995), but the change concerns more historical musicology and less analysis and theory. Nevertheless, metatheoretical studies did penetrate *JMT* in relatively recent years. The inception of this trend can be traced precisely to the "theory colloquium" in issue 33/1. Of the fifteen metatheoretical essays, only four preceded this colloquium, although certain earlier articles discussed philosophical aspects in the history of theory (e.g.,

⁴¹ See similar comment by Dunsby (2002, 5) on the absence of gender studies in *Music Analysis*.

Clifton 1970 on Goethe and Schenker). The “new music theorists” are sensitive to aspects of disciplinary discourse, such as the use of metaphors (Mead 1999), which formerly remained unnoticed. Although focus on metatheoretical issues might turn music theorists away from indulging in the music itself (as Browne 2003 warns), in a journal as conservatively inclined as *JMT*, this danger is probably not very strong.

The forceful trend of postmodernism has penetrated *JMT* to a limited extent, and thus softens the relationship of *JMT* to the sciences, which, in the climax of the modernist approach (e.g., in Boretz [1969–73] 1995), had been considered desirable. The current intellectual climate encourages a descientification of Schenkerian and other aspects of music theory. Despite this, however, we can detect with neo-Riemannian theory a scientification process similar to that undergone by Schenkerian theory a generation previously and described by Rothstein 1986 (1990). Just as this process split Schenker’s philosophical background from his music theory, so the current state of affairs in neo-Riemannian transformational theory found in the journal ignores Riemann’s philosophical background.

Other Types of Articles

The forty-two articles that are not ordinary “essays” in my counting include four bibliographies, fifteen translations of theory treatises, three technical reports, four replies (discussed above with other marginal documents), and eight analysis symposia (twenty-three pieces that appeared as sixteen items, discussed toward the end of the present article). The corpus of “essays” alone is definitely more uniform than the entire corpus, which also contains these other types of so-called “articles.”

The four bibliographies that appeared in *JMT* include two lists of translated treatises (Coover 1959, 1969) and two of Schenkerian studies (Beach 1969, 1979). In the following decades *JMT* did not publish further bibliographic updates, and there is currently no place for bibliographies in print journals. However, Beach did publish two further updates of his Schenkerian bibliography in other print journals (Beach 1985, 1989), and recent Schenker bibliographies have appeared in two full-length printed books (Ayotte 2004, Berry 2004).

The fifteen translated treatises that appeared in *JMT* are very heterogeneous. Their origin ranges from Ancient Greece (e.g., Mathiesen 1975) to the twentieth century (Clarkson 1984). Translations appeared mainly in *JMT*’s early period (average volume: 18; six of the fifteen translations appeared in the first decade). Some translations have been surpassed by later ones. For example, Schenker [1926] 1968 was surpassed by Kalib 1973 and later by Schenker [1926] 1996.

The few articles I identify in my database as “technical reports” (e.g., Hiller 1963) are not so described formally. These articles report in a rather

practical manner on the equipment in specific laboratories for electronic music and, even more than the other articles on electronic music, became outdated rather quickly.

The eight analysis symposia discussed the following pieces (in chronological order): Mozart, Minuet K. 355 (issue 10/1); Schubert, *Moment Musical*, op. 94/1 (12/2 and replies in 13/1 and 13/2); Beethoven, Piano Sonata op. 53, second movement (13/2); Brahms, *In Melodien*, op. 105/1 (15/1–2); Webern, Orchestral Pieces op. 13, first movement (18/1 and 19/1); Debussy, *Pour les Sixtes* (piano etude) (22/2); Brahms, *Alto Rhapsody* (27/2); and, after many years, Cole Porter, “Night and Day” (43/2). This project opened very intensively, became less frequent, and eventually all but ceased. (The analysis symposium in the present issue was not included in the bibliometric study.) The contribution in 43/2 is exceptional not only in repertoire but in essence as well. Whereas the earlier symposia discussed one work by several methods, here each scholar examined another version (Shaftel 1999 on the original song; Larson 1999 on improvisations by Oscar Peterson; and Strunk 1999 on a Chick Corea performance).

The seven earlier symposia addressed five tonal works from the Classic-Romantic repertoire, one atonal work, and one transitional (impressionistic) work. Most of the chosen pieces do not invoke unique problems, albeit the Mozart minuet is much denser texturally and chromatically than is the norm with Mozart. The four earliest symposia were later reprinted in Yeston 1977 under the title *Readings in Schenkerian Analysis and Other Approaches*. The title is emblematic of the then-emerging status of Schenkerian theory as the ultimate method to analyze tonal music. Three of these four symposia included one Schenkerian analysis and one or two analyses using other approaches. Read in the perspective of the reprinted title, it almost seems as if Schenkerians were attempting to demonstrate via these analyses the superiority of their method over competing approaches that were later neglected. The collection of several analyses of the same piece in various approaches is more instructive for comparing the analytical tools than for evaluating the piece itself. By contrast, when several analyses of the same piece in the same method appeared (Schenkerian readings of Schubert’s *Moment Musical*, op. 94/1 in Schachter’s contribution within Hughes, Moss, and Schachter 1968, and the replies by Rothgeb [1969] and Schachter [1969]), comparing the analyses illuminates the piece rather than the method. That the Debussy symposium consisted of Schenkerian analyses alone, exploring how the existing analytical tools could work with such a piece rather than examining alternative methods, is emblematic for the centripetal process of establishing two methods only at a certain stage in the life of *JMT*.

Repertoire Discussed in *Journal of Music Theory*

I have ascribed 408 period records to all 393 articles. The articles in *JMT* are devoted mostly to the classical Western tradition. Very few articles discuss other repertoires. Besides the analysis symposium on a Cole Porter song mentioned above, a single recent three-article symposium (in issue 49/2, outside the studied database) addresses jazz music—a project previously unthinkable in *JMT*—and only eight articles discuss non-Western or traditional music of various cultures (Chinese, Indian, Arabic, Cuban, Ladino). Of these, two do so in a comparison with the Western canon (Thomson 1958 and Powell 1979).⁴² The articles on non-Western music become even less frequent in *JMT*'s later periods. The limitation to Western art music is not indicated in the journal's title, nor is it self-evident. In an age when the Society for Music Theory opens interest groups in jazz and even popular music, their absence from *JMT* suggests a solid conservatism, as well as a certain cultural stance.

Table 6 provides a detailed view of the number of articles per period, but it might be more instructive to take a broader view and examine the three largest categories of Western music history: early (pretonal) music, tonal music, and modern (posttonal) music. The separation is not always justified since the border periods are related (e.g., Clough 1957 on Renaissance and Baroque music), but few articles cross period boundaries. Most of the articles that do not address a special period discuss theoretical aspects that might be relevant to any kind of repertoire, for example, acoustics or metatheoretical issues. Tonal music and posttonal music are discussed in almost total separation from each other. David Lewin is exceptional in grasping general phenomena that have tonal as well as posttonal manifestations (for example, Lewin 1998a on contrary motion between the bass and the upper voices in Liszt and Crumb). Among the three large categories, the numbers of articles are 43 (10.9 percent) for early (pretonal), 136 (46.2 percent) for tonal, and 121 (30.8 percent) for modern (posttonal) music. Early music was much more prominent in the journal's earlier periods. The decline of early music studies in *JMT* is even stronger if one also takes into account the decrease in discussion of Baroque music (only eight articles on early music, Baroque included, since vol. 41). This decline might derive from the absence of a paradigmatic theory, comparable to Schenkerian or set theories, for the analysis of pretonal music and also from changes in the general balance in historical musicology.⁴³ The fact that the recent issue 47/2 lacks any items on nineteenth- and twentieth-century music again points to a possible shift of emphasis after the break in actual publication of *JMT*.

⁴² Powell 1979 is not indexed in *RILM*.

⁴³ Kerman (1985, 42) notes that prewar European musicology laid stress on the Renaissance and Middle Ages. This emphasis still dominated in early postwar American musicology.

Table 6. Distribution of articles per period of repertoire in JMT

Larger Periods													
Period Name	Average						Period + Articles Count	Percentage of Articles	Percentage of Period Records		Average Volume		
	Articles	1-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-48/1							
Ancient (Greek)	8		3	4	1		23.4	Early music 43 (1 with 2 subperiods)	10.9	10.5	19.5		
Ancient (post-Greek)	1	1					2						
Medieval	13	3	3	3	2	2	23.5						
Renaissance	22	9	6	3	2	2	16.6						
Tonal general	43	7	7	9	12	8	26.1	136 Tonal (5 with 2 subperiods)	34.6	33.1	31.9	26.8	
Baroque	33	9	7	7	6	4	21.0						
Classical	27	5	8	8	4	4	25.2						
Romantic	32	6	6	6	6	14	33.8					26.5	
Post-Romantic	6	1	1	1	3	1	32.7	127	32.3	31.1	25.8		
Impressionistic	5		4	4	1	1	27.2						
Modern	96	14	17	26	21	18	27.1	121 Modern	30.8	29.7	43	16.5	
Modern (American)	8		1	3	4		29.9						
Electronic	12	11	1				8						
Jazz	3					3	43	Jazz 3	0.8	0.7			
Non-Western: General	1	1					2	Non-Western 8	2.0	2.0			
Arabic	1		1				13						
Ladino	1				1		37						
China	1	1					1						
India	3	1		2			18.7						
Cuba	1			1			23						
No special period	91	25	26	5	19	16	22.8	No special period 91	23.2	22.3	22.8		
Total periods	408	85	87	82	81	73		402	102.3				
Total items	393	80	87	79	78	69		393		100	(*99.9)		

Within tonal music, most noteworthy is the recent rise in analysis of Romantic (especially late Romantic) music. This rise too seems to result from the establishment of a matching method (in this case neo-Riemannian theory); the special issue 42/2 is responsible for part of this increase.

The matching between theoretical methods and periods discussed is fairly high, but not absolute. Five articles use Schenkerian theory to investigate posttonal music (e.g., Nolan 1995), and two additional articles discuss posttonal music from a wider Schenker-related approach. The complementary method is the application of set theory for tonal music in at least four articles (most notably in Clough 1979). Whereas the long and problematic history of Schenkerian applications to posttonal music is heterogeneous in character (see the survey in Straus 1997b, 237–38, note 1), application of set theory to tonal music is based on the principle of generalization: applying the idea of set-classes to the diatonic universe rather than to the chromatic one. Additionally, the rediscovery of Riemann seems to owe much to set theory. Riemann's idea that major and minor triads relate to each other by inversion seemed of little relevance to Schenkerians as well as to traditional harmonists such as Piston, but in set theory it is the private case of set 3–11. This aspect of set theory assisted a new theoretical branch with a different intended repertoire. Here, too, generalization could prove useful, as when Lewin (1998b) uses transformational theory in an analysis of Bach, by applying the general idea of flips not to 3–11 but to another trichord, 3–2.

There are large differences between the analyzed repertoire and what is commonly known as the “standard” repertoire. Although modern music is given somewhat less space in *JMT* than tonal music, it still receives much more attention than it receives in the standard concert or broadcasting repertoire. Within modern music, the gap is even more striking, as is evident from Table 7, which shows the choice of composers to which entire articles are devoted (the table is organized according to the chronological order of births, and thus avoids stylistic categorization).

Ninety-three articles are devoted to the work of specific composers (with three articles referring to two composers each, a total of ninety-six entries). These include all sixteen entries in the analysis symposia; inconsistencies in the input of the symposia create some disproportions but do not modify the large picture.

The two composers who receive the largest number of articles (with ten and nine articles, respectively) are Schoenberg and Webern. The absence of Berg is puzzling, surprising, and perhaps inadvertent since reviews are devoted to books on his music (e.g., in Hall 1987) and examples from his music are discussed (e.g., Väisälä 2002). Seven articles address composers of considerable modernity (Dallapiccola, Xenakis, Penderecki), some of them Americans (Ruggles, Carter, Crumb, Martino), and one article (Johnson 1993) studies

Table 7. Articles devoted to specific composers in *JMT*

<i>Number of Articles</i>	<i>Composer (arranged by date of birth according to New Grove, 2nd ed.)</i>	<i>Number of Articles</i>	<i>Composer (arranged by date of birth according to New Grove, 2nd ed.)</i>
3	Machaut (1300–77)	5	Debussy (1862–1918)
2	Du fay (1397–1474)	1	Skryabin (1872–1915)
1	Ockeghem (1410–97)	1	Reger (1873–1916)
1	Josquin (c.1450/55–1521)	10	Schoenberg (1874–1951)
1	Gascongne (flourished 1517/18)	3	Ives (1874–1954)
1	Forestier (c.1500–35)	1	Ruggles (1876–1971)
1	Cortecchia (1502–71)	2	Bartók (1881–1945)
1	Cabezón (1510–66)	4	Stravinsky (1882–1971)
3	J. S. Bach (1685–1750)	1	Szymanowski (1882–1937)
1	C. P. E. Bach (1714–88)	9	Webern (1883–1945)
2	Haydn (1732–1809)	1 (3)	Porter (1891–1964)
6	Mozart (1756–91)	1	Dallapiccola (1904–75)
6	Beethoven (1770–1827)	2	Carter (b.1908)
6	Schubert (1797–1828)	1	Britten (1913–76)
1	Berlioz (1803–69)	1	Xenakis (1922–2001)
3	Chopin (1810–49)	2	Crumb (b.1929)
1	Liszt (1811–86)	1	Martino (1931–2005)
1	Wagner (1813–83)	1	Penderecki (b.1933)
3	Brahms (1833–97)	1	Adams (b.1947)
2	Wolf (1860–1903)		

music by the minimalist composer John Adams. By contrast, more traditional twentieth-century composers receive much less attention: only two articles are devoted to Bartók, Hindemith appears as a theorist but not as a composer, and neoclassical composers (e.g., Prokofiev, Shostakovich, or Poulenc) or post-Romantic ones (e.g., Sibelius or Elgar) remain outside *JMT*. Even a full-text search in *JSTOR* reveals (until vol. 45) very few entries on these composers (13, 11, 3, 16, and 2, respectively). The numbers include such irrelevant materials as back matters—including one of the two appearances of “Elgar.”

Composers of the tonal classical tradition are seriously underrepresented in the list I have given since many examples from their works appear mixed within larger articles. A *JSTOR* full-text search in *JMT* reveals 335 items that include the name “Beethoven” and 281 with “Mozart,” but Haydn is still represented less than Webern (151 items mention Haydn, 215 mention Webern). It is nevertheless surprising that 47.5 volumes of *JMT* do not include any article specifically devoted to composers such as Handel, Mendelssohn, or Schumann, to name three.

Studies of most French, Italian, and Russian composers are also absent in *JMT*, as are studies of opera.⁴⁴ The choice of the tonal repertoire in *JMT*

⁴⁴ On the need to develop ample tools for the analysis of opera, see Abbate and Parker 1989.

confirms to a large extent the preferences of Schenker, just as the most analyzed posttonal composers lend themselves best to a set-theoretical approach. Theoretical aspects in the study of tonality or atonality are demonstrated as a rule by pieces of the common repertoire (tonal or atonal) alone. When a different repertoire is taken, as in McNamee 1985 on Szymanowski or Harrison 1991 on Reger, the analytical examination of the specific repertoire becomes the main issue.

This is of course emblematic of the constant tension between theory and analysis in general.⁴⁵ Along with the ninety-three articles devoted to specific composers, many additional articles analyze musical excerpts, mostly as a demonstration of theoretical points (which, in turn, should illuminate musical works). *JMT* seems slightly more inclined toward theory than toward analysis. This was very much evident in the journal's earliest period. Until issue 10/1, *JMT* included not a single article devoted entirely to one composer or one work, and only one article that was mostly concerned with one composer (Rochberg 1959 on Schoenberg). Probably as a reaction to this approach, *JMT* initiated the series of analytical symposia discussed above, where the musical focus was put on specific musical pieces.

Conclusion

Content analysis of the articles in *JMT*, combined with additional bibliometric inputs, has proved illuminating for the study of *JMT*. Whereas most of the discovered features might be obvious to devoted readers of *JMT*, the use of bibliometric methods helps to show the apparent as well as more concealed features with more exactitude. It is my impression that although the content of *JMT* generally reflects the field of music theory in the United States in general, and that content analysis of additional American periodical literature in music theory would produce generally similar results, *JMT* seems nonetheless more conservative than other theory journals (e.g., in its approach to popular music studies). *JMT*, the solid house of hard-core set and Schenkerian theory, nevertheless has become more pluralistic in recent years. It is the task of future contributors and editors to maintain the delicate balance between broadening the scope of the inquiry both in repertoire and in method, and preserving the journal's highly rigorous theoretical and analytical levels.

⁴⁵ Even articles with analytical focus might use the musical examples as demonstration of theoretical points. For example, Beach (1994, 2) claims: "To demonstrate, three excerpts from Schubert's chamber music have been cho-

sen." It is instructive to compare in this respect the titles of several other journals in the discipline: *Music Analysis* versus *In Theory Only*, and the compromise in *Theory and Practice*.

Works Cited

- Abbate, Carolyn and Roger Parker. 1989. "Introduction: On Analyzing Opera." In *Analyzing Opera*, ed. Carolyn Abbate and Roger Parker, 1–24. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Agawu, V. Kofi. 1991. *Playing with Signs: A Semiotic Interpretation of Classical Music*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Agmon, Eytan. 1996. "Coherent Tone-Systems: A Study in the Theory of Diatonicism." *Journal of Music Theory* 40/1: 39–59.
- Almén, Byron. 2003. "Narrative Archetypes: A Critique, Theory, and Method of Narrative Analysis." *Journal of Music Theory* 47/1: 1–39.
- Atkinson, Charles M. 1980. Review of *Huchald, Guido, and John on Music: Three Medieval Treatises*, trans. Warren Babb, ed. Claude Palisca; and *Commemoratio Brevis de Tonis et Psalmis Modulandis*, trans. and ed. Terence Bailey. *Journal of Music Theory* 24/2: 268–77.
- Ayotte, Benjamin McKay. 2004. *Heinrich Schenker: A Guide to Research*. New York: Routledge.
- Babbitt, Milton. 1961. "Set Structure as Structural Determinant." *Journal of Music Theory* 5/1: 72–94.
- Baker, James M., David W. Beach, and Jonathan W. Bernard. 1997. "Introduction." In *Music Theory in Concept and Practice*, ed. James M. Baker, David W. Beach, and Jonathan W. Bernard, 1–7. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Beach, David W. 1969. "A Schenker Bibliography." *Journal of Music Theory* 13/1: 2–37.
- . 1979. "A Schenker Bibliography: 1969–1979." *Journal of Music Theory* 23/1: 275–86.
- . 1983. "A Recurring Pattern in Mozart's Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 27/1: 1–29.
- . 1985. "The Current State of Schenkerian Research." *Acta Musicologica* 17/2: 205–307.
- . 1988. "The Fundamental Line from Scale Degree 8: Criteria for Evaluation." *Journal of Music Theory* 32/2: 271–94.
- . 1989. "The Current Literature (July 1985–Fall 1988)." Supplement to "Schenkerian Theory." *Music Theory Spectrum* 11/1: 3–14.
- . 1994. "Harmony and Linear Progression in Schubert's Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 38/1: 1–20.
- Beach, David W., Donald Mintz, and Robert Palmer. 1969. "Analysis Symposium [Beethoven, Piano Sonata op. 53. 2nd movement: Introduzione]." *Journal of Music Theory* 13/2: 186–217.
- Becker, Judith and Alton Becker. 1979. "A Grammar of the Musical Genre 'Srepegan.'" *Journal of Music Theory* 23/1: 1–43.
- Benjamin, William E. 1981. "Schenker's Theory and the Future of Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 25/1: 155–73.
- Berger, Jonathan. 1994. "Playing with Playing with Signs: A Critical Response to Kofi Agawu." *Journal of Music Theory* 38/2: 293–313.
- Bernard, Jonathan W. 1991. "Letter to the Editor." *Journal of Music Theory* 35/1–2: 310–13.
- Berry, David Carson. 2004. *A Topical Guide to Schenkerian Literature: An Annotated Bibliography with Indices*. Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon.
- Boretz, Benjamin. [1969–73] 1995. *Meta-variations: Studies in the Foundations of Musical Thought*. Red Hook, NY: Open Spaces. Originally published serially in *Perspectives of New Music*, 1969–73.
- Boss, Jack. 1994. "Schoenberg on Ornamentation and Structural Levels." *Journal of Music Theory* 38/2: 187–216.
- Brauneiss, Lauri. 1996. "Zur Aktualität Benjamin Brittens." *Musiktheorie* 11: 125–37.
- Brender, Maurita P. and Ronald F. Brender. 1967. "Computer Transcription and Analysis of Mid-Thirteenth-Century Musical Notation." *Journal of Music Theory* 11/2: 198–221.

- Brinkman, Alexander R. 1986. "Representing Musical Scores for Computer Analysis." *Journal of Music Theory* 30/2: 225–75.
- Brittin, Ruth V. and Jayne M. Standley. 1997. "Researchers in Music Education/Therapy: Analysis of Publications, Citations, and Retrievability of Work." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 45/1: 145–61.
- Brown, Matthew and Douglas J. Dempster. 1989. "The Scientific Image of Music Theory." *Journal of Music Theory* 33/1: 65–106.
- Browne, Richmond. 1974. Review of *The Structure of Atonal Music*, by Allen Forte. *Journal of Music Theory* 18/2: 390–415.
- . 1979. "The Inception of the Society for Music Theory." *Music Theory Spectrum* 1: 2–5.
- . 1995. "The 1994 Lancaster University Conference." *Journal of Music Theory* 39/2: 385–95.
- . 2003. "The Deep Background of Our Society." *Music Theory Online* 9/1.
- Buchler, Michael. 2001. "Relative Saturation of Interval and Set Classes: A New Model for Understanding Pcset Complementation and Resemblance." *Journal of Music Theory* 45/2: 263–343.
- Burkhart, Charles. 1978. "Schenker's 'Motivic Parallelisms.'" *Journal of Music Theory* 22/2: 145–78.
- . 1997. "Remembering David Krahenbuehl." *Journal of Music Theory* 41/2: 183–92.
- Carey, Norman and David Clampitt. 1996. "Regions: A Theory of Tonal Spaces in Early Medieval Treatises." *Journal of Music Theory* 40/1: 113–47.
- Clarkson, Austin. 1968. Review of Three Books from the Series Colorado College Music Press Translations. *Journal of Music Theory* 12/2: 281–89.
- . 1984. "On New (and Not-So-New) Music in America by Stefan Wolpe: A Translation." *Journal of Music Theory* 28/1: 1–45.
- Clifton, Thomas. 1970. "An Application of Goethe's Concept of *Steigerung* to the Morphology of Diminution." *Journal of Music Theory* 14/2: 165–89.
- Clough, John. 1957. "The Leading Tone in Direct Chromaticism." *Journal of Music Theory* 1/1: 2–21.
- . 1979. "Aspects of Diatonic Sets." *Journal of Music Theory* 23/1: 45–61.
- . 2002. "Acknowledgements." *Journal of Music Theory* 42/2. Unnumbered page.
- Clough, John, John Cuciurean, and Jack Douthett. 1997. "Hyperscales and the Generalized Tetrachord." *Journal of Music Theory* 41/1: 67–100.
- Clough, John and Jack Douthett. 1991. "Maximally Even Sets." *Journal of Music Theory* 35/1–2: 93–173.
- Cohen, Albert et al. 1972. "National Predilections in Seventeenth-Century Music Theory: A Symposium." *Journal of Music Theory* 16/1–2: 4–71.
- Cohn, Richard. 1998. "Introduction to Neo-Riemannian Theory: A Survey and a Historical Perspective." *Journal of Music Theory* 42/2: 167–80.
- Coover, James B. 1959. "Music Theory in Translation: A Bibliography." *Journal of Music Theory* 3/1: 70–96.
- . 1969. "Music Theory in Translation: A Bibliography Supplement." *Journal of Music Theory* 13/2: 230–48.
- Dahlhaus, Carl. 1975. "Some Models of Unity in Musical Forms." *Journal of Music Theory* 19/1: 2–30.
- Daniels, Arthur. 1965a. "Microtonality and Mean-Tone Temperament in the Harmonic System of Francesco Salinas: Part 1." *Journal of Music Theory* 9/1: 2–51.
- . 1965b. "Microtonality and Mean-Tone Temperament in the Harmonic System of Francesco Salinas: Part 2." *Journal of Music Theory* 9/2: 234–80.
- Davis, James A. 1995. "Philosophical Positivism and American Atonal Music Theory." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56: 501–22.

- Demske, Thomas R. 1988. "Inversional Common-Note Structure and Interval-Class Content." *Journal of Music Theory* 32/2: 295–334.
- Drabkin, William. 1980. "Prolongation." In *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. 1st ed. London: Macmillan.
- . 2000. "Prolongation." In *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan.
- Dubiel, Joseph. 1990. "When You Are a Beethoven: Kinds of Rules in Schenker's Counterpoint." *Journal of Music Theory* 34/2: 291–348.
- Dunsby, Jonathan. 2002. "Scenarios, Mostly from the Early Days of MusA." Special issue, *Music Analysis* 21: 5–11.
- Epstein, David. 1981. "On Schenker's *Free Composition*." *Journal of Music Theory* 25/1: 143–53.
- Erickson, Raymond. 1968. "Music Analysis and the Computer." *Journal of Music Theory* 12/2: 240–63.
- Etzion, Judit and Susana Weich-Shahak. 1993. "'Family Resemblances' and Variability in the Sephardic Romancero: A Methodological Approach to Variantal Comparison." *Journal of Music Theory* 37/2: 267–309.
- Everett, Walter. 2004. "Deep-Level Portrayals of Directed and Misdirected Motions in Nineteenth-Century Lyric Song." *Journal of Music Theory* 48/1: 25–68.
- Fay, Thomas. 1971. "Perceived Hierarchic Structure in Language and Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 15/1–2: 112–37.
- . 1974. "Context Analysis of Musical Gestures." *Journal of Music Theory* 18/1: 124–51.
- Forte, Allen. 1959. "Schenker's Conception of Musical Structure." *Journal of Music Theory* 3/1: 1–30.
- . 1988. "Pitch-Class Set Genera and the Origin of the Modern Harmonic Species." *Journal of Music Theory* 32/2: 187–270.
- . 1992. "Concepts of Linearity in Schoenberg's Atonal Music: A Study of the Opus 15 Song Cycle." *Journal of Music Theory* 36/2: 285–382.
- . 1998. "Paul Hindemith's Contribution to Music Theory in the United States." *Journal of Music Theory* 42/1: 1–14.
- Forte, Allen et al. 1977. "Ernst Oster (1908–1977) in Memoriam." *Journal of Music Theory* 21/2: 340–54.
- Fowler, Maria. 1978. Review of *Regulae de Contrapunto*, by Antonio de Leno, ed. Albert Seay; *Quaestiones et Solutiones* (Anonymous), ed. Albert Seay; and *Quatuor Tractatuli Italici de Contrapunto* (Anonymous), ed. Albert Seay. *Journal of Music Theory* 22/1: 115–17.
- Friedmann, Michael. 1987. "A Response: My Contour, Their Contour." *Journal of Music Theory* 31/2: 268–74.
- Fuller, Ramon. 1975. "A Structuralist Approach to the Diatonic Scale." *Journal of Music Theory* 19/2: 182–210.
- Godzich, Wlad. 1978. Review of *A Theory of Semiotics*, by Umberto Eco; and *Fondements d'une sémiologie de la musique*, by Jean Jacques Nattiez. *Journal of Music Theory* 22/1: 117–33.
- Gold, Christian and Rune Rolvsjord. 2006. "Citation Patterns and Scientific Impact of the *Nordic Journal of Music Therapy*." *Nordic Journal of Music Therapy* 15/2: 139–53.
- Hall, Patricia. 1987. Review of *The Operas of Alban Berg*, vol. 2, "Lulu," by George Perle. *Journal of Music Theory* 31/1: 140–46.
- Hamann, Donald L. and Keitha V. Lucas. 1998. "Establishing Journal Eminence in Music Education Research." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 46: 405–13.
- Harrison, Daniel. 1991. "Max Reger's Motivic Technique: Harmonic Innovations at the Border of Atonality." *Journal of Music Theory* 35/1–2: 61–91.
- . 2002. "From the Editor." *Music Theory Spectrum* 24: 163–64.
- . 2003. "Rosalia, Aloysius, and Arcangelo: A Genealogy of the Sequence." *Journal of Music Theory* 47/2: 225–72.

- Hasty, Christopher, Pieter van den Toorn, and Warner Marshall. 1989. "From the Editors." *Journal of Music Theory* 33/1: 64.
- Hatch, Christopher. 2005. "Observations on Editing." *Current Musicology* 79–80: 139–42.
- Hiller, Lejaren A., Jr. 1963. "Electronic Music at the University of Illinois." *Journal of Music Theory* 7/1: 99–126.
- Hood, William W. and Concepción S. Wilson. 2001. "The Literature of Bibliometrics, Scientometrics, and Informetrics." *Scientometrics* 52: 291–314.
- Hook, Julian L. 2002. "Uniform Triadic Transformations." *Journal of Music Theory* 46/1–2: 57–126.
- Hughes, Matt, Lawrence Moss, and Carl Schachter. 1968. "Analysis Symposium [Schubert: Moment Musical, op. 94/1]." *Journal of Music Theory* 12/2: 184–239.
- Hyde, Martha Maclean. 1980. "The Roots of Form in Schoenberg's Sketches." *Journal of Music Theory* 24/1: 1–36.
- Hyer, Brian. 1995. "Re-imag(in)ing Riemann." *Journal of Music Theory* 39/1: 101–38.
- Johnson, Timothy A. 1993. "Harmonic Vocabulary in the Music of John Adams: A Hierarchical Approach." *Journal of Music Theory* 37/1: 117–56.
- Kaarela, Edwin E. 1992. "Letter to the Editor." *Journal of Music Theory* 36/1: 221.
- Kalib, Sylvan Sol. 1973. "Thirteen Essays from the Three Yearbooks *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*: An Annotated Translation." Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University.
- Kerman, Joseph. 1985. *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Knopoff, Leon and William Hutchinson. 1981. "Information Theory for Musical Continua." *Journal of Music Theory* 15/1: 17–44.
- . 1983. "Entropy as a Measure of Style: The Influence of Sample Length." *Journal of Music Theory* 17/1: 75–97.
- Krahenbuehl, David. 1957. "Foreword." *Journal of Music Theory* 1/1: 1.
- Krahenbuehl, David et al. 1959. "The Nature and Value of Theoretical Training: A Forum." *Journal of Music Theory* 3/1: 31–69.
- Kramer, Lawrence. 1995. *Classical Music and Postmodern Knowledge*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Krantz, Richard J., Jack Douthett, and Steven D. Doty. 1998. "Maximally Even Sets and the Devil's-Staircase Phase Diagram for the One-Dimensional Ising Antiferromagnet with Arbitrary-Range Interaction." *Journal of Mathematical Physics* 39: 4675–82.
- Lambert, Philip. 1990. "Aggregate Structures in the Music of Charles Ives." *Journal of Music Theory* 34/1: 29–55.
- . 1993. "Toward a Theory of Chord Structure for the Music of Ives." *Journal of Music Theory* 37/1: 55–83.
- . 1997. *The Music of Charles Ives*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Larson, Steve. 1997. "The Problem of Prolongation in 'Tonal' Music: Terminology, Perception, and Expressive Meaning." *Journal of Music Theory* 41/1: 101–36.
- . 1999. "Swing and Motive in Three Performances by Oscar Peterson." *Journal of Music Theory* 43/2: 283–314.
- Lenneberg, Hans. 1958a. "Johann Mattheson on Affect and Rhetoric in Music (I)." *Journal of Music Theory* 2/1: 47–84.
- . 1958b. "Johann Mattheson on Affect and Rhetoric in Music (II)." *Journal of Music Theory* 2/2: 193–236.
- Lerdahl, Fred. 1997. "Issues in Prolongational Theory: A Response to Larson." *Journal of Music Theory* 41/1: 141–55.
- Lerdahl, Fred and Ray Jackendoff. 1977. "Toward a Formal Theory of Tonal Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 21/1: 111–71.

- . 1981. "Generative Music Theory and Its Relation to Psychology." *Journal of Music Theory* 25/1: 45–90.
- . 1983. *A Generative Theory of Tonal Music*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . 1985. "A Reply to Peel and Slawson's Review of *A Generative Theory of Tonal Music*." *Journal of Music Theory* 29/1: 145–60.
- Lewin, David. 1959. "Re: Intervallic Relations between Two Collections of Notes." *Journal of Music Theory* 3/2: 298–301.
- . 1976. "On the Interval Content of Invertible Hexachords." *Journal of Music Theory* 20/2: 185–88.
- . 1987. *Generalized Music Intervals and Transformations*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 1998a. "Some Ideas about Voice-Leading between PC Sets." *Journal of Music Theory* 42/1: 15–72.
- . 1998b. "Notes on the Opening of the F-Sharp Minor Fugue from *WTC I*." *Journal of Music Theory* 42/2: 235–39.
- Lipetz, Ben-Ami. 1999. "Aspects of *JASIS* Authorship through Five Decades." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 50: 994–1003.
- Longyear, Rey M. 1977. "Article Citations and 'Obsolescence' in Musicological Journals." *Notes* 33: 563–71.
- Maegaard, Jan. 1985. "The Nomenclature of Pitch-Class Sets and the Teaching of Atonal Theory." *Journal of Music Theory* 29/2: 299–314.
- Marvin, Elizabeth West. 1990. Review of *The Music of Edgard Varèse*, by Jonathan W. Bernard. *Journal of Music Theory* 34/2: 359–68.
- Mathiesen, Thomas J. 1975. "An Annotated Translation of Euclid's *Division of the Monochord*." *Journal of Music Theory* 19/2: 236–59.
- Maus, Fred Everett. 1993. "Masculine Discourse in Music Theory." *Perspectives of New Music* 31/2: 264–93.
- McGaughey, Janet et al. 1974. "Pedagogy in Perspective: Music Theory in Higher Education." *Journal of Music Theory* 18/1: 46–123.
- McNamee, Ann K. 1985. "Bitonality, Mode, and Interval in the Music of Karol Szymanowski." *Journal of Music Theory* 29/1: 61–84.
- Mead, Andrew. 1999. "Physiological Metaphor and Musical Understanding." *Journal of Music Theory* 43/1: 1–19.
- Meyers, Robert G. 1964a. "Technical Bases of Electronic Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 8/1: 2–54.
- . 1964b. "Technical Bases of Electronic Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 8/2: 184–250.
- . 1966. "Technical Bases of Electronic Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 10/2: 216–17.
- . 1967. "Technical Bases of Electronic Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 11/2: 222–76.
- Mooney, Kevin. 2000. "Hugo Riemann's Debut as a Music Theorist." *Journal of Music Theory* 44/1: 81–99.
- Morgan, Robert P. 1999. "Are There Two Tonal Practices in Nineteenth-Century Music?" Review of *The Second Practice of Nineteenth-Century Tonality*, ed. William Kinderman and Harald Krebs. *Journal of Music Theory* 43/1: 135–63.
- Morris, Robert D. 1982. Review of *The Technique of Electronic Music*, by Thomas Wells; and *Tape Music Composition*, by David Keane. *Journal of Music Theory* 26/2: 331–48.
- Neumeyer, David. 1987. "The *Urtlinie* from 8 as a Middleground Phenomenon." *In Theory Only* 9: 3–25.
- Nolan, Catherine. 1995. "Structural Levels and Twelve-Tone Music: A Revisionist Analysis of the Second Movement of Webern's Piano Variations Opus 27." *Journal of Music Theory* 39/1: 47–76.

- Oster, Ernst. 1960. "A New Concept of Tonality (?)" *Journal of Music Theory* 4/1: 85–98.
- Parks, Richard. 1985. "Tonal Analogues as Atonal Resources and Their Relation to Form in Debussy's Chromatic Etude." *Journal of Music Theory* 29/1: 33–60.
- Pearsall, Edward. 2004. "Transformational Streams: Unraveling Melodic Processes in Twentieth-Century Motivic Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 48/1: 69–98.
- Peel, John and Wayne Slawson. 1984. Review of *A Generative Theory of Tonal Music*, by Fred Lerdahl and Ray Jackendoff. *Journal of Music Theory* 28/2: 271–94.
- . 1985. "Reply to a Reply." *Journal of Music Theory* 29/1: 161–68.
- Peritz, Bluma C. and Judit Bar-Ilan. 2001. "The Inside-Outside Looking of the Field of Bibliometrics-Scientometrics as Reflected in References." Paper presented at the 8th International Conference of Scientometrics and Informetrics, Sydney.
- Poirel, Annalisa Swig. 1998. "The Impossible Course: Music in the Core Curriculum." *Current Musicology* 65: 70–81.
- Polansky, Larry and Richard Bassein. 1992. "Possible and Impossible Melody: Some Formal Aspects of Contour." *Journal of Music Theory* 36/2: 259–84.
- Powell, Newman W. 1979. "Fibonacci and the Golden Mean: Rabbits, Rumbas, and Rondeaux." *Journal of Music Theory* 23/2: 227–73.
- Rahn, John. 2001. "Logic, Set Theory, Music Theory." In *Music Inside Out: Going Too Far in Musical Essays*, 109–26. New York: Routledge.
- Rahn, Jay. 2001. "Program Committee Report on the 2000 Toronto Conference." *SMT Newsletter* 25: 9.
- Reynolds, William H. 1958. "Re: Unity in Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 2/1: 97–104.
- Rochberg, George. 1959. "The Harmonic Tendency of the Hexachord." *Journal of Music Theory* 3/2: 208–30.
- Rothgeb, John. 1966. "Some Uses of Mathematical Concepts in Theories of Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 10/2: 200–15.
- . 1969. "Another View on Schubert's Moment Musical Op. 94/1." *Journal of Music Theory* 13/1: 128–39.
- Rothstein, William. 1980. "Linear Structure in the Twelve-Tone System: An Analysis of Donald Martino's 'Pianississimo.'" *Journal of Music Theory* 24/2: 129–65.
- . 1990. "The Americanization of Heinrich Schenker." In *Schenker Studies*, ed. Heidi Siegel, 193–203. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Originally published in *In Theory Only* 9/1 (1986): 5–17.
- . 2001. Review of articles on Schenker and Schenkerian Theory in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed. *Journal of Music Theory* 45/1: 204–28.
- Sanders, Ernest H. 1980. "Letter to the Editor." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 23: 602–7.
- Saslaw, Janna K. 1996. "Forces, Containers, and Paths: The Role of Body-Derived Image Schemas in the Conceptualization of Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 40/2: 217–43.
- Satyendra, Ramon. 2004. "An Informal Introduction to Some Formal Concepts from Lewin's Transformational Theory." *Journal of Music Theory* 48/1: 99–141.
- Schachter, Carl E. 1969. "More about Schubert's Op. 94/1." *Journal of Music Theory* 13/2: 218–29.
- . 1977. "Diversity and the Decline of Literacy in Music Theory." *College Music Symposium* 17: 150–53.
- . 1981. "A Commentary on Schenker's *Free Composition*." *Journal of Music Theory* 25/1: 115–42.
- Schenker, Heinrich. [1926] 1968. "Organic Structure in Sonata Form." Translated by Orin Grossman. *Journal of Music Theory* 12/2: 164–83.
- . [1935] 1979. *Free Composition*. Revised and edited by Oswald Jonas. Translated by Ernst Oster. New York: Longman.

- . [1926] 1996. "On Organicism in Sonata Form." In *The Masterwork in Music*, vol. 2, ed. William Drabkin, 23–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, Charles P. and Stephen F. Zdzinski. 1993. "Cited Quantitative Research Articles in Music Education Research Journals, 1975–1990: A Content Analysis of Selected Studies." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 41: 5–18.
- Schoepflin, Urs and Wolfgang Glanzel. 2001. "Two Decades of *Scientometrics*: An Interdisciplinary Field Represented by Its Leading Journal." *Scientometrics* 50: 301–12.
- Scotto, Ciro. 2002. "The Conflict between Particularism and Generalism in Andrew Mead's *Introduction to the Music of Milton Babbitt*." *Journal of Music Theory* 46/1–2: 285–345.
- Shaftel, Matthew. 1999. "From Inspiration to Archive: Cole Porter's 'Night and Day.'" *Journal of Music Theory* 43/2: 315–47.
- Simoni, Mary, ed. 2005. *Analytical Methods in Electroacoustic Music*. New York: Routledge.
- Smoliar, Stephen W. 1976. "Music Programs: An Approach to Music Theory through Computational Linguistics." *Journal of Music Theory* 20/1: 105–31.
- Smyth, David H. 1999. "Schenker's Octave Lines Reconsidered." *Journal of Music Theory* 43/1: 101–33.
- Standley, J. M. 1984. "Productivity and Eminence in Music Research." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 32: 149–57.
- Straus, Joseph N. 1987. "The Problem of Prolongation in Post-tonal Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 31/1: 1–21.
- . 1997a. "A Response to Larson." *Journal of Music Theory* 41/1: 137–40.
- . 1997b. "Voice Leading in Atonal Music." In *Music Theory in Concept and Practice*, ed. James M. Baker, David Beach, and Jonathan Bernard, 237–74. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Strunk, Steven. 1999. "Chick Corea's 1984 Performance of 'Night and Day.'" *Journal of Music Theory* 43/2: 257–81.
- Suurpää, Lauri. 2000. "The Path from the Tonic to the Dominant in the Second Movement of Schubert's String Quintet and in Chopin's Fourth Ballade." *Journal of Music Theory* 44/2: 451–85.
- Tenney, James and Larry Polansky. 1980. "Temporal Gestalt Perception in Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 24/2: 205–41.
- Thomson, William. 1958. "The Problem of Tonality in Pre-Baroque and Primitive Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 2/1: 36–46.
- . 1965. "Hindemith's Contribution to Music Theory." *Journal of Music Theory* 9/1: 52–71.
- Tischler, Hans. 1982. "A Propos Meter and Rhythm in the *Ars Antiqua*." *Journal of Music Theory* 26/2: 313–29.
- Travis, Roy. 1959. "Toward a New Concept of Tonality." *Journal of Music Theory* 3/2: 257–84.
- Treidler, Leo. 1979. "Regarding Meter and Rhythm in the *Ars Antiqua*." *Musical Quarterly* 65: 524–58.
- Truax, Barry. 1976. "A Communicational Approach to Computer Sound Programs." *Journal of Music Theory* 20/2: 227–300.
- Väisälä, Olli. 2002. "Prolongation of Harmonies Related to the Harmonic Series in Early Post-tonal Music." *Journal of Music Theory* 46/1–2: 207–83.
- Waldbauer, Ivan F. 1989. "Riemann's Periodization Revisited and Revised." *Journal of Music Theory* 33/2: 333–91.
- Walters, Anne Elizabeth. 1982. Review of *Ars Musicorum—Libri VI et VIII*, by Guilielmus di Podio, ed. Albert Seay, and other books. *Journal of Music Theory* 26/2: 349–56.
- Wason, Robert and Elizabeth West Marvin. 1992. "Riemann's *Ideen zu Einer Lehre der Tonvorstellungen*: An Annotated Translation." *Journal of Music Theory* 36/1: 69–79.

- Whittenberg, Charles. 1969. Review of *Twentieth-Century Music*, by H. H. Stuckenschmidt. *Journal of Music Theory* 13/2: 295–306.
- Wilcox, H. J. 1986. “Fibonacci Sequences in Period N for Groups.” *Fibonacci Quarterly* 24/4: 356–61.
- Winckel, Fritz. 1963. “The Psycho-acoustical Analysis of Structure as Applied to Electronic Music.” *Journal of Music Theory* 7/2: 194–246.
- Yarbrough, Cornelia. 1984. “A Content Analysis of the *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 1953–1983.” *Journal of Research in Music Education* 32/4: 213–22.
- . 2002. “The First 50 Years of the *Journal of Research in Music Education*: A Content Analysis.” *Journal of Research in Music Education* 50/4: 276–79.
- Yeston, Maury, ed. 1977. *Reading in Schenker Analysis and Other Approaches*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 1980. [The Passing of William G. Waite]. *Journal of Music Theory* 24/1 [unnumbered page].
- Zbikowsky, Lawrence M. 1997. “Conceptual Models and Cross-Domain Mapping: New Perspectives on Theories of Music and Hierarchy.” *Journal of Music Theory* 41/2: 193–225.

Yosef Goldenberg teaches at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and at the Jerusalem Academy for Music and Dance, where he also serves as head librarian. His research interests focus on tonal music, on which he has published articles in *Theory and Practice*, *Music Theory Online*, and *Journal of Schenkerian Studies*, as well as Israeli folk and art music. ♪