

From: **Bakulina, Ellen** <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Date: Fri, Nov 29, 2019 at 8:18 PM
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper
To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>, Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>, Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>, Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>, Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Looks good to me. I think it should definitely be sent through SMT-announce.

Best,
-Ellen

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Friday, November 29, 2019 12:55 PM
To: Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>; Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Cc: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Hi all,

Here is a new copy of the call with "Schenkerian community" changed to "theory community" and the January 13 deadline. How/where should we send it out? We previously discussed using the SMT list and possible other places (Estonian and Sibelius academies).

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2019 10:56 AM

To: Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>; Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Cc: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

In that case, it may be well to backdate submissions to—say, November 1st, 2019. That way we'll have them before the call is sent out, which would be convenient for all concerned, I should think. This would create an alternative time line, which we could utilize as needed.

-sps

Stephen Slottow
Associate Professor of Music Theory
University of North Texas

From: "Graf, Benjamin" <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Date: Wednesday, November 27, 2019 at 9:44 AM
To: "Cubero, Diego" <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>, "Bakulina, Ellen" <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Cc: "Walls, Levi" <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>, "Slottow, Stephen" <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>, "Chung, Andrew" <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>, Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Dear Diego and all,

I completely agree with point #2, which is now changed to "theory community" (thank you Levi).

As to the deadline-- from an editor's perspective, we really cannot delay the submissions further. There is quite a bit of work that must be done after the submissions come in. For example, the following timeline would be a fair estimate:

Feb 1: collect submissions
Feb 15: editing submissions
Feb 27: revisions complete

March 8: add front/back matter, ads, sign and collect contributor agreement forms

March 15: Karen at UNT Press reads final PDF

March 25: document sent to printers

April/May: we get print copies

Again, from an editor's perspective, it would be best to not delay further. The responses should not be very long, so I hope that we can stick to January 13th.

Best,
Ben

Benjamin Graf, Ph.D.

University of North Texas

Music History, Theory and Ethnomusicology

Office: MU215

From: Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2019 2:00 PM

To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>

Cc: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>

Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Dear Levi and all,

The call looks good. I would make the two following suggestions:

1. There is a passage that reads: "We invite interested parties to submit essay responses to Ewell's paper." I would change it to: "We invite responses to Ewell's paper."
2. I do not like the phrase "Schenkerian community." It is quite exclusive.

Think of a way to reword this sentence. I will, too.

2. Extend the deadline at least to February 1st. A month and a half is a pretty short turn around, especially considering that it is the holidays.

Best,

Diego

Journal of Schenkerian Studies vol. 12 (2019) Call for Papers

The SMT plenary presentation given by Philip Ewell, "Music Theory's White Racial Frame," has inspired a good deal of debate within the Schenkerian community. As a journal dedicated to Schenkerian studies, we find it important to foster these discussions. As part of volume 12, we invite interested parties to submit essay responses to Ewell's paper. The *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* takes no official stance on the issues addressed by Ewell, and we hope to publish a variety of thoughts and perspectives. Submissions must adhere to the following guidelines:

1. Essays should be 1,000 to 3,000 words in length.
2. In order to leave sufficient time for editorial work, submissions must observe a strict deadline of January 13, 2020.

Any questions or concerns regarding submissions may be directed at the editors (Schenker@unt.edu).

Please refer to Ewell's abstract, as well as links to the presentation slides and video recording (listed below):

On Nov 26, 2019, at 12:39 PM, Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu> wrote:

Looks good to me. Thanks for asking for our opinions!

-EB

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2019 12:24 PM
To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Dear Drs. Jackson, Slottow, Graf, et al.,

I've attached a new version of the call. Let me know if it looks okay, or if there are any other issues that come to mind.

Dr. Bakulina, I believe that was the plan. Dr. Jackson also mentioned sending it to the Sibelius and Estonian academies. We'll have to confirm exactly how/where to send it out.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2019 6:21 AM
To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Hi all,

Thank you all very much for the input. Drs. Jackson, Slottow, and Graf, I'll draft a final version of the call and get it back to you around midday, then we can discuss how to proceed. We should be able to send it out today.

Regards,

Levi Walls

From: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2019 11:32:30 AM
To: Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Oh, and change January 13, 2019 to 2020.

-EB

From: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2019 1:22 PM
To: Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Yes, good idea to provide link to the recording of Ewell's talk. As far as I know, it will be available on the SMT website until January 15, which is after your January 13 deadline, so there is no problem here.

Could you specify that the paper was part of the plenary session? Right now, it looks like it was a regular SMT paper (which would probably produce less reverberation than a plenary one).

As for encouraging different kinds of responses, the CFP already says "variety of thoughts and perspectives." I think this is quite clear.

All best,
-EB

From: Slottow, Stephen <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2019 1:15 PM
To: Chung, Andrew <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>; Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Cubero,

Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>

Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>

Subject: Re: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Good idea. One way this could be done is to reproduce Ewell's SMT abstract and link to the SMT reproduction of his slides and video of his talk, which is on both the SMT and his Hunter website. I'm not sure how long it'll stay on the SMT website.

-sps

Stephen Slottow
Associate Professor of Music Theory
University of North Texas

From: "Chung, Andrew" <Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>

Date: Monday, November 25, 2019 at 1:07 PM

To: "Walls, Levi" <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>, "Bakulina, Ellen" <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>, "Cubero, Diego" <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>

Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>, "Slottow, Stephen" <Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>, "Graf, Benjamin" <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>

Subject: RE: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Dear Levi + others,

I think it's great that JSS is looking to engage Ewell's SMT talk. What do you think about mentioning very briefly some of the content and context of Ewell's remarks vis-à-vis Schenker? As the CFP stands, it seems to presume that everyone knows what Ewell said, and what tendencies of Schenker's Ewell chose to talk about (most readers probably do understand both of these things). The thing to be careful about, of course, is not to implicitly encourage responses of one kind and discourage responses of another kind.

Cheers,
Dr. Chung

From: Walls, Levi

Sent: Monday, November 25, 2019 1:00 PM

To: Bakulina, Ellen <Ellen.Bakulina@unt.edu>; Chung, Andrew

<Andrew.Chung@unt.edu>; Cubero, Diego <Diego.Cubero@unt.edu>
Cc: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>; Slottow, Stephen
<Stephen.Slottow@unt.edu>; Graf, Benjamin <Benjamin.Graf@unt.edu>
Subject: Framing for call for responses to Ewell paper

Dear Drs. Bakulina, Chung, and Cubero,

The JSS is preparing to send out a call for responses to the Ewell paper at SMT. We all thought it would be prudent to get input from other faculty members regarding the specific framing of the call. Please let us know if you have any thoughts on improving the language of the call, especially in regards to inclusiveness and impartiality:

The SMT paper given by Philip Ewell, "Music Theory's White Racial Frame," has inspired a good deal of debate within the Schenkerian community. As a journal dedicated to Schenkerian studies, we find it important to foster these discussions. As part of volume 12, we invite interested parties to submit essay responses to Ewell's paper. The *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* takes no official stance on the issues addressed by Ewell, and we hope to publish a variety of thoughts and perspectives. Submissions must adhere to the following guidelines:

1. Essays should be 1,000 to 3,000 words in length.
2. In order to leave sufficient time for editorial work, submissions must observe a strict deadline of January 13, 2019.

Any questions or concerns regarding submissions may be directed at the editors (Schenker@unt.edu).

Regards,

Levi Walls (with Drs. Jackson, Slottow, and Graf in copy)

From: **Timothy Jackson** <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Jul 27, 2017 at 6:22 AM
Subject: Re: your proposal
To: Ellen Bakulina <epb037@gmail.com>

PS. Did Ben contact you about the possibility of writing a review? Is that

something that would interest you?

From: **Timothy Jackson** <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Date: Thu, Jul 27, 2017 at 6:12 AM

Subject: Re: your proposal

To: Ellen Bakulina <epb037@gmail.com>

Dear Ellen,

Actually, when I originally sent you the *JSS* issues, the deadline had not passed, and your earlier comments were in fact helpful (Stephen was not directly involved in all of the editorial work). Furthermore, your later comments (after your Quebec trip) are also important because we will consult with Lauri and address the issue you raised. Therefore, in no sense was the time that you spent reading volume 9 wasted. Your statement about not wanting to "do any work that is no longer necessary" is factually incorrect. On the contrary, the work that you did was both necessary and needed. Additionally, you said that you found the articles of interest.

In future, I will send you deadlines.

I finally got the scans from McGill, and they are most interesting!

Thanks, Tim

On Wed, Jul 26, 2017 at 9:41 PM, Ellen

Bakulina <epb037@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Tim,

Stephen has told me that the deadline for the *JSS* issues has passed. Why didn't you let me know in time? It was very difficult to carve out the time for the proofreading work, because I am working intensively on an article of my own right now. I value my time and do not want to do any work that is no longer necessary. In future, could you please give me precise deadlines?

Thanks in advance!

Thanks also for sharing your work on Farrenc.

-Ellen

On Tue, Jul 25, 2017 at 12:22 AM, Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Ellen,

Her name is Louise Bertin. Her opera is "L'Esmeralda" and it is based on Victor Hugo's novel "The Hunchback of Notre Dame" with a libretto by Hugo himself! It turns out that the music is excellent. Indeed, Liszt thought highly of the opera and made a piano-vocal score.

Levi has a copy of the Liszt vocal score that he should share with you. The manuscript full score is available on line from the Bibliotheque Nationale. A recording is posted on Youtube:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=al8ZZEFek6Y&t=628s>

There is also an excellent University of Chicago doctoral dissertation in Musicology by Denise Boneau posted on Proquest Dissertations. It gives a lot of important background information. I think that this opera is a fascinating topic and I hope that you will enjoy working on it with him. I suggested Frank as another reader given his expertise in Berlioz and the French music scene at that time.

I will contact Lauri with cc. to you.

By the way, I corresponded with Poundie after the meeting, and he agrees with all of the readings in our Strasbourg paper, taking the "TC" where we did.

For our study of the 19th century "punctuation form" in the G minor symphony, we have delved into Farrenc's Third Symphony (in G minor). At first, Veijo and I both took the "TC" in m. 81. But now I have come to conclusion that this placement of the TC was much too early. The reason is this.

It is very interesting how Farrenc structures the first main period or

exposition over a large-scale tritone progression from G to C# (m.131), which is enharmonically transformed into Db (m. 145), and which in turn becomes the upper fifth of a German sixth chord over Gb in the key of Bb major. Only then does the music move to the V of III (m. 153) to III (m. 157). All of this is shown in my "overview" graphs. What this means is that Farrenc brilliantly **postpones** the arrival on III until very late in the exposition (m. 157). The very important point here is that the earlier cadences on Bb major in mm. 81 and 125 do NOT represent a modulation to Bb major or III, but rather the prolonged Bb major chord of mm. 81-125 is caught within the arpeggiation of the tritone G (m. 25) - Bb (m. 81) - C# (m. 131). Thus, III does not become a Stufe until m. 157. It is quite an amazing feat!

I attach the score and graphs to separate messages. What this shows - if my latest reading is good - is the tremendous sophistication of Farrenc; France seems to have allowed and enabled a few women to become great composers in the 19th century.

with best wishes, Tim

On Mon, Jul 24, 2017 at 8:38 PM, Ellen Bakulina <epb037@gmail.com> wrote:
Hi Tim,

Yes, definitely, it's fine to write to Lauri. Can you email him with a CC to me? He knows me, and we saw each other just a few weeks ago in Strasbourg. I'll be happy to discuss with him, if needed.

I'm glad you finally heard from McGill library! I almost completely stopped going there, because I used to have access to the computers, but now I don't anymore. They changed something in the electronic system. So it's pointless to visit the library now, except to see friends (but that happens relatively rarely).

I hear that Levi Walls is going to write a thesis with you on another French woman composer, whose name I forget. I'm happy he's going to work with

you. He asked me to be his second committee member, and I agreed.

Best,
-Ellen

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=0B58aNZ4dHoHMaHdjdGNmSGx5Njg>

From: **Timothy Jackson** <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Jul 25, 2017 at 3:15 AM

Subject: Re: your proposal

To: Ellen Bakulina <epb037@gmail.com>

Dear Ellen,

I am sorry to be slow. I have been bogged down in finishing off some analytical work for a version of the "Punctuation Form" article dealing with music from the 19th century.

I will get back to it.

Finally, I received a brief sign of life from Cynthia at the McGill Library, and I hope that they will send scans of the Schloss Chinese Rhapsodies.

Your comments are most informative and interesting - and good. I am afraid that it is now too late to change the issue itself, but we should contact Lauri and ask him to review your comment, and perhaps include some kind of correction or response from him in the next issue. Would you mind if I contacted him about this matter and shared your name?

I have been looking at the Third Symphony of a French woman composer, Louise Farrenc: a genius.

More later,

Tim

On Mon, Jul 24, 2017 at 8:06 PM, Ellen Bakulina <epb037@gmail.com> wrote:
Hi again, Tim,

Just a little reminder that I am waiting for your Rachmaninoff proposal... and looking forward to reading it :)

-Ellen

From: **Ellen Bakulina** <epb037@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Apr 27, 2017 at 9:00 PM
Subject: Re: health care
To: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>

Dear Tim,

Sorry I never replied to this. Thank you very much for the website and your recommendations! I'm looking into this issue now.

Best,
-Ellen

From: **Timothy Jackson** <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Apr 15, 2017 at 6:00 AM
Subject: health care
To: Ellen Bakulina <epb037@gmail.com>

Dear Ellen,

Unfortunately, my primary care physician is located in one of the main hospital centers in Dallas, and since you do not drive, he would not be a practical choice for you.

But, since you must have United Health Care as your insurance through UNT as your employer, you need to look on their website for a primary care physician or PCP located nearby in Denton.

<https://www.uhc.com/find-a-physician>

They will have a list of PCPs who are "in network" in Denton, and you should be able to find an appropriate doctor. Your PCP will then refer you to the appropriate specialists for your back and regular checkups.

If you have trouble, Human Resources at UNT should be able to help you.

When I strained my back some years ago, my PCP provided effective treatment, and also arranged for excellent physical therapy, all of which was covered.

It is most important that you look after your health and have regular check-ups, etc.

With best wishes, and concern,

Tim