

From: **Ellen Bakulina** <epb037@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 25, 2017 at 2:49 AM
Subject: Re: JSS 9 and 10 Final
To: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>, <stephen.slottow@unt.edu>

Hi Tim,

I just you and Steve my comments for the remainder of the 2016 JSS issue.

Thanks for sending me another photo of Laufer! I am sad that I never met him. I'm sure he was a wonderful person.

I just want to mention once again that, in Lauri Suurpaa's article, there is a terminological mistake about conflicting downbeat. I mentioned it in the other email. Sorry I am so insistent... but it's an important issue and should be corrected. If it's not too late at this point, of course.

All best,
-Ellen

On Tue, Jul 11, 2017 at 10:19 AM, Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Ellen,

Have a good holiday in Quebec city. There are some nice old buildings there too, but not as old as in Colmar. I am pleased that you enjoyed Colmar; it is a wonderful place with a lot of Renaissance architecture.

Now the next time you go to that part of France, you must go to Carcassonne.
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carcassonne>

Unfortunately, I myself have not been there. However, my father, who was a professor of architecture at Dalhousie University in Halifax, went there and was really excited about the medieval architecture. Now that is a truly OLD town! Perhaps I will make it there one day.

In certain ways, you remind me a bit of Ed Laufer; I will tell you why when I

see you in the fall.

Your comments are interesting and good. I would like their continuation.

I hope that you can be more involved from the beginning of future issues of the *Journal*. For fun, I attach another picture of Ed Laufer in a characteristic pose.

Best wishes,

Tim

On Mon, Jul 10, 2017 at 7:55 PM, Ellen Bakulina <epb037@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Tim,

Thank you for sharing this with me. It's a great collections of papers, and I'm especially happy to see a work that combines form-functional and Schenkerian approaches--the one Julie P-D and Don McLean.

I am leaving for a short vacation tomorrow, and unfortunately don't have time right now to work on this properly (since I did not know in advance that this would come up). Nonetheless, I have looked at the first three papers from the 2016 volume, and below are some of my thoughts on them. (I will finish and send more once I come back.) I wanted to send this now, so I don't look like that one lazy person who did not react to this!

Here are the comments:

I generally appreciate it when graphs have a key specified before the RNs. I don't know if this can be done at this point. Beach's graphs, for instance, have the keys only when the key changes (the secondary key of the sonata exposition). That's helpful, but it shows that the main key could perhaps be specified as well. Most (or all?) other authors don't show keys at all.

Another comment on Beach's article concerns his figure 6. This is completely his own choice regarding the style of his graph, but it strikes me a very different from all his other graphs: it has fewer slurs (see mm. 1 and 3) and is generally more "bare." It looks like an inconsistency to me. Is there a reason for this, or is it an editor's mistake?

I wonder if there may be more consistency between the different articles with

respect to the terms "figure" and "examples." Right now, the articles differ from each other. Intuitively, I would call an "example" everything that has musical notation in it. "Figures" are things like tables etc. Am I wrong with this?

A little specific comment on Kamien's article: in his Example 1, I wonder if his second motive, Gb-F-E-Eb-Db-C can be somehow shown in the score in m. 1, in the soprano. It is one of the motives he discussed at the outset of the article. It is, of course, obvious at first glance, but I think that circling it would make the example more readily clear.

I assume that the lack of slurs and brackets in Kamien's Example 7 is the author's conscious choice? Just to make sure the type-setters didn't miss any slurs or flags (to show neighbor tones).

Regarding Pedneault and McLean's article, I wonder if some of the form-functional analysis shown in the score can also be shown in the graphs, at least partially. This would add more rapport between the two views, which right now seem somewhat isolated from each other.

More to come once I come back from Quebec City!

All best,
-Ellen

On Mon, Jul 10, 2017 at 9:26 AM, Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Ellen and Diego,

Could you please take a quick look at these final proofs of the two most recent issues of the JSS to see if anything untoward jumps out at you. I understand that you are busy with your own projects, but it would be most helpful if you could eyeball them.

Please let me know if you have any problem opening the files.

Best wishes, Tim

Vol. 9 (2016)

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B58aNZ4dHoHMaHdjdGNmSGx5Njg>

Vol. 10 (2017)

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B58aNZ4dHoHMOV1QxQ0FjdFVNYWM>