

TO ALLEN FORTE FROM HIS FORMER ADVISEES:
TRIBUTES AND REMINISCENCES

Festschriften have often included a *tabula gratulatoria*, that is, a listing of names of colleagues, former students, and friends who are sending compliments and felicitations to the honoree. Less often, the *gratulationes* have transcended the *tabula* to become full-fledged tributes and reminiscences. Perhaps the latter are not as common because Festschriften (of the particular kind that circulates in academe) are viewed as repositories of scholarship and not personal reflections—that is, a place for contributions to the broader field and not remembrances pertinent to the few. However, if the honoree’s career was emerging and evolving at the same time that his discipline was taking shape, and if his very activities and teachings helped to determine the form that the field would eventually assume, then the recollections of those who worked closely with him over the decades take on greater significance. They are the eyewitness accounts of these activities and teachings, and thus memories pertinent to the field at large, worthy of preservation.

Allen Forte is such a scholar within the discipline of music theory, and the many doctoral advisees he taught and shepherded through dissertations at Yale are such eyewitnesses. And with these thoughts in mind, I invited his former advisees to contribute what they wished, but with the suggestion that their testimonials convey something about Allen, both professionally and personally, at the time in which the writer studied with him. That way, when ordered and read chronologically (by the writers’ Ph.D. dates), the recollections will suggest the evolution of Allen himself, as well as North American music theory, during the decades.

Contributions were sent by forty-two of Allen’s advisees, ranging across thirty-four years of graduation dates, from John Rothgeb (the first to complete his doctorate, in 1968) to the present editor (the final link in the chain, in 2002).¹ Just as different groups of us entered music theory when it was in very different phases, so did different groups of us come to know, in some sense, a different Allen. The person, like the field, changed over time in various particulars,

¹ Although Allen began teaching at Yale in 1959, the Ph.D. program in theory did not begin until several years later; his advisees were the first to complete the degree.

while remaining remarkably consistent at the core—something these testimonials vividly convey. (As Schenker might have phrased it: despite the varied pathways taken from his point of origin through his development to his present—that is, from his background through his middleground to his foreground—together, interactively, these stages reveal the unity or “oneness of an individual, self-contained life.”)²

To help in navigating the tributes, two tables appear on the following pages. The first simply lists the (chronological) order in which they appear, and thus serves as a table of contents or inventory of contributors. Those wishing to (re)locate a *specific* tribute will find the second table, organized alphabetically by contributor, to be useful.

David Carson Berry

Editor, *A Music-Theoretical Matrix: Essays in Honor of Allen Forte*

² Heinrich Schenker, *Free Composition (Der freie Satz)*, trans. and ed. Ernst Oster (New York: Longman, 1979), 3.

TABLE 1. Chronological list of contributing advisees (“FA” denotes Forte Advisee number)³

John Rothgeb (Ph.D. 1968; FA1)
Richard Chrisman (Ph.D. 1969; FA2)
Jens L. Hanson (Ph.D. 1969; FA3)
David W. Beach (Ph.D. 1974; FA6)
Maury Yeston (Ph.D. 1974; FA7)
John Graziano (Ph.D. 1975; FA9)
David Neumeyer (Ph.D. 1976; FA10)
Jonathan W. Bernard (Ph.D. 1977; FA11)
James M. Baker (Ph.D. 1977; FA12)
Kim H. Kowalke (Ph.D. 1977; FA13)
Alan Chapman (Ph.D. 1978; FA15)
Janet Schmalfeldt (Ph.D. 1979; FA19)
Ann K. McNamee (Ph.D. 1980; FA20)
Harald Krebs (Ph.D. 1980; FA21)
David A. Damschroder (Ph.D. 1981; FA22)
Irene M. [Levenson] Girton (Ph.D. 1981; FA23)
William Rothstein (Ph.D. 1981; FA24)
Joseph N. Straus (Ph.D. 1981; FA25)
Robert W. Wason (Ph.D. 1981; FA26)
Deborah Stein (Ph.D. 1982; FA28)
Philip Russom (Ph.D. 1985; FA34)
Harry R. Ballan (Ph.D. 1986; FA36)
Daniel Harrison (Ph.D. 1986; FA37)
Stephan M. Schwanauer (Ph.D. 1986; FA38)
Taylor A. Greer (Ph.D. 1986; FA39)
Fusako Hamao (Ph.D. 1988; FA40)
J. Randall Wheaton (Ph.D. 1988; FA41)
Catherine Nolan (Ph.D. 1989; FA44)
Gretchen Horlacher (Ph.D. 1990; FA45)
Joel Galand (Ph.D. 1990; FA46)
Jack F. Boss (Ph.D. 1991; FA48)
Annie K. Yih (Ph.D. 1992; FA52)
Jairo Moreno (Ph.D. 1996; FA60)
John Check (Ph.D. 1997; FA62)
Leslie Black (Ph.D. 1998; FA63)
Stephen C. Brown (Ph.D. 1999; FA64)
Edward D. Latham (Ph.D. 2000; FA66)
Matthew R. Shaftel (Ph.D. 2000; FA68)
Rachel Bergman (Ph.D. 2001; FA69)
Philip Ewell (Ph.D. 2001; FA70)
Mark S. Spicer (Ph.D. 2001; FA71)
David Carson Berry (Ph.D. 2002; FA72)

³ These numbers are taken from David Carson Berry, “The Twin Legacies of a Scholar-Teacher: The Publications and Dissertation Advisees of Allen Forte,” in *A Music-Theoretical Matrix: Essays in Honor of Allen Forte (Part I)*, ed. David Carson Berry, *Gamut* 2/1 (2009), 214ff.

TABLE 2. Alphabetical list of contributing advisees, with page numbers

Baker, James M.	p. 284
Ballan, Harry R.	p. 306
Beach, David W.	p. 276
Bergman, Rachel	p. 332
Bernard, Jonathan W.	p. 282
Berry, David Carson	p. 335
Black, Leslie	p. 325
Boss, Jack F.	p. 320
Brown, Stephen C.	p. 326
Chapman, Alan	p. 289
Check, John	p. 324
Chrisman, Richard	p. 273
Damschroder, David A.	p. 294
Ewell, Philip	p. 333
Galand, Joel	p. 318
Girton, Irene M. [Levenson]	p. 296
Graziano, John	p. 279
Greer, Taylor A.	p. 310
Hamao, Fusako	p. 312
Hanson, Jens L.	p. 275
Harrison, Daniel	p. 307
Horlacher, Gretchen	p. 317
Kowalke, Kim H.	p. 287
Krebs, Harald	p. 292
Latham, Edward D.	p. 328
McNamee, Ann K.	p. 291
Moreno, Jairo	p. 323
Neumeyer, David	p. 281
Nolan, Catherine	p. 316
Rothgeb, John	p. 271
Rothstein, William	p. 297
Russom, Philip	p. 304
Schmalfeldt, Janet	p. 290
Schwanauer, Stephan M.	p. 309
Shaftel, Matthew R.	p. 330
Spicer, Mark S.	p. 334
Stein, Deborah	p. 302
Straus, Joseph N.	p. 299
Wason, Robert W.	p. 300
Wheaton, J. Randall	p. 314
Yeston, Maury	p. 277
Yih, Annie K.	p. 321

FROM JOHN ROTHGEB (PH.D. 1968; FA1)

During the last years of my undergraduate study at Northwestern University, I had by design or accident found my way to Heinrich Schenker's *Harmony*, and was immediately captivated by its unorthodox approach to the topic. I discussed this with my composition teacher, James Hopkins, a recent graduate of the Yale School of Music, who encouraged me to apply to the School, citing in particular a Professor Allen Forte, noted for his teaching of Schenker's approach.

When I first encountered Allen, in autumn of 1963, his professional career was well under way. *Contemporary Tone Structures* (1955) and *The Compositional Matrix* (1961) had already appeared, and *Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice (THCP)* had just been published the previous year. Allen was editor of the *Journal of Music Theory* and was on the cutting edge of the discipline, of which, in its modern incarnation, he may justly be regarded as a founder.

My eagerly anticipated immersion in Allen's "Schenker" course had to be deferred until my second year at Yale. During my first year, Allen instead taught his revelatory two-semester course in the history of music theory, which I naturally took. I was registered at the same time in his music theory seminar.

This accidental alignment of circumstances unexpectedly provided a great advantage. During the first year, I "put myself through" *THCP*, which immediately cleared up all manner of residual anomalies from my undergraduate instruction. At the same time, Allen would, at the conclusion of the theory seminar meetings, provide me with impromptu individual lessons in realization at the keyboard of figured outer voices, figured basses, and unfigured outer voices and basses. The materials used came from *THCP* and its associated *Workbook in Harmonic Composition*, whose exercises Allen (with Alfred B. Kuhn) had adapted from good period compositions in collections in the Yale Music Library. Allen knew and generously imparted many "tricks of the trade" (mnemonic aids and the like) in solving these problems in voice leading and chord structure. The approach was purely from the standpoint of figured bass; there was never any talk of "first inversions" and the like.

No better basis for the understanding of harmony essential to subsequent studies (such as the "Schenker" course) could be imagined. I drew throughout my teaching career on the skills first cultivated (free of the burden of irrelevant theory) under Allen's tutelage.

Allen later referred me to Ernst Oster for further study, and this showed me the direction in which my efforts would be focused from then on.

Miscellaneous recollections from that period prominently feature work on *JMT*, such as copy-editing, proofreading, paste-up and other preparation of the “mechanicals” (the pages to be replicated through the photo-offset process). The final day of production of the book was one of strenuous and relentless work over light-boxes in the large workroom of Allen’s Linden Street apartment. What I learned through my contact with Allen in that endeavor alone cannot even be hinted at in the space at my disposal here. Those were memorable times.

FROM RICHARD CHRISMAN (PH.D. 1969; FA2)

I might not have thought of applying to Yale until one of my professors pointed to a poster of a big Guidonian hand announcing Yale's new graduate program in music theory. "That's where you should apply," he said. Thank you, Edwin Simon.

There were five of us originally: two already at Yale (John Rothgeb and Brian Fennelly), two from Colorado (Jens Hansen and Jane Boyden), and one from California (me). Allen was away that first year. We took four courses: William Waite's course in medieval notation, Mel Powell's and Bülent Arel's course on electronic music (strands of recording tape, razor blades to cut them, and splicing tape), and two courses with visiting professor George Perle: a "seminar" in twentieth-century music (there were about forty or fifty of us), and another in twentieth-century theory.

What I remember most about that year had little to do with music theory. A number of us were doing a Waite transcription in the seminar room when the door opened and Noel Swedlow (later a MacArthur fellow) came in to announce, "The Beatles' *Help* just opened downtown." I didn't think much of it until I saw everyone getting up. I asked where they were going. "To see the movie." I packed up thinking, "I like this place."

The second year was different. Remember in *Men in Black* when Tommy Lee Jones tells Will Smith not to push the red button in the car? But he goes ahead and pushes it anyway? That's what it was like for me when Allen got back. We again took four courses: two in theory, one in medieval music history, and one outside the department. Forte taught the two theory seminars, one on Schenker, the other on computer applications for music theory. The Schenker was great, though the translation of *Der freie Satz* hadn't come out yet, so the reading was a bit challenging. The computer course was fun too, though like the status of electronic music at the time, computers and programming were in their infancy. Our programs and data were typed on punch cards, put in stacks, handed to a technician who placed the stack into the one computer for the University—it was about the size of the building. But this was only after we waited for about forty minutes for all the other students' stacks to be processed.

We all spent that summer reading up on history of theory, which we knew would be part of our comprehensive exam. The exams themselves were stressful but okay: a question on history of theory (something about linear vs. vertical considerations in treatises from x date to y

date), one on Babbitt's contribution to music theory, a tonal analysis and a post-tonal analysis. And somehow we didn't have to have orals, which was a blessing.

For my dissertation, Forte gave me the best advice I'd ever heard: "Start writing," which helped me immensely because it was in writing the theory itself that the problems and "sticky bits"—as I call them when I teach history of theory—emerged out of hidden corners of the outline. Also, as if guided by some invisible hand, all my roommates at Yale were mathematicians, thus I had help on all the technical stuff that was *de rigueur* for music theory in those days. I did have a moment of terror when I realized that my dissertation was running parallel to what Allen was doing at the time. It didn't seem to bother him, so I was fine with it.

It was pleasure to work with Allen. His organizational skills and precise methodology were most apparent and helpful. He has always been supportive, demanding, and from my experience always seemed to know what questions to ask before anyone else did. I also appreciated his sense of humor, and one time mentioned to him that I thought he'd be a great comedy writer if he ever needed a second vocation.

FROM JENS L. HANSON (PH.D. 1969; FA3)

Allen Forte influenced my musical education long before I met him. My frustration with the approach to the teaching of tonal theory, in my undergraduate courses, led me to seek out new sources. I came across his book *Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice*, which was exactly what I was looking for: a systematic treatment of tonal theory starting from the simple and proceeding, by logical steps, to the complex. When I discovered that Allan Forte was spearheading a new Ph.D. program in Music Theory at Yale, I applied in 1965 and was accepted, even though my master's was in composition.

Forte's teaching was always exciting, thorough, and intellectually challenging—exactly what I had been seeking. He led us through Schenker, requiring us to wrestle with Schenker's German and apply what we learned through the analysis of music. He told us when our analyses were good and found a way to tell us if our analyses were lacking without discouraging us. He shared with us his developing set theories and the way in which they explained music of the early twentieth century. We were also introduced to the pioneering use of computers to convert scores to computer language, and to use the results to search for patterns, sets, and whatever else we thought of. This introduction was both exciting and difficult in the days of punch cards, batch computing, and the slow development of computer languages for the arts and humanities. He was allowed to be my dissertation advisor even though he had left Yale for MIT. He gave generously of his time despite being in Cambridge, and was always prompt in his replies to the dissertation material I sent him. His comments were always accurate, fair, helpful, and challenging. Although, I remember him saying to me once that writing comments on student papers was a little like writing for Chinese fortune cookies.

There are warm memories of going to his house to paste up the *Journal of Music Theory* in its early days, the way he chided people who came late to class by just reminding them of the time the class met, his presentations at music theory conferences, his sharp sense of humour, and of course, his books.

FROM DAVID W. BEACH (PH.D. 1974; FA6)

I first arrived in New Haven in September 1961 to begin graduate work in music theory. At that time the graduate theory program at Yale resided in the School of Music; it was a three-year program leading to the degree M.Mus. This was an exciting time for me, but also for the field of music theory. Speaking personally, I can say I arrived at Yale with very old-fashioned theory training, but most eager to learn. Allen Forte opened my eyes and ears to new exciting worlds: the history of music theory, Schenker, and atonal/twelve-tone theory. Speaking more globally, this was the dawn of the modern age of music theory, in which the field became established as a legitimate research discipline allied with but independent of historical musicology. Not long after this, the Society for Music Theory was founded with Allen Forte as its first President.

I was most fortunate to be offered a teaching position at Yale, on Allen's recommendation, upon completion of my master's degree, the highest degree available at Yale at that time. I remember being dismayed, however, when Allen left Yale that year to accept a visiting professorship at M.I.T., a situation that became more alarming when it appeared as if this arrangement might become permanent. Allen had wanted to start a Ph.D. program in music theory at Yale, but apparently negotiations either with the Department or the Graduate School or both were not proceeding as he wanted. Fortunately for all of us (and for the field of music theory in general), Allen persisted. The next thing I knew he was back in New Haven with a promotion to full professor and his appointment switched to the Department of Music. The Ph.D. program was established the following year, and the rest is history. Speaking personally again, I returned as a student to take advantage of this wonderful opportunity after eight years teaching full time, seven of them at Yale. I believe I still hold the departmental record, having completed all requirements for the degree in two years. Very intense, but a great time!

FROM MAURY YESTON (PH.D. 1974; FA7)

S A T O R
 A R E P O
 T E N E T
 O P E R A
 R O T A S

(trans.: “The sower, Arepo, keeps the work circling.”)

A L L E N
 F O R T E
 1 9 7 3
 E T R O F
 N E L L A

(trans.: “Allen was really into this stuff in the early ’70s.”)

The cigarettes.

First and always (for us to recapture and recall the setting and the *Zeitgeist*), it would have to be the cigarettes. And the ubiquitous, cheap tin 2½-inch flat ashtrays strewn on every seminar table for students and teachers alike . . . and the curlicues of smoke rising with ineffable boredom like the plangent vacuity of yet another Claude Palisca reconsideration of the letters of Girolamo Mei, read from notes yellowed and ancient and more authentically *reliques* from the late Middle Ages than any actual splinter of the True Cross.

Ah Yale! Ah musicology! . . . with its then-hermetically-sealed divisions of music *history*, music *theory*, and music *practice* . . . as dissimilar from each other as Bantu, Sanskrit, and Pig Latin. No. Sorry. Performance had no place in Theory. And Musicology’s idea of analysis sounded a lot like: “the oboes then enter, rising upwards doubling the bassoons at the octave, in a varied restatement of the prior low brass motif from the *Introduzione*.”

Wow. So *that’s* what’s going on.

And music *theory* had impeccable hexachordal vision, as though tone-clusters could be

best viewed through the eye of a bee: 6-z36, 6-z12, 6-z19 . . . *hike!* (It did sound a bit like football.)

And through it all, cool . . . calm . . . collected . . . with a mind like a steel trap . . . lecturing *mezzo piano* with a speech rhythm *andante con moto* . . . was Forte, as *elegant* a thinker as has ever walked our planet. Unimaginable to think of him without the cigarette, because he used it for his pauses . . . for his timing as precise and measured as a great actor's, or stand-up comic's, or surgeon's.

The incomprehensible Mozart phrase you'd been up all night futilely Schenkerizing? He'd draw a bit of its middleground . . . raise an eyebrow . . . take a drag and inhale . . . creating *just* enough time for what he'd done to sink into your head.

Elegance in dress, in manner, in thought, in expression, in understanding, in simplicity. And for him to make the "complex" reveal itself was not to make it merely simple, but rather to make it orderly. Mel Powell had defined "form" over at the School of Music as "Perceived Differentiation." But only Forte could help you perceive it. Only Forte could tell you a melody was "a sequence of tones perceived as an entity."

Elegance is expressed through efficiency. What makes a mathematical proof brilliant is its accuracy, but what makes it *elegant* is its being accomplished in fewer steps . . . ideally, with the *fewest* steps.

And it is now easy to see, over his lifetime, that everything Allen ever addressed he did with his signature elegance. It could be a harmony book. An overview of all conceivable atonal simultaneities. Twelve-tone composition. Tonal analysis. Berg. Beethoven. Irving Berlin.

To see through Allen's eyes. To hear through Allen's ears. You wanted to do that. You wanted to *be* that. The best thing he taught was not merely what he *said*. It was what he *was*. You wanted to grow up to be like him, and to think like him.

For me, he will always be a father. And one I will always look up to.

FROM JOHN GRAZIANO (PH.D. 1975; FA9)

There are several memories of Allen and my time at Yale that have stayed with me over the years. During my two years at the School of Music, I didn't have much contact with him, and while I was taking seminars in the Ph.D. program, he left Yale for a year to run a new theory program at MIT.

The first (unexpected) encounter occurred when I applied to the School of Music, where theory and composition were offered (there was no doctoral program at that time), as a late admission in May 1964. My wife and I drove up to New Haven from New York, and I met with Allen and Mel Powell. They had looked at my compositions and read the Letter of Recommendation from my City College mentor, Mark Brunswick, who had evidently written such an enthusiastic letter that both Allen and Mel were somewhat startled by it. Since they both mentioned it in the course of the interview, it was obvious that Brunswick thought very highly of me.

My second memory is of the doctoral seminar Allen taught that was dedicated to learning computer languages that would be helpful for musical analysis. The class struggled mightily with writing programs in SNOBOL, which we then had to bring to the computer center (which encompassed an entire block just north of the campus), where we would sit and type punch-cards to be submitted to the mainframe. It was a slow and frustrating process, with the printout taking upwards of an hour at times; only then would one find that there was a mistake in the program. Allen was convinced that computer analysis was the wave of the future, and he was available and always helpful to discuss what was wrong with our programs and how we could fix them.

My third memory is of the party that he and his wife, Sharland, gave for the theory students in their apartment on Linden Street. It was decorated in Alice-in-Wonderland black and white, with blow-ups of some Tenniel drawings on the walls. I had never seen a dwelling so decorated and I spent quite a bit of time looking in amazement at the concept.

A final memory is of the Schenker seminar Allen gave, which was visited several times during the year by Ernst Oster, who followed Schenkerian theoretical precepts closely. It was interesting to hear two Schenkerian scholars examine and discuss a particular analysis, sometimes disagreeing about details. To someone who was just learning how to use the system, it was a revelation that there was sometimes more than one way to view the structure of a particular

passage. Given their different approaches to Schenker analysis, I wonder today how Oster managed to sit through some of the “imperfect” analyses that were presented.

FROM DAVID NEUMEYER (PH.D. 1976; FA10)

I began graduate studies at Yale in fall 1972, along with Jonathan Bernard and Christopher Hasty. Maury Yeston, who was returning to finish his Ph.D., took the fourth spot. As a Midwesterner I was something of an exotic, and Allen enjoyed early on a joke at my expense about the pronunciation of “route.” But there was never any question about his support, then or later (even as I resolved to return to the Midwest on graduation). In a seminar the first year, we studied *The Structure of Atonal Music* with photocopied text and blue dittoes of the musical examples and figures, offered up a week at a time, so that the book and its theory seemed to unfold slowly in front of us. Publication occurred very shortly thereafter, but it was only two years later, while preparing for exams, that I worked systematically through the published version.

I have always thought it was my paper for that seminar that convinced Allen of the viability of my dissertation topic. (The paper eventually went into the dissertation almost intact.) I entered the program at Yale knowing I wanted to write a dissertation on Hindemith, and it took some thinking to find a way past the Scylla and Charybdis of pc set theory and Schenker. As it happened, Scylla’s currents were mild, and once I’d settled on a style study of Hindemith’s early music, it was smooth sailing. Allen apparently liked the idea of a “test” application of pc set theory to a style study of music outside the Schoenberg circle, and he consistently offered a mentor’s insight into design and argument. Later he told me that he recommended my dissertation to his students, but, if so, that undoubtedly changed by the early 1980s, when such style studies had become more common and pc set theory itself was starting to evolve.

I do regret missing Allen’s work on the early Schoenberg songs (the 1978 *Musical Quarterly* article), as it might well have served as a model for analysis of some of Hindemith’s own transitional music, which I found difficult to manage and largely ignored in favor of the compositions that anticipated what I later called the turn to the New Objective manner in early 1923.

FROM JONATHAN W. BERNARD (PH.D. 1977; FA11)

My opportunity to observe Allen at close range extended over a period of some fifteen years—from matriculation in the Theory Ph.D. program at Yale until my departure from the Yale faculty in 1987—but the most vivid impressions of him that I retain are undoubtedly my earliest. Autumn 1972 was my first semester in graduate school, and Allen’s course, “Analytic Method: Atonal Music,” was required instruction for every theory student at the time. A dozen of us or so trooped up to the seminar room on the third floor of Sprague Hall every week to be initiated into the mysteries of pitch-class set theory. That particular iteration of the course, I believe, provided Allen with his first occasion to teach from the completed text of *The Structure of Atonal Music* (*StrAM*). The book was not yet in print, but he had the page proofs in front of him on the seminar table, and we had copies of most of the musical and tabular illustrations to refer to as he worked through his text.

Forty years on, it is hard to recreate the excitement we all felt. It wasn’t registered in any obvious way—there were no heated post-seminar discussions over coffee at Naples Pizza, at least none that I recall—but still there was the growing sense that we were witnessing something big: a breakthrough, in fact, that would change the face of the very discipline we were being educated to enter. Speaking for myself, after years spent attempting to find a way into the post-tonal repertoire with this or that jerry-built, clumsily invented construct that would fall apart at the slightest provocation, it was thrilling to be presented, finally, with something that *worked*: a theoretical approach that was comprehensive, that was designed according to consistent principles, and—once one got up to speed with the terminology—that was relatively straightforward in its analytical application.

It goes without saying that this introduction gave us all a kind of model for our own subsequent, fledgling efforts to develop theories more modest in scale. Certainly, the success of *StrAM* over the years after its publication, in particular during the years leading up to the founding of the Society for Music Theory, served to vindicate our early experience with this, arguably Allen’s most significant contribution to the field. In retrospect, though, what strikes me as equally worth remarking upon is the probable explanation for our initially low-key reception: in this respect, too, we were learning to emulate our teacher. Allen’s classroom demeanor, which the newcomers among us were still getting used to, never conveyed enthusiasm for the subject in

any conventional manner. What kept the students engaged, what brought us along week to week, besides the crystal clarity of his lectures, was the quiet confidence with which he delivered them—leavened, as one eventually noticed, with a certain dry humor in almost perfectly calibrated doses. Without fully realizing it at the time, perhaps, we were discovering that pedagogical style and intellectual content were not qualities that, in the final analysis, could be separated. And I suspect that, even if none of his students came away wanting to teach exactly the way he did, neither was the influence of his example entirely avoidable. I'm sure I've carried at least a little of Allen into every class I've ever taught.

FROM JAMES M. BAKER (PH.D. 1977; FA12)

I first studied with Allen in 1970–71, following my graduation from Yale College the preceding June. I had won a Carnegie Teaching Fellowship, which enabled me to stay on in the Department of Music and teach an introductory music-theory course while taking a graduate course as well. The course I elected to take was Allen’s seminar in pitch-class set theory, which he based on his manuscript of *The Structure of Atonal Music*, then in preparation for publication. Looking back, I realize what a special opportunity this was for those of us in that course—perhaps especially for me, since that experience convinced me that I should pursue a career in music theory. To the best of my recollection, we did not read the actual text of Allen’s manuscript, but he covered the subject matter very much as it is presented there. We did not know it at the time, but some of the pieces he assigned for our presentations were the compositions analyzed in his study. I was given Schoenberg’s “Farben,” Op. 16/3, and spent most of the semester working on a systematic set analysis of this pivotal work. I calculated the identities and relations of every segmentation I could imagine in the dense, complex piece—a huge undertaking for me at that time. Allen was a generous advisor, and I checked in with him frequently. Although he had completed his own magisterial analysis (which appears as the culmination of the published study), he never clued me in as to his views, but rather encouraged me to go about things my way. Come to think of it, this open approach held true for all of my studies with Allen over the years. He strongly valued independent thinking and allowed his students the freedom to explore whatever music and approaches they chose. Always a discerning reader, however, he expected analyses to be insightful, rigorous, and cogently presented.

The early '70s was an exciting time to be studying with Allen. The Yale program was young and a vital part of the newly burgeoning field of music theory, now being recognized as a distinct subdiscipline. Allen’s expertise extended to a broad range of topics from Schenker, to mathematical applications, to computer languages. We theorists all took a semester of SNOBOL4 and became fairly adept at the Ford-Columbia Representation (DARMS), lugging around boxes of punch cards wherever we went. Although computer applications perhaps did not pan out for music analysis the way many of us believed they would, I think this study nonetheless had a profound effect on our view of the analytical value of systematic evaluation across a spectrum of parameters. What was perhaps most impressive about this study is that we achieved

a degree of mastery as programmers that enabled us to come to grips with daunting aspects of recent music by composers such as Boulez, Stockhausen, and Babbitt.

Allen's deep knowledge and love of the history of music theory made him a particularly good fit with the Yale program, with its core courses in theory and aesthetics. Like several other faculty members, he had an extensive collection of rare treatises, which we students were permitted to view when we visited Allen at home. The experience of handling original documents and artifacts has always seemed to me an essential aspect of the Yale education. One has a sense of becoming part of a venerable tradition. As a moment of inspiration, holding Allen's first edition of Riepel was for me right up there with viewing a lock of Lord Byron's hair in the vault of the Elizabethan Club.

Although he would mention from time to time his high regard for popular composers such as Cole Porter and Jerome Kern, I must say that I was not aware at that time how deeply Allen was involved in music of the Great American Songbook. I know that he found it very gratifying to turn his scholarly attentions to this music later in his career, and I suspect, too, that he took pleasure in surprising those who imagined his tastes more narrowly confined. From Allen's accounts of having played staples of the piano repertoire, and from the very brief examples he would play in class, we gathered that he must have considerable keyboard chops, but in truth I never heard him play for any extended time while I was his student. I was truly amazed and touched to hear him play a veritable recital of American standards at a recent birthday party in New Haven. It is clear that this music has always engaged and sustained him in a remarkable way.

No recounting of studying with Allen in the '70s would be complete without mention of his indomitable spouse and soulmate, Sharland, who was the doyenne of departmental social life. Sharland's artistic personality was strongly felt in the distinctive décor of the Forte's home in Hamden, an eclectic combination of the modern with artifacts from Mitteleuropa. (An extravagantly painted cuckoo clock stands out in my mind.) Their frequent parties were occasions not to be missed, the guest lists crafted to ensure stimulating, sometimes dramatic, always entertaining evenings. I shall always treasure their generosity and friendship. When I returned to New Haven to submit the dissertation, Allen and Sharland put me up, and I spent several days in Allen's office sorting papers and putting final touches into multiple copies (pre-word-processing!) before Allen helped me get them to the binder's.

Allen has always been for me the very model of what it means to be a teacher and mentor. Through the years, he has followed my work, and has been unfailingly available for advice and support. (Imagine writing quantities of references for literally scores of students!) His personal devotion to his students together with his rich achievement in music theory make him one of the great scholars of music of his or any era.

FROM KIM H. KOWALKE (PH.D. 1977; FA13)

I arrived at Yale in September 1971 unprepared for the paucity and obscurity of the decidedly “old musicology” seminars on offer at that time. By default I ended up with medieval or renaissance topics comprising fully half of my sixteen courses. If I recall correctly, I encountered only one post-Schumann history seminar before I took my exams and started casting about for a dissertation topic. No wonder, then, that I gravitated to what was for me the “new theory”: atonal analysis with Allen my first semester, twelve-tone theory with Bob Morris, and—with Allen on leave the following year—Schenker with Tom Clifton. I was indeed lucky that the “History of Music” and “Theory of Music” curricula and faculty at Yale were as decompartmentalized as they were. Otherwise, with Robert Bailey also on leave for a year, it would have been even slimmer pickings. In fact, all but one of my musicological cohorts that year were dissatisfied enough to leave the program, and I was the only one to finish the Ph.D.—largely because of Allen, whose dedication to teaching and advising “his theorists” was already legendary.

I suspect that he had advocated for my admission. A double major in math and music at Macalester, I had submitted my senior honors thesis on mathematical models for twelve-tone row manipulations. At the time Allen was very interested in computer-assisted research, and in the “Atonal Analysis” seminar we all learned COBOL (wasn’t it?), punched our data onto IBM cards, and evaluated the results of various segmentations of our portions of the assigned work. It all seems so primitive now, of course, but at the time we felt something like a team of music-scientists at the cutting edge, particularly because our textbook was Allen’s Selectric typescript of *The Structure of Atonal Music*. Later I audited his “Rite of Spring” seminar; I vividly recall the impish relish he took in pointing out that Stravinsky’s superimposed initials in the sketches looked just like a dollar sign.

Once I had stumbled upon Kurt Weill as a dissertation topic, I approached Allen to see if he would co-advise with Robert Bailey, whose days at Yale as an untenured faculty member were already numbered. Indeed, Bailey left for Eastman before I finished, so Allen became the sole advisor of record. I think I was his first “History of Music” dissertation, but with Jim Baker working with him on Scriabin, David Neumeier on Hindemith, and Jonathan Bernard on Varese, I considered myself an affiliate member of the theory club. (Craig Wright still seems to think I must have written a theory dissertation because Allen advised it!)

I remember discussing with “Mr. Forte” my misgivings about restricting the dissertation to “Kurt Weill in Europe.” Other than a raised eyebrow and that signature chuckle, he characteristically refrained from comment on Claude Palisca’s admonition to me: “Well, I like ‘September Song’ too, Mr. Kowalke, but I wouldn’t write a dissertation about it.” By then of course, I knew, from late-night gatherings around his piano in Hamden, Allen’s then-still-clandestine affection for American popular song. Eventually, however, we agreed that his historian colleagues in the department weren’t quite ready for a dissertation on the American musical theater.

Allen’s advising strategy was unique and remarkably efficient: I would submit a chapter, he would read it within a few days, and usually return it with only the sparsest annotations, sometimes restricted to a few words in his fine hand (which I probably couldn’t read now without a magnifying lens): “good. keep writing.” Sharland helped me a lot with the tricky passages in the German essays I was translating. When the dissertation won Yale’s “Theron Rockwell Field Prize in the Humanities,” my wife-to-be Liz and I took the Fortes to dinner to celebrate. Before the martinis arrived, Mr. Forte announced that henceforth I was to address him as “Allen,” in recognition of my rite of passage. I will always treasure that moment of mentorship morphing into friendship.

FROM ALAN CHAPMAN (PH.D. 1978; FA15)

I first crossed paths with Allen Forte in the distant past, when I was an undergraduate at MIT and he was a visiting professor. Although I didn't take any classes from him, I had the distinct advantage of learning theory from his *Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice*, which meant that I was especially well prepared when I came to Yale.

I remember one occasion at Yale that demonstrated the range of Forte's musical interests. It was during a strike of dining hall workers. A group of graduate students would buy pizza at Naples and congregate in his office. One day, out of left field, Forte looked at those of us who were pianists and asked, "What changes do you play on the bridge of 'Over the Rainbow'?" It was almost one o'clock, time for one of the theory classes I was teaching. We quickly moved to the nearby classroom, where many of the students were already present. One by one, three graduate students plus Allen Forte went to the piano to play their preferred chords for the song. When the others left, I told my curious students that the distinguished gentleman was the author of their textbook. They were delighted.

That book, by the way, has been part of my life through the years. For a while now my principal "day job" has been host and producer at Classical KUSC-FM in Los Angeles, but I have never abandoned teaching. (I sometimes refer to myself as a "recovering academic.") For the past eight years, I have taught courses at the fairly new Colburn Conservatory in Los Angeles. As long as copies of *Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice* were still available, it was my text of choice. When I was compelled to use something else, I still used certain chapters in which Forte addresses key subjects with a clarity that is not even approached by any other book. I have just taught a course in twentieth-century analysis in the new master's program at Colburn and I have gained an even greater appreciation for Forte's achievements in atonal theory.

One last recollection: At one of our graduate seminars, a fellow student asked Forte if he had any advice on teaching. He replied, "Before you go into the classroom, make sure your fly is zipped." (I still make a point of doing that.)

FROM JANET SCHMALFELDT (PH.D. 1979; FA19)

My first chance to study with Allen Forte arose, I think, during the academic year 1969–70, when I was still in the process of completing my M.M.A. as a pianist in the Yale School of Music. Having not yet been accepted into Yale’s doctoral program in music theory, but with scholarships, as possibilities, should that come about, I enrolled in Professor Forte’s graduate seminar on “Schenkerian Analysis.” In those days, going to class meant going down into the bowels of Harkness Hall, where our elegant instructor, occasionally with a cigarette in his left hand (yes, those were still the days) would preside over us with wit, charm, and dedication. Allen may well have been privately preoccupied by then with progress towards the completion of *The Structure of Atonal Theory* (1973), but his pleasure in teaching us about Schenkerian theory was palpable, and we were learning from one of the very first American experts in that field. To put it simply, his seminar was life-changing. From that year forward, I knew that I would want to try to become a music theorist.

Five years later, and now having taken on a full-time teaching position at McGill University, I had not yet come close to completing my dissertation. Perhaps by then, or maybe sometime thereafter, Professor Forte had become “Allen.” It is entirely thanks to his support and to his gentle but persistent prodding as my advisor that, on one unforgettable afternoon in late 1978, I flew to New Haven with my dissertation in hand. When, much later, I returned to Yale to serve as a teacher, I felt just slightly more comfortable about calling Professor Forte “Allen,” because now we had become colleagues, in the technical and the very best sense of the word.

Of the many memories about Allen that I cherish, let me mention that, although Yale doctoral students during my time were not supposed to be indulging in serious performance activities, Allen tacitly condoned my efforts to perform and even came to my concerts. Over all the following years, he never once rubbed it in that, every now and then, I would put aside an article for the sake of preparing a performance. Eventually I understood why: those who have had the joy of hearing Allen at the piano know that he himself is a warm and wonderful performer at heart.

To have known Allen Forte has meant not only to be inspired by his brilliant scholarship but also to love his sly sense of humor, to watch for the twinkle in his eye, and to appreciate his great humanity. I am so very grateful for his friendship.

FROM ANN K. MCNAMEE (PH.D. 1980; FA20)

“Thank you, Sir,” said a very young boy, as he shook Allen’s hand. We were at the WWII Memorial in Washington, DC, looking for the Pacific Theater monument.

Allen’s contributions to the academic world are unparalleled, yet he always kindly reminded me that he and my father had an unbreakable bond in common: their military service in WWII.

For all of Allen’s support, both academic and away from the classroom, for all the music, both classical and popular, for making me believe a woman could fight the system and win those less-important battles, I add my loving “Thank you.”

FROM HARALD KREBS (PH.D. 1980; FA21)

I had the pleasure and the honor to study with Allen Forte in 1976–80. When I arrived at Yale at a young age, fresh from an undergraduate degree from a university in western Canada, Allen’s invariable kindness and generosity smoothed my transition into a milieu that could have been intimidating for me. I was excited by the opportunity to be introduced by him to Schenkerian analysis and set theory. I also very much enjoyed his seminars on Schoenberg and on composers’ autographs, both of which obviously grew out of his own intense research interests and which kindled the same interest in me and in other students. His comments on my work, written in the characteristic meticulous hand that I remember so vividly, were trenchant and incisive, but always encouraging. He was equally encouraging during my dissertation work, when I was at times despondent about the quality of my ideas and my prose. After I completed my degree, it took me several years to land a tenure-track job, and my publication career started slowly; during that difficult initial period of my career, Allen was a supportive mentor.

I remember fondly the opportunities for non-academic interaction with Allen during my years at Yale. One of these was a dinner with Allen and Sharland after the completion of my degree requirements—a traditional event in the career of his advisees. The dinner took place in a restaurant with very loud live music. As we enjoyed our food, Allen regaled me and the other student in the party with a point-by-point analysis of a twelve-bar blues that was being played. This was my first indication that Allen was interested in and knowledgeable about “popular” music (I had never had the privilege of hearing him play this music on the piano); his expertise in this area is now obvious to all from his numerous publications on American popular song.

During my third year at Yale, while they traveled to Europe, Allen and Sharland asked me to house-sit, to water the giant rhododendrons on their property (“rhodies,” Allen affectionately called them), and to take care of their beloved sheep-dog Mopsa. Apparently, Mopsa gave me good reports, for I was given another opportunity to house- and dog-sit during my fourth year. Those stays in the Forte home were a highlight of my time at Yale. Allen’s explanations of his elaborate Cable TV push-button console (no remotes back then!) and of appliances that I needed to use were just as lucid as his explanations of Schenkerian concepts, so that I never felt uneasy being “in charge” of his home. I enjoyed my walks with Mopsa through that beautiful part of Hamden, as well as my browses through Allen’s superb collection of theory treatises.

Goethe's Prometheus says, "Hier sitz' ich, forme Menschen / Nach meinem Bilde, / Ein Geschlecht, das mir gleich sei" (Here I sit [and] shape people in my image—a race that is like me). Although Allen certainly ignited my interest in music theory, his teaching and supervision were never Promethean in the sense of the above lines; I never felt that he was trying to shape me into a copy of himself, or that he was concerned that my research should follow in his footsteps (which, in a literal sense, it has not). I will always be grateful to him for that.

FROM DAVID A. DAMSCHRODER (PH.D. 1981; FA22)

I first set eyes upon Allen Forte in the Eastman annex building (in Rochester) during the summer of 1976. David Beach had organized a workshop on Schenkerian Analysis, taught in segments by several visiting scholars. Forte was the prime attraction, of course. Beginning graduate students such as myself were very curious about what was going on in that room! Having arrived early for a class in the same room the next hour, I was hoping to get a glimpse of the man. When that moment finally came, the excitement was as if President Ford had just walked past.

A more substantial relationship with Forte soon developed. As David Beach was on sabbatical to translate Kirnberger, I worked with John Rothgeb at Eastman during the following year to launch my Schenkerian studies. Through the encouragement of both Beach and Rothgeb and in accordance with my own predilections, I moved to New Haven and began studies under Forte in September 1977. I recall his teaching as elegant and cheerful, and his life as efficient and energetic.

I recently ran across a comment I penciled in at the bottom of page 78 of Forte's and Gilbert's *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis*: "I claim personal responsibility for these lines—I showed Mr. Forte my analysis of the Bourrée and convinced him that F# (♯) was not the *Kopfton*." I also recall a special interaction regarding one of Chopin's Mazurkas. I had translated a passage from *Der freie Satz* in support of my reading. Noting that my comprehension of what Schenker was conveying was faulty, Forte took the trouble to type up Oster's translation of the relevant lines (from the pre-publication copy of *Free Composition* that Oster had given him).

I inadvertently upset Forte while he was teaching one day. The music department had just moved into new quarters on the New Haven Green, and finally the instructors had office space equipped with a piano. So I went to town grading an assignment: playing through each student's solution to a part-writing exercise, stopping frequently to write comments on their papers. This happened to be two doors away from the new seminar room in which Forte was teaching, with Maury Yeston's office in between. Little did I know how sound traveled in that building! I found out later that Forte assumed some undergraduate had found a piano to abuse and made comments to the class expressing his discomfort. But it was poor me! We soon moved the piano into a side room, solving the problem.

Certainly the community of aspiring theorists that had grown up around Forte at Yale was unique at the time. Looking at how the field of Schenkerian studies developed over the following decades, it is rather astonishing that the likes of Kevin Korsyn, Harald Krebs, and William Rothstein were hovering above me as dissertating students while I was pursuing my Schenker coursework under Forte. At that age I did not think too far ahead, to realize that the people I knew at Yale would be among the leading lights in the field for my entire career. The common link was Forte himself, and the trajectories we have pursued in our distinctive ways all reflect the curriculum that he had established. Fortunately he helped us to understand that a dissertation was a first step, not our magnum opus. Indeed my recent books on Schubert, on Haydn and Mozart, and (forthcoming) on Chopin deal with issues that I raised initially in my dissertation on Liszt and Wagner. In fact, I intend soon to write a book on Liszt and Wagner!

FROM IRENE M. [LEVENSON] GIRTON (PH.D. 1981; FA23)

My years with Allen Forte—from 1976 to 1981—were revelatory. I came to Yale from the Oberlin Conservatory, with a terrific foundation but with very little familiarity with linear analysis, Schenker, or the application of set theory to post-tonal music. The work I did with Allen in my very first semester at Yale was so exciting that I decided to change my emphasis from Musicology, my original area, to Music Theory—despite counsel from one of Allen’s colleagues that I’d spend the rest of my days grading theory exercises rife with parallel fifths (true enough, but there’s been so much more, thank God).

Immersion in Allen’s musical world meant a constant focus on looking at tonal and post-tonal music from a variety of points of view. It meant strengthening my German reading ability so that I could understand the source of much of the work we did. It required me to challenge my lifelong math anxiety, resulting in a tremendous boost to my confidence and creativity when I was able to read Babbitt and Forte himself on the interaction of pitch-class sets across large and small spans of music. I became a fully-engaged interlocutor in classrooms populated by men and women just as committed as I was to learning as much as we possibly could from each other but, most particularly, from our remarkable, complex, intimidating, inspirational guide.

The most striking memory I have of Allen came from very early days—most likely my first class in tonal analysis with him. Using those huge sheets of horizontal “Schenker paper” we had made specially for us at one of the local copy shops, we would work on our analytic assignments each week, turn them in to Allen with great trepidation, and wait until next week’s class for his comments. One week I got my paper back, scanned it quickly, and then focused on a comment that was truly life-altering: “You will be good at this,” he wrote. Maybe not now—okay, fair enough—but you *will* be good at this. I have remembered those words my whole life since.

FROM WILLIAM ROTHSTEIN (PH.D. 1981; FA24)

I studied with Allen from 1976 to 1980, although I completed my dissertation a year later, while teaching at Amherst College. Unlike most first-year Ph.D. students in those days, I entered the Yale program with a good working knowledge of Schenkerian analysis (through study with Ernst Oster) and a decent knowledge of pitch-class-set theory (through study with Donald Martino). Allen offered me the opportunity of advanced placement in his Schenker sequence, which I was wise enough to decline. Allen's Schenker pedagogy was very different from Oster's: more systematic, if less inspirational; also, entirely free from what Allen liked to call *Mitteleuropa* drama. Since I already knew Schenker's method fairly well, I was able to focus on the pedagogy. The contrast between the teaching styles of Oster and Forte gave me the idea for my "Americanization of Heinrich Schenker," and my own teaching aims for a synthesis of the two approaches.

Shortly after I finished the two-semester Schenker sequence, Allen gathered a few students for a small-group tutorial in which we read Schenker in the original German. This was a wonderful experience for which I remain grateful. At that time, no work by Schenker had been published in English except *Harmony* and the essay "Organic Structure in Sonata Form." I was immediately inspired to spend half the summer of 1978 reading the two volumes of Schenker's *Kontrapunkt*, cover to cover. (During the other half I wore my pianist hat at Yale's Summer School of Music and Art, practicing six hours a day and playing in eight concerts. It was an unforgettable summer!) Allen also gave me a photocopy of the Oster translation of *Free Composition*, at least a year before it was published. I couldn't have written my dissertation without it.

Allen was a slightly distant dissertation advisor but an extremely responsible one. He never wanted to see less than a complete chapter at a time, and that in polished form. He would respond to each chapter promptly with pages—rarely fewer than two—of single-spaced comments, typed of course, which always went right to the point and showed his deep knowledge of Schenker's writings.

Most of all, Allen taught me how to be a professional theorist. One isn't born a professional; it's a skill, and it's one that Allen taught supremely well. One of his many classrooms was Yale Commons, where the theory Ph.D. students gathered for Monday lunch with Allen.

(Supposedly it was voluntary, but we understood it to be required.) I hated the building and didn't think much of the food, but I was there every Monday.

FROM JOSEPH N. STRAUS (PH.D. 1981; FA25)

When I arrived at Yale in 1977, I was about as green as a person could be. I didn't know that musicology and music theory were becoming (and at Yale, already were) separate fields. As a further indicator of my profound ignorance, it wasn't until my third week that I realized that Allen's last name had only one syllable!

That such ignorance was possible reflects not only on my own sheltered upbringing, but also the general state of scholarly affairs at that time. So much of the infrastructure of music theory that we take for granted, including the Society for Music Theory and *Music Theory Spectrum*, had not yet come into being, and the field itself was only then taking its distinctive shape.

The fact that the field did take the particular shape it has, sustained by a strong infrastructure, is attributable to a significant degree to Allen. He helped found and became the first President of the Society for Music Theory in 1977. If "Schenker and sets" were for a long time the principal research topics in that newly created organization, that's because they were Allen's principal topics. My time at Yale was bracketed by *The Structure of Atonal Music* (1973) and *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis* (with Steven E. Gilbert, 1982). As a student, you were expected to be proficient in both areas, and as an emerging researcher, you had to navigate within and between them.

Allen never treated his interests as orthodoxies, however, and was always open to his students finding their own paths. And, whatever you did, he was fiercely loyal and endlessly supportive—good qualities in a mentor!

Allen's rich legacy of published writings, which (along with the rest of the field) has long since branched out from "Schenker and sets," still has a great deal to teach us. We can learn from it not only compelling methodologies for analyzing music, but also what it means to be a scholar with original vision, pioneering spirit, remarkable tenacity, and amazing productivity. For this grateful former student, Allen has provided an enduring model of what music theory and music theorists are and should be.

FROM ROBERT W. WASON (PH.D. 1981; FA26)

It was the fall of 1974. I was an instructor (on the tenure track) at the Hartt School. I'd enjoyed a local career as a jazz pianist and composer in Hartford; but with only a master's (in composition), tenure was not assured, mobility past that point seemed severely limited, and playing the piano for a (partial) living had its own problems. (I'm a morning person.) I'd had an interview at Columbia that ultimately led to a nice deal for a DMA in composition, but a Hartt colleague called my attention to the relatively new Ph.D. in music theory at Yale, or "the theory of music," as the Yale Catalogue phrased it in strict-constructionist fashion. It came as a surprise: I guess I'd assumed that "theory-composition" was an indivisible phrase. Sure, there were programs I knew of where theory was the consolation prize—for "disappointed composers," as Allen used to characterize them—but it was clear that this was completely different. Still, I never dreamed that Music Theory (purposely in caps) would develop as a separate academic discipline as it has, and that Allen's "Yale model" would be the crux of that development.

The surprises continued. Upon calling the Yale Music Department, I was told to call the famous Allen Forte, whom I'd encountered only in the pages of *Contemporary Tone Structures* and the *Journal of Music Theory*, at home! Then there was the number itself, famously memorable in its simplicity: I'd expected something more elaborate for the author of the article on "BIPs" I was puzzling through. I worked up my courage, called the number, and Allen answered (we actually answered the phone back then). I met him in his office in the basement of Harkness Hall a couple of days later, and we hit it off personally right away. But then he showed me recently completed dissertations by Maury Yeston and Bo Alphonse, both junior faculty at that point, and I knew I'd entered the deep water. I brought up my interest in *CTS*, which to my surprise Allen quickly dismissed as "old work." A setback. Fortunately, I also knew *Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice*: Allen was a "harmony teacher," just as I was, I figured; we could communicate on that level at least.

Those were great years for Allen and the Yale Theory Program. *The Structure of Atonal Music* hadn't been out long when I arrived. It was *the* music theory book of the 1970s, and reviews of and reactions to it (e.g., Lewin's *JMT* articles of the mid and later '70s) set the course of atonal theory well into the '80s and beyond. Allen taught the Schenker class (that I had anxiously awaited) in my first year, the atonal class in my second. The very young Bob Morris taught a wonderful class in twelve-tone theory, and I had a couple of excellent classes with Bob

Bailey. Claude Palisca taught Renaissance and Baroque Theory and Aesthetics, and Allen did nineteenth-/early twentieth-century T&A, which, together with the history-of-theory interest that I entered with, set me on the road that I followed in my later studies. We read *JMT*, *PNM*, *Music Forum*, and a new upstart called *In Theory Only*. That was about it for theory journals. There was no national society for music theory, although there were rumblings that such a thing might come about.

Allen Forte proved to be much more than a harmony teacher, of course. Teacher, model scholar, mentor, friend, he was the visionary who, in large measure, conceived the American Music Theory Movement (as I've characterized it to graduate students). Its early period was an exciting time for all of us, and I count myself as lucky to have been a part of it.

FROM DEBORAH STEIN (PH.D. 1982; FA28)

When I arrived at Yale in 1977, it was to study with Allen Forte. Allen had created a phenomenal department, which had a job-placement record that was exceptional. Allen's courses were the basics: Schenkerian analysis, set theory (with his text), and history of theory, which then was taught by musicologists, especially Claude Palisca. For me, it was a tremendous opportunity, and I loved working on analysis assignments for two or three hours at a time—a luxury I had never had. Allen was at the helm: he was whom you studied with, and he was your advisor, at least until David Lewin arrived (but that's another story). He was kind and cordial, and initially I was terribly intimidated. But over time, through his warmth and dry sense of humor, I came to feel more comfortable and I enjoyed working with him a great deal.

As a teacher and advisor, Allen was attentive to and supportive of all his students. He also occasionally gave his students special opportunities. Harald Krebs was employed to find the musical examples for Allen's forthcoming Schenker text. Joe Straus and I were asked to produce ear-training examples for undergrad theory courses. Allen supported me throughout my stay at Yale and I knew he'd help me in my job search. He gave me stability and encouragement for which I'll always be grateful.

Allen and I had some special moments. During my first year, a group of us graduate students went to a national SMT meeting. We were staying at a hotel and the whole group (including the young, single Ann Kosakowski and the mischievous Alan Chapman) had dinner together around a long table, with Allen at the helm. At some point, dance music began. Ann and I were at the other end of the table from Allen and we (having drunk too much) agreed to ask him to dance, as a joke. We marched down to him and Ann, being more advanced in the program, said something like "Debbie wonders if you'd like to dance." Well, to my shock and amazement (and terror!), he said "yes." He got up and we danced. He clearly enjoys dancing and is well known for his love for the older popular music, such as Cole Porter, Gershwin, etc. And unlike me, he was a great dancer. He was so good that at one point I quipped: "you don't dip do you." And he did!! Needless to say, the entire table thought it was hilarious!

With the growing Women's Movement in the country, the Theory Department was predominantly male, with mostly only one woman entering a year. When Martha Hyde became the first woman to graduate from Yale with a Ph.D., the Department had a party to celebrate this major achievement. Allen had worked hard to support Martha and spoke of how proud he was of

her achievement. While it might seem patronizing today, this response was genuinely kind and supportive in the early '80s. Indeed, Allen continued to champion and befriend his women students, including Janet Schmalfeldt, Jane Clenndinning, and myself.

FROM PHILIP RUSSOM (PH.D. 1985; FA34)

“Everything I Need to Succeed, I Learned from Allen Forte and Yale University”

Believe it or not, my work as an industry analyst is similar to that of a music theorist. Almost every day, I research and write about trends and best practices in my industry: namely, information technology, or IT. On some days, I speak at conferences or in Webinars, where I talk about the findings of my research. I’m regularly viewing production proofs of a completed article or report, while researching and writing the next one. Across all this work, my goal is to teach business and technology people practical methods, based on my primary research.

Oddly enough, I learned these research and writing skills as a graduate student in music theory at Yale University (Ph.D. 1985). I then honed them in faculty posts at Yale, Indiana University, Penn State, and Brandeis. I also applied these skills as a technical writer (producing software documentation) and a product marketer (researching current and potential markets for software). Eventually, I found my true destiny as an industry analyst, and have to date produced over five hundred research-based publications. My point is that I would not have survived and succeeded in several “publish or perish” jobs over twenty-seven years, if it weren’t for the research and writing skills I learned at Yale.

Furthermore, I would not have learned these skills as well as I did—and with such a pragmatic and productive bent—if it weren’t for the guidance of my friend, mentor, and dissertation advisor, Allen Forte. In all sincerity, I feel that my continued success, across multiple careers, stems back to Allen.

Note that I have not kept these skills a secret. Over the years, I’ve shared them and other tips with many musicians, technical writers, marketers, and analysts. And now I’d like to share with you the top ten tips that have helped me succeed. I hope you find these useful. And I hope they remind you of your own good times at Yale with Allen.

Top Ten Tips for Successful Research and Writing

1. *Manage your calendar ruthlessly.* Research and writing take a lot of time. So, block out (and enjoy!) time for them.
2. *A deadline focuses the mind.* If no one gives you one, set your own.

3. *Don't let your job get in the way of your work.* Remember: your career is based on research, not the other stuff.
4. *Don't explain everything.* You're writing for an expert audience. Don't waste time with details they all should know.
5. *Leave history to the historians.* Go directly to your analysis without much background. Never indulge in revisionist history.
6. *Write about the big picture.* Let your editor (or your reader's imagination) fill in the gaps.
7. *A real theorist or analyst has a method.* Present a structured framework with rules based on your unique insights.
8. *Keep a list of potential article topics.* As you finish a project, have the next one ready to go.
9. *Apply for research grants.* Research costs money, and you deserve extra compensation. Grants force you to focus, and they impress your management.
10. *Manage your critics.* Ignore the jealous and clueless ones. Yet, be open to constructive dialogs with the enlightened ones.

FROM HARRY R. BALLAN (PH.D. 1986; FA36)

I met Allen Forte on Tuesday, 5 September 1978, when, as a sophomore in Yale College, I became his academic advisee. As a freshman, I had learned tonal theory from his groundbreaking textbook, which I still cherish. Allen's Stravinsky book was published that year. I remember the application of "atonal" theories to "neoclassical" music as a signal event, controversial and exciting. Allen was fully up to the controversy and reveled in the excitement. With a wonderful sense of humor and an acute sense of having already earned a place in history, Allen went about his teaching and scholarship with quiet rigor and unceasing devotion.

I graduated from Yale College in 1981, entered the Ph.D. program at Yale, and the next year Allen's (and Gilbert's) *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis* arrived. Again the controversy, again the excitement. Being around Allen in those days, you felt as if you were somewhere near the center of an intellectual world. I took every one of his courses enthusiastically and completed a dissertation on Schoenberg's tonal music. Many afternoons and weekends I would go to the Fortes' home where there was always great talk, great food and great fun. Allen and Sharland felt like adoptive parents and seemed to take a personal interest in everything I did.

After completing the dissertation I taught for a few years, then went to law school, got married to Judith Silber, a wonderful musicologist turned history teacher, and had four great kids. Allen and I fell out of touch, to my great regret. In tribute to him now, I would say that he gave to me what he gave to so many others, a sense that what the music and scholarly sources had to say was precious, but that what I had to contribute as a teacher and scholar was also worthwhile. He demonstrated the nobility of scholarly labor and coupled it with great personal warmth. Those are Allen's legacies.

FROM DANIEL HARRISON (PH.D. 1986; FA37)

I first met Allen Forte on a late afternoon in December 1980. He had agreed to meet me to discuss Yale's graduate program in music theory. For all he knew, I could have been a non-viable applicant and a waste of his time. But he drove in from home to the Music building (which was essentially unheated at the time, the school being on break) and chatted with me until I ran out of questions. I remember that it was less than thirty minutes from greeting to parting. Only much later—after I myself was being sought out by applicants—did it occur to me that Allen might have met with anyone who was interested in studying music theory at Yale. He wasn't too busy, too important, or too proud to spend a few minutes with nobodies like me if the cause of music theory could somehow be advanced. He set a standard of dedication to the profession—recruiting, teaching, advising, placing—that cannot be surpassed.

Allen taught three graduate courses per year in the early 1980s. Two of them were year-long courses in Schenkerian analysis and pitch-class set theory, alternating per year. The third was often a seminar on topics that he believed were ripe for further work. One of these, offered in my second year, dealt with later nineteenth-century music. His articles on the Adagietto from Mahler's Fifth Symphony, Brahms's Alto Rhapsody, and the first movement of the latter's String Quartet, Op. 51/1, were either in press or in advanced stages of development. These were discussed early in the semester and became practical templates for our own projects. I wrote two papers for the course: the first on the introduction to Strauss's *Tod und Verklärung*, which resulted in a large and highly satisfying Schenkerian sketch, and the second on the theme of a variation set by Max Reger (Op. 73), a strange and inscrutable little piece that I failed to crack open. But the issues broached in the course kept my interest over the summer, and I continued to analyze Strauss tone poems as well as with other works by Reger.

When I came to see Allen next fall to talk about dissertation projects, I brought some good-looking graphs and decent ideas for a Strauss project, as well as a sheaf of annotated scores, a bunch of tentative sketches, and a confession of cluelessness about what Reger was about. Despite Reger's odd reputation (and Schenker's condemnation), Allen discerned that I was more energized to take on the Reger "problem" than I was to do the more inviting work on Strauss. In his mind, it was better to set students on projects they were motivated to do rather than those "the field" may have thought it needed. It was a shrewd strategy, as it led to higher rates of degree completion as well as a general broadening of the practice of music theory and

analysis. A look at the titles of all the dissertations Allen advised—especially from the late 1970s onwards—shows truly remarkable breadth; he may not have been expert in many of the topics, but he trusted that interest and motivation would produce a student’s best work. He himself preferred risks to safety plays, and while he never forced this preference on students, he managed, in his inimitably understated way, to instill it in many of us nonetheless.

FROM STEPHAN M. SCHWANAUER (PH.D. 1986; FA38)

Let me start by saying that writing a tribute to Allen Forte is like trying to find a gift for someone who has it all. I will probably not say something that somebody else has not said as well. Allow me to state for the record, however, that Professor Forte's many admirable attributes include a benevolent tolerance of idiocy and a deadpan sense of humor.

I can give you an example. More than one, actually, but I'll spare the gentle reader. As an undergraduate student, I had to write a paper for Professor Forte about an Arnold Schoenberg composition. As I was cleverly noting how the piece's contrapuntal events related to the twelve tones of the basic set, I neglected to spell canon correctly. I spelled it "cannon," as in loose, repeatedly. A wry comment to the effect that I might find an English dictionary "most beneficial" came back on the graded paper.

When I became a graduate student, it occurred to me that his light approach to things reflected a gentleman's style, an approach to pedagogy that made his extraordinary accomplishments—including programming a computer successfully for the analysis of music in the 1960s, long before the rest of the world followed him—less intimidating to his students. This was a good thing, because it inspired me to do an interdisciplinary dissertation topic on Music Theory and Artificial Intelligence. Allen Forte, of course, encouraged and advised me just as he has encouraged and advised countless other students.

Allen, I wish you the very best!

FROM TAYLOR A. GREER (PH.D. 1986; FA39)

“As Forte Goes By”

In his entertaining portrait of the American Schenkerian landscape, William Rothstein proposes that the Departments of Music at Yale and Princeton formed the “extrema of the great symmetrical set of Schenkerism.”* When I arrived in New Haven in 1981 as a greenhorn theory grad student, the place seemed more like the center of gravity for the discipline. Even though I already had a master’s degree from the University of Michigan, after a few weeks it became clear that there were many things I couldn’t hear, understand, or even imagine. I think a better metaphor for the Department would have been a “magical kaleidoscope” of theoretical and historical inquiry. Of course, this metaphor is drawn from one of Forte’s own essays (1981) on the pitch structure in Schoenberg’s piano music. But I think it is an apt way of characterizing how the Yale scene would have appeared to newcomers like me. Some thought that the curriculum in this academic “kaleidoscope” was too narrow, including only “the primary colors” such as Schenkerian analysis, set theory, and various periods in the history of theory and aesthetics. On the contrary, there was an abundance of colors, styles, and approaches represented on the faculty in those years and we all profited from it.

For example, one of the other towering intellects at Yale during the early ’80s was David Lewin, who originally hailed from Princeton via Harvard, Berkeley, and Stony Brook. Considering the contrasting styles that Forte and Lewin each possessed, one would have expected some intellectual tension—more like an electromagnetic field—running right down the middle of the Yale music theory faculty. Yet nothing could be further from the truth. Although Allen and David differed enormously in the way they approached theory and analysis, they still got along famously.

As a classroom teacher, Professor Forte, as we called him, was in a class by himself. He was a paragon of urbanity, full of charm, wit, and restraint—as if he had stepped out of some Cary Grant movie. Always well dressed in a coat and tie, he was a creature of habit; we all tried to mimic the way he held his glasses when he intoned his usual opening line: “Let’s all look at the schedule.” In short, his lectures in seminar were prototypes of organization and clarity. Yet

* William Rothstein, “The Americanization of Heinrich Schenker,” *In Theory Only* 9/3 (1986), 12.

he wasn't afraid of rolling up his sleeves and working one-on-one with us. One day without warning he asked each student in his "Theory Pedagogy" class to realize the figured bass symbols from a short passage of eighteenth-century music. Alas, about half of the class knew more facts than figures in his pop *Generalbass* quiz! As a result, for the next month he improvised weekly independent study sessions with each of us to monitor our progress in reading figured bass at the piano. Eventually we discovered that this little exercise was not really about the keyboard or the Pedagogy class. For him, achieving fluency with traditional harmonic syntax using figured bass symbols and attaining a mastery of counterpoint were the first steps toward understanding Schenker's unique way of hearing and analyzing. His ultimate goal was to nurture our interpretive skills as tonal analysts.

He also had an unexpected and generous sense of humor. Whether making a pun about a technical term or a tongue-in-cheek quip about musicology, Professor Forte always had a twinkle in his eye. One day he asked us to solve a harmonic puzzle: to reharmonize a phrase from one of his favorite ballads, "As Time Goes By." When we were all stumped, he sat down to play the solution, and the twinkle in his eye turned into a beaming smile that I shall never forget.

FROM FUSAKO HAMAOKA (PH.D. 1988; FA40)

My first encounter with Mr. Forte was through his book *The Structure of Atonal Music* (1973). At that time, I was working on my master's thesis on Arnold Schoenberg's atonal music in my native country of Japan. After reading this book, I was deeply fascinated by his theory. While I initially did not have much ambition to study abroad, I started to wonder if I could become his student in the United States. After a year of preparation, I was admitted to Yale Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. I arrived at New Haven in the fall of 1981, and met Mr. Forte in person for the first time in a seminar room at the Department of Music. I still remember his warm smile when he pronounced my full name correctly without any accents at the first meeting.

Before I came to the U.S., I thought he would offer courses exclusively on modern music theory, since in Japan he was recognized as a specialist of this area. Contrary to my assumption, he offered courses on music pedagogy and Schenkerian analysis in the first year of my study. In the pedagogy course, we studied his textbook *Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice* (3rd ed., 1979). By taking this course, I realized that his atonal music theory is based on his wide knowledge of music—not only of modern music but also of tonal music and music before the establishment of tonality. For the Schenkerian analysis course, he taught from his teaching notes. When his *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis*, co-authored with Seven E. Gilbert, was published the next year (1982), I noticed that his teaching notes and his book had much in common: this book must have been based on his years of teaching experience of this topic, reflecting his interactions with students.

In my second year, we read his article “The Magical Kaleidoscope: Schoenberg's First Atonal Masterwork, Opus 11, No. 1” (1981) in addition to *The Structure of Atonal Music*. The article introduced me to an empirical application of his pitch-class set theory to musical analysis, which I had wanted to learn eagerly. Although my original plan was to go back to Japan after two years of study, when the end of the second year approached, I couldn't help but hope to stay for several years more. With Mr. Forte's help and advice, I ended up becoming a Ph.D. candidate and started to write a dissertation under his guidance. When I finally left New Haven, he gave me an offprint copy of his upcoming article “Liszt's Experimental Idiom and Music of the Early Twentieth Century” (1987) with his signature.

More than two decades have passed since then. I still live in the U.S., and have conducted research projects, some of which stem from my years with Mr. Forte. Although I have not been affiliated with academic institutions, I will continue to write articles because he taught me, among other things, the importance of a never-ending sense of curiosity and an aspiration to pursue ideas without any compromises. I believe that, while being his student was an honor and a privilege, it also comes with a responsibility to keep moving forward, as he has set a great example for all of us.

FROM J. RANDALL WHEATON (PH.D. 1988; FA41)

Allen Forte's name first came to my attention during the winter semester of 1977 while I was a master's student at the University of Michigan. I was taking a course on music theory pedagogy and was asked to give a presentation on Allen's *Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice*. Given my earlier tentative and uninformed encounters with what we might politely call tonic-six-four books (Piston, for example), reading this volume was a revelation. Soon, I encountered *The Structure of Atonal Music* (1973), voraciously read all of the reviews (both praiseworthy and otherwise), and desperately tried to learn Schenkerian analysis from what was available at the time, those misleading and troublesome "secondary sources." Then I discovered Allen's seminal article "Schenker's Conception of Music Structure" (1959) and was hopelessly under his spell.

Recklessly, I decided to attempt a Schenkerian analysis of Brahms's Intermezzo, op. 118/1, for the presentation portion of my qualifying exam and would even hazard to perform the piece. Euphoric after having played well, I was then chastised by a distressingly offended committee member—in retrospect, notable for his particularly regressive and fusty views—who asked: "Why in the world would you 'do' Schenker? That's already been done!" My analysis must have been childishly inept, but that would hardly have made any difference in this setting. I was obviously in the wrong place.

Shortly after, the Society for Music Theory was formed (1977), with Allen as its first President, the first issue of *Spectrum* appeared (1979), and Richmond Browne, a member of my thesis committee, excitedly showed me his copy of Ernst Oster's just-published translation of *Free Composition* (1979), the very year that Susan and I were married. I was accepted into a number of Ph.D. programs, but Yale's offer was the only one that counted. In April of 1980, I finally met Allen face-to-face at Detroit's International Brahms Festival, where he gave his remarkable paper on the Alto Rhapsody. I was honored to sit with him throughout the conference, found his witty asides devastatingly funny, and will never forget our lunch together. These were heady days brimming with optimism, and all things seemed possible.

In an earlier life, I'd worked as an organic chemist in the Yale School of Medicine, so that my return to New Haven nearly a decade later and under such radically different circumstances was suffused with irony and nostalgia. The classes that I took with the senior faculty—

Allen, Claude Palisca, and David Lewin—were the most engaging and intellectually inspiring courses that I'd ever had. Allen and I became close personal friends, especially during my dissertation years and after I joined the faculty and assumed the editorship of the *Journal of Music Theory*. His first wife, Sharland, a gifted artist and highly original personality, was particularly fond of Susan, and they both loved the cookies that Susan made for them every Christmas. We have especially warm memories of our many get-togethers at their home in Hamden, Sharland's art exhibits, which she always insisted that I personally mount and photograph, driving them to and from Tweed Airport, and much more. I will always treasure Allen's gift to me when, after ten years at Yale, we were finally leaving for Cincinnati. It was the first edition of Ebenezer Prout's *Double Counterpoint and Canon* (1893) and included an inscription to me on the title page that I greatly value.

It is a pleasure to contribute my article on Schumann's *Liederkreis*, op. 39, to this Festschrift in Allen's honor, and it poignantly reminds me of feelings that I expressed so long ago in the acknowledgments section of my dissertation:

It has been the greatest good fortune of my academic life that I was given the opportunity to study with the foremost music theorist in the world today, Allen Forte. The inspiration of his compellingly original and profound work, combined with his brilliant teaching and phenomenal devotion to his students, have exerted an influence on me so salutary and indelible that my life, and certainly my every scholarly activity, stands immeasurably enriched. The time and care he has lavished on my work, both as my teacher and dissertation advisor, his dedicated concern for my intellectual development, and his warm personal friendship are blessings for which I am deeply thankful. I am especially grateful to him for his steadfastness, tolerance, and heartening words of encouragement during some of the darker moments I experienced with this project.

Putting aside the inevitable difficulties that all of us confront in life—I might be a poster child in this regard—I am pleased to say that these words are just as valid and relevant today as they were when I wrote them in April of 1988. As Allen used to tell me, always with a hopeful ring in his voice: Onward and upward!

FROM CATHERINE NOLAN (PH.D. 1989; FA44)

The opportunity to study with Allen Forte will forever be a highlight of my life. From my very first encounter with him I was struck by the astounding scope of his research and musical interests. When I came to Yale in the mid 1980s, Allen was working on or had recently completed a breathtaking variety of research projects including, but not limited to, an article on Brahms's *Alto Rhapsody* (*Journal of Music Theory*, 1983), an article on the Adagietto from Mahler's Fifth Symphony (*19th-Century Music*, 1984), an article on Liszt's experimental harmonic language (*19th-Century Music*, 1987), his theory of pitch-class set genera (*Journal of Music Theory*, 1988), and an article on linear analysis in atonal music (*Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 1988).

When we would arrive at the seminar room in 143 Elm Street for his classes, he would often be sitting at the keyboard playing music from the orchestral epilogue from Berg's *Wozzeck*, Stravinsky's *Rite of Spring*, or classic popular songs by Cole Porter or George Gershwin, and would share with us some ideas he was developing for new projects that materialized later. He was always generous with his time, and would converse with his students over lunch after class about his ongoing work. He would frequently speak about his circuitous route to the field of music theory as we understood it, since it didn't exist for him when he was our age.

I was fascinated by his vision of music theory, his intellectual strength, his musical sensitivity, and his concern for his students' academic growth in a broad sense that transcended the focused subject matter of the courses he taught. He inspired me to conceive of our discipline of music theory as one of great diversity in terms of musical repertoire and theoretical formulation and one of great dynamism in terms of its continuing evolution.

I consider Allen not only my most significant teacher and mentor, but also a dear, dear friend to whom I owe more than I can say. Allen will always have a special place in the heart of his "Canadian daughter."

FROM GRETCHEN HORLACHER (PH.D. 1990; FA45)

In about 1985 I took a class from Allen entitled something like “Three Post-Tonal Masterworks,” an in-depth seminar on the *Rite of Spring*, *Pierrot lunaire*, and *Wozzeck*. At that time I had certainly heard and become very curious about the *Rite*, but the other two works were largely names I recognized from a list of “pieces you should know.” During that semester I came to know all three works better, as one would hope, but the ramifications of that class were much larger than that.

A couple of things stand out particularly for me. First of all, I was completely amazed by the level of detail in which the pieces were studied. These were early, heady days for pitch-class set analysis, and we went after these pieces with a vigor I had only experienced for tonal music. That such music could be taken so seriously was a (naïve) revelation, but one that has stuck with me through the years. Moreover, I have wonderful memories of entering the classroom to find Allen sitting at the piano, playing portions of the *Rite* (and perhaps some of the other two, although the *Rite* grabbed my attention and it has never let go). His example of joining the aural and tactile aspects of the piece with some very abstract analysis was a wonderful and provocative way of inviting us to engage with these works across a very wide spectrum.

Allen also brought the sketchbook of the *Rite*, published in 1969 but still a relatively unknown document. Its colored pencils, arrows, and symbols, and numerous cross-outs and revisions absolutely fascinated me (a fascination intensified by Martha Hyde’s subsequent seminar in sketch studies) and brought home in an even stronger way that the agglomerations of complex pitches in all three of these works were in fact precisely chosen and deserved the close examination we were giving them. At a lunch with graduate students during that time, Allen mentioned to me that the Paul Sacher Foundation had opened to the public, and that an enormous pile of the Stravinsky *Nachlass* could now be studied. Later on I made three extensive visits to the foundation, and what I found has changed the way I think about Stravinsky in many ways.

Nearly thirty years have passed since that seminar, and the interests raised there—the close study of modernist works, the importance of their sounds as well as their structures, and the introduction of novel topics and methods—continue to shape my research and teaching. I will always be grateful.

FROM JOEL GALAND (PH.D. 1990; FA46)

Those who studied with Allen in the nineties and early aughts, when his courses on popular song were staples of the Yale undergraduate music curriculum, may be surprised that I did not meet him until my senior year. I was well aware of Mr. Forte, of course (all male professors, at that time, were “Misters,” regardless of their highest degrees). With the notable exception of David Lewin, all of my undergraduate theory instructors—Maury Yeston, Bill Rothstein, David Damschroder, Chris Hasty—were his current or former advisees. Our harmony textbook was *Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice*, and the text for the undergraduate course in post-tonal theory was *The Structure of Atonal Music*.

Just before my senior year, I read some music theory on my own, including Yeston’s anthology, *Readings in Schenker Analysis*, which reprinted Allen’s early essay on “Schenker’s Conception of Musical Structure.” When the 1982–83 “Blue Book” (the undergrad catalog) arrived at my parent’s house, I was chagrined to find Allen’s name absent. Would I really graduate without ever having studied with him? Summoning my courage, I wrote to him. Middle of the summer though it was, he took the time to reply, giving me his home phone number, inviting me to call him, and closing with “I will be happy to do all I can to assure that your senior year at Yale is a profitable one.”

And it was! That year, I studied Schenkerian analysis with him, one-on-one, and he allowed me to take his graduate seminar on late Romantic music, somewhat paradoxically titled “The Experimental Tradition.” It is largely because of Allen that I stayed on to earn a Ph.D. in theory, rather than going to law school.

Two events during my grad school years—Allen’s dinner speech at the 1987 SMT meeting in Rochester and his 1986 exchange with Richard Taruskin in *Music Analysis*—gave the scholarly community a taste of the wry, understated humor that his students were able to enjoy every Wednesday during his morning and afternoon courses and the intervening lunch at Lords. On the first day of the “Experimental” seminar, he casually mentioned that, not long after he presented his first academic paper on this repertoire, the journal *19th-Century Music* was founded. “I’m not necessarily saying there’s a connection.” Every so often, he would pronounce a musical passage “refractory to analysis” and promise that his forthcoming edition of the work would remove the offending pitch class representatives.

As a dissertation advisor, he was a *Doktor Vater* of the old school. He expected us to work independently. He was not keen on shooting the breeze about half-baked, tentative projects, but once we had something concrete, he was an excellent editor. He cared deeply about the professional development of his advisees and was of enormous assistance early in our careers. He also dispensed advice of a more personal nature. He once told me to avoid “entanglements” with women—counsel that, as a graduate student in theory, I found frustratingly easy to follow.

The “Experimental” seminar marked a change of direction for Allen, whose recent work had been mostly devoted to developing and applying his theory of set classes. In the ensuing years, he produced an impressive series of articles on Brahms, Liszt, Wagner, Mussorgsky, and Mahler. It was exciting to be in on this new research program, however tangentially. Later, as a junior faculty at Yale in the early '90s, I witnessed his next new big turn, which led to his monograph on *The American Popular Ballad of the Golden Era*. We spent many hours at his Hamden home listening to and discussing this music, we lent each other records and scores, and we caught a show or two together. This happened to be the period when I was embarking on my Kurt Weill research, and it marked the only time we worked on similar repertoire simultaneously. Those were wonderful years!

FROM JACK F. BOSS (PH.D. 1991; FA48)

I came to Yale in the fall of 1984 with the express purpose of studying music theory with Allen Forte and David Lewin. Meeting both of these august personages was a little terrifying for a twenty-six year-old who hadn't spent much time outside of Ohio, but I soon found (in both cases) a gentle-spirited human being behind the personage, who nevertheless challenged and stretched me (gently).

This was especially the case with Allen, with whom I studied for seven years. After a couple of years, he discovered that I had some handyman skills, so he would invite me to the house on Mulberry Hill to help him install an air conditioner or plant roses by the driveway. As we worked together, I discovered that the Allen Forte I knew from class and office visits was actually just the small tip of a much larger iceberg. We wouldn't talk that much about the Schoenberg analyses I was working out for him (although I kept trying to bring those up). Instead, we'd hear a bird call and he'd identify it by breed, and we'd talk about some of the differences between that particular bird and some of the others he'd heard in his neighborhood. Or he'd discourse for an hour on different types of roses (particularly those native to Portland, Oregon, his home town) and how to care for and feed them properly. Like many in his generation, he had expertise on a wide variety of topics outside of the one on which he built his career.

The one aspect of his teaching that stands out to me (because it surprised me a little) was his willingness to let me choose a research topic that went against the grain of the work I'd been doing in his analysis classes. The dissertation topic we finally settled on (a motivic analysis of Schoenberg's first Op. 22 song, which systematized some of the composer's remarks) wasn't his favorite to begin with, maybe because it relegated pitch-class set analysis to a secondary role behind pitch-interval patterns. But as I "gathered steam," he became enthusiastic along with me—although he continued to challenge me to support and justify aspects of the project that I was taking for granted. These challenges were organized in neatly typed lists, keyed to numbers in my text, as was his habit. The work he made me do in response paved the way for the dissertation to become the basis of two articles, which are still widely quoted to this day.

FROM ANNIE K. YIH (PH.D. 1992; FA52)

My first meeting with Allen was back in early spring of 1985, when I went for an interview for the Ph.D. program. Because of his reputation, I was a bit nervous, but surprisingly I found him to be very friendly and he greeted me with a very warm smile that made me feel quite at ease immediately. During our first meeting, I raised my concern about whether he would consider me doing a dissertation on Debussy's music, because at that point I noticed most of his research and his students' current works were on Viennese composers, and not much had been written about Debussy. He quickly responded that he would consider all composers. That indeed turned out to be quite true.

I then met him for the second time at the inaugural Schenkerian Symposium at the Mannes School of Music (March 1985). I had not attended any classes with Allen yet, but he greeted me by my name as if he had known me already. His warm mannerism has always impressed me most about him as a person. Throughout the years, this reception from him gave me constant reassurance about myself during my studies with him.

Another trait that I admire about him is how he speaks so precisely; with just a few words, he often poignantly guides me down a path to think through a difficult concept such that I could find answers to my own questions. He is not only a man of a few words, he is also very direct when it comes to solving a problem. I remember the time when I was going through a very difficult personal time, toward the end of my fourth year. I was not productive and struggled for nine months without any focus. I finally told Allen about my personal problems. His tone of voice turned quite serious and gave me an advice that was almost fatherly. It was probably something I needed, and he gave me a suggestion for solving my despair, and I somehow found my focus and was able to finish my dissertation on the structure and organization of Debussy's String Quartet.

Since that personal advice, Allen has made me feel a special kinship to him. To me, he was not only my advisor; he has become my mentor, my role model as a teacher, and a fatherly figure. Over the years, I have observed how he uses humor in class when necessary, and how he knows when to move on without dwelling on a problem. Whenever someone in class had a question that required some thinking, I always remember that—instead of giving us an answer—he would say, “Think about it.” That taught me to become more self-reliant, and I find the approach very stimulating.

In the spring of 1998, I received a Teaching Development Grant from Hong Kong Baptist University (where I taught for five years) to invite Allen and Madeleine to give a series of lectures and recitals in Hong Kong. During their visit, I got to escort them on a personal level, and we went out for many dinners and lunches and spent some time sightseeing. It was during this trip that my friendship with Allen and Madeleine grew more closely. Madeleine's open and forthcoming personality is quite in stark contrast with Allen's relatively reserved and quiet manner. I must admit that it felt a little bit strange at first when Madeleine introduced me to their friends as their "little Chinese daughter"—and I in return addressed them as "mom and dad"—but over time I have become quite heart-felt about it. We still communicate occasionally by phone but mostly by email, and I like signing off with the phrase I use now:

“Love from your little daughter, Annie.”

FROM JAIRO MORENO (PH.D. 1996; FA60)

“Music theory,” Allen Forte loved to joke in the seminar room, “is the world’s second oldest profession.” The first one, of course, was the honorable labor of the blacksmiths. No, that’s not a joke. For Allen, theory was nothing short of the longest affair Western thought had had with making sense of music, an affair that began with the pre-Socratics and was very much kept alive by the very few who—like him—could legitimately call themselves theorists. This sense of theory’s past was forcefully communicated to those of us who worked on historical matters. One day, as he received me in his home studio in Hamden to go over a dissertation chapter, he corrected me on a small detail in Kirnberger as he walked over to his bookcase and proceeded to pull out a first-edition copy of *Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik*. Without pausing for a second, he found the passage. “There!,” he said, without further comment.

This intimacy with the toil of theorists past came as no surprise, in light of his own rapid developments at the time. Popular song, the persistence of the octatonic collection in early twentieth-century European modernism (and before), the work on genera, and his return to Webern were among the things occupying Allen during my years as his student. Music changes, and so do theorists and their theories. Perhaps he appeared disinterested in such contingencies to historians intent on making of “context” a predictable causal structure for explaining anything in and of the past. I never asked Allen, but I suspect he may have thought of that as too facile an alternative to the positivist musicological strictures that he would have known in his youth. He much preferred to confront and dwell in the paradox of an endeavor, as practically as any (back to this shortly) and as speculatively as few. The paradox was noted by Dahlhaus, and I often mentioned it in Allen’s presence. His retort? “That’s fine, but have you ever *heard* anything Dahlhaus said?”

Allen would not compromise on his requirement that history, theory, or analysis must respond to music’s practical demands. No speculation without practice; no theorists without the blacksmiths. That, among many other things, was a vital lesson I received from Allen Forte, a vital teacher and a living musician.

FROM JOHN CHECK (PH.D. 1997; FA62)

For sixteen years, I have had the privilege of teaching music theory. I doubt this would have happened without the help of Allen Forte.

It was 1995 and I was desperate. I had spent a year working on a dissertation that came to nothing. Quitting school was not an option, even though I was angry with my then advisor and frustrated with myself. The only thing to do was to try a different topic and, with it, a different advisor. It seemed a long shot, but I wondered if I might write about jazz improvisation. Unlike the songs of Robert Schumann (my abandoned topic), jazz was for me a keen and immediate interest. It was something I cared about and felt I knew. That there had never been a Yale music-theory dissertation on the topic concerned me, but as to its feasibility I knew the man to ask.

If there was ever a time to come to Professor Forte with my idea, it was in the summer of 1995. Princeton University Press was about to publish his new book, *The American Popular Ballad of the Golden Era: 1924–1950*. It made quite an impression on a distressed graduate student: its analytical reductions were not as forbidding as I then assumed they had to be; its tone was characterized by genuine affection, not bemused condescension; and its surprising details, both musical and extra-musical, along with its occasional puckishness, were buoyant in their effect.

He once gave me a copy of a lecture he delivered in Germany and Austria in 1958, “The Development of Diminutions in American Jazz.” (Unpublished for a half-century, the essay was later featured in a 2011 issue of the *Journal of Jazz Studies*.) What impressed me on reading it was how long he had been interested in jazz improvisation. Only later would I grasp the lecture’s greater significance: in taking seriously the work of Bessie Smith, Louis Armstrong, Lester Young, and Charlie Parker, he was making an implicit case for the dignity of four of its greatest practitioners, all of them African Americans.

I regret that I was too immature in New Haven to take proper advantage of working with Professor Forte. Another of his advisees, William Rothstein, expressed it well when—in the acknowledgements of his dissertation—he wrote of the “extended adolescence of . . . graduate school.” Allen Forte was patient with me during my own adolescence, and he supported me when it counted most. For this I express my lasting gratitude.

FROM LESLIE BLACK (PH.D. 1998; FA63)

After my second year as an undergraduate at the University of Western Ontario, I decided to spend the summer at school picking through the music library. I wanted to know more about particular pieces, including the *Rite of Spring*. So, I grabbed *Allen Forte's Harmonic Organization of The Rite of Spring* (1978) off the shelf and pretty much began my career as a music theorist. It was the introduction of that book that actually hooked me. Here was a beautiful, direct system to characterize the motivic and harmonic relationships in all sorts of complex modern music. This seemed a perfect pathway right into the minds of the great composers of the twentieth century. A few years later Richard Parks told me that I should really go to Yale and study Schenkerian analysis with Allen. He said, "With me you will only be part of an illegitimate line. With Professor Forte, you will earn your lineage back to Schenker." So, not only did Allen Forte inspire me to be a theorist, he would now make me legitimate to boot!

Needless to say, I was a bit intimidated when I arrived at the little house on Elm Street for my first class with Allen. The class was pitch-class-set analysis, and once I got over my sense of awe and wonder at being in a class taught by Allen Forte, I managed to attempt a contribution. Alas, in the midst of my description of a passage, I identified a particular set as "four-zed-fifteen." At the end of my statement, Allen wryly said, "Yes, that's all fine. But, it is an American system." Of course, my first reaction was one of utter horror and despair, believing I had offended a titan of music theory. Naturally, after getting to know Allen, I realized that it was a good-natured quip from a warm and witty man. And yet, I wonder about the subtext of this remark. I always thought it was honestly nationalistic: a sort of music theory jingoism, if such a thing is possible. But reflecting on the statement, and on Allen's character, I think he was actually being modest. To say that pitch-class set theory is an American system suggests that it is somewhat provincial (albeit of a rather large province). Of course, this type of modesty was hardly necessary in 1989 when that class took place. In the room were grad students from several countries, and I am sure that over the years most of us have read articles and books by scholars from around the world who owe a profound debt of gratitude to Allen's remarkable intellect and musicianship. So to this day, I'm not entirely sure how to take that statement from twenty-five years ago. Perhaps I will say "four-zee-fifteen" in America, and stick to my original Canadian distortion in lands that end their "ABC" song without a proper rhyme. In this way I celebrate the works of a great American scholar who has meant so much to music theorists everywhere.

FROM STEPHEN C. BROWN (PH.D. 1999; FA64)

Allen played a significant role in my development as a music scholar. During my years at Yale (1992–98), I not only worked on my dissertation with him but also took three semesters of coursework from him: a seminar on *Pelléas et Mélisande* and *Wozzeck*, as well as the full-year course on post-tonal theory and analysis. The latter course was an especially important early experience for me. Aside from the specific concepts and methods I learned that year, the course encouraged me to pursue independent scholarship in the field of music theory—in other words, it helped me learn how to *be* a music theorist. During both semesters Allen took a low-key approach, largely centering the class on student presentations, which gave me a great opportunity to develop my skills as both analyst and presenter (and as a teacher, for that matter). I particularly appreciate that Allen did not push an overly specific agenda, allowing me to develop my own ideas and find my own voice as a music theorist. Allen also had us write reviews of recent articles in music theory. These reviews were excellent exercises. For someone with little previous graduate training in music theory, the assignments accelerated my “acculturation” into the field. They also forced me to think critically about recent work, provided models for my own work, and even—arguably—have proved useful now that I am called upon to write reviews for articles submitted to music theory journals.

As a dissertation advisor, Allen was always very prompt about giving feedback. Every time I gave him pages to critique, he would word-process a list of comments keyed to little circled numbers that he wrote in the margins of the hard copy I supplied him. We would then meet in his first-floor office in the back of the old Elm Street Music Department building, and he would patiently clarify or amplify his comments.

Allen gave me one piece of dissertation advice that may seem utterly obvious, but in fact was very helpful at the time. During the initial stages of my work, I spent much time delving into various pieces by Shostakovich (the original subject of my dissertation). After a couple months, I met with Allen and confided that I hadn’t gained a sense of real “traction” with my work. He said that to produce a dissertation, I simply had to start writing. Following our meeting, I began composing a series of short essays, about one a month, on various Shostakovich pieces. Though I eventually strayed from my Shostakovich project, Allen’s advice engendered a crucial turning point for me, after which my work truly gathered momentum. As he had earlier done during my

classes with him, Allen helped put me on a path toward being a more mature and independent music scholar.

FROM EDWARD D. LATHAM (PH.D. 2000; FA66)

From the day he first walked through the door of the front classroom at 143 Elm St., with its view of Charles Ives's Center Church-on-the-Green, Allen drew us into his inner circle. With a twinkle in his eye and an impish grin, he would reveal the mysteries of pitch-class set theory to a seminar packed two rows deep with theorists and composers alike. Though he did not suffer auditors gladly, often referring to them as "taking up oxygen" and demanding their active participation in class as the minimum dues of initiation, he seemed to derive genuine pleasure from the fact that his course was one of only two or three that drew such an interdisciplinary clientele. I remember sitting around the large, Harkness-style seminar table with composers like Kevin Puts and Robert Aldridge and listening to presentations on Bartók, Stravinsky, or Messiaen delivered in sharply contrasting styles. The theorists in the room would dutifully present charts, graphs, and tables, pointing to measures in the scores they had conscientiously excerpted and photocopied for the rest of the class to illustrate the points they wished to make. The composers would then get up and stride to the piano, vociferously pounding out set-classes and jumping from moment to moment in the score, punctuating their stream-of-consciousness verbal narratives with abbreviated exhortations such as "and then it does . . ." and "don't you hear it?" Allen calmly took it all in, acknowledging key observations in his typically understated fashion and providing trenchant follow-up questions that kept the discussion moving forward.

During my years working with Allen (1994–2000), he was in the midst of publishing *The American Popular Ballad of the Golden Era, 1924–1950* (1995), and its subsequent incarnation for the general reader, *Listening to Classic American Popular Songs* (2001), with an accompanying CD that he recorded with baritone Richard Lalli. In my mind's eye, he is wearing his black shirt and grey tweed blazer combo, a jazzy twist on an Ivy League classic that combined in one ensemble the two worlds represented in his classroom. While he still had little use for "unreconstituted tonalists," as he called those who refused to accept the atonal analysis of works by turn-of-the-century composers like Debussy and Bartók, he was reinvigorated by the opportunity to showcase the beloved tonal music of his youth to a new generation of scholars and enthusiasts. When I approached him about writing a dissertation on *Porgy and Bess* and three other operas, his response was simple and direct: "It seems you want to do something big with your dissertation. Good." His approach throughout the dissertation-writing process was to balance targeted

critique with gentle encouragement; each time I entered the front office of 143 Elm St. for an appointment with him, I would hear the strains of Gershwin, Porter, or Arlen drifting out from behind the receptionist's desk, since his studio adjoined the front office at that time. I always left with more questions than answers, but also with the knowledge that I could find the answers I needed on my own.

Whether he was relating pitch-class sets to familiar tunes (to this day, I can never teach set-class 4-23 without calling it the "I Got Rhythm" tetrachord) or admonishing first-time conference presenters not to "snow people under" with a "Princeton paper," as he called conference papers that barraged an audience with a welter of jargon and detail more properly belonging to a journal article or book chapter, Allen had a knack for keeping even the most abstract of concepts relatable and rooted in musical observation. Like all of my co-contributors to this unique *Festschrift*, I am deeply indebted to him and continue gladly to pay down that debt in my own classroom from week to week and year by year.

FROM MATTHEW R. SHAFTEL (PH.D. 2000; FA68)

“Did you bring your scores?” I share a glance with my fellow undergraduates—each of us has had a book of Cole Porter songs open and ready to go ever since walking in the door and sitting down at the huge square table. The renowned Allen Forte has roped us all into a grand experiment: his first-ever course on the analysis of the popular ballad. He flashes his winning grin, sits at the piano, and invites us to sing: “Ev’ry time we say goodbye I die a little”

Every class meeting in each of the five courses I took with Professor Forte began the same way: “did you bring your scores?” The great scholar’s question is truly an emblem of the music-theoretical community that he helped to shape. We learn, study, and speculate about music through the scores themselves: we explore the music on the page and try to understand the way its elements interrelate and communicate. Like Forte, we are also insatiably curious about the way a score can open a doorway to performance, but he taught us that *heard* music is something quite different from the “Urtext,” the notated source. I will always remember looking up from the Porter score quite puzzled that the harmonies emanating from Forte’s piano didn’t match the ones on the page. “Do you like my arrangement?” he asks us, with a wink.

“How about this one?” Forte plays an E-minor triad while striking virtually every G on the piano. I am the only undergraduate in his graduate course on post-tonal music, and we are playing one of his favorite games: guess the piece from a single harmony. At each meeting he’s got a new one: 6-30, 6-z19 (and, of course, 6-z44), 4-19, and the list continues. He’s given us the ability to pare down the texture to the simplest of elements and to appreciate the minutiae of the written harmonies. Eager to impress, I’ve listed every possible segmentation in the Webern piece we are studying; I’ve got five printed pages of sets listed . . . in 9-point font. “Very impressive, Matthew,” Forte says, and as I’m glowing from his praise he continues, “but you know it’s octatonic.” I’m stunned. How could Webern, light years away from the Russian motherland, have become musically bilingual? Forte proceeds to show us the three disparate strands of the octatonic that combine to create the musical surface. This octatonic “Threat” (as the proofs for the article, “The Golden Thread,” mistakenly proclaimed) has struck some critics as hollow, but it was simply the result of his incessant search for underlying structure—the hallmark of Fortean music theory.

It was a curiosity about these underlying musical connections that drew me into Forte’s office in my senior year, with offers in hand from graduate programs in both music theory and

musicology. “Music theorists are much happier than musicologists,” he told me with that famous smile, “we can study any kind of music, and we always know how it really works.” Now I realize that the capacity to understand how music “works” was a special gift that Forte shared with his students. Even though the more I learn about music, the less confident I am to make such claims, I sorely miss this assuredness that helped to define music theory as a distinct discipline.

I also miss the long, numbered lists of concise and incredibly astute comments that were returned with each chapter of my dissertation, the last of which was always a line of encouragement. (“The weight of this chapter is substantial . . . I can hardly lift it. Keep working hard.”) And I will always appreciate the many “Papa Forte” moments, such as when I called to let him know I was expecting my third child: “Matthew, do I need to explain to you how this happens?”

More than twenty years after my first course with him, I am sitting and drinking iced tea with Allen and his always effervescent better half, Madeleine, in their living room. He moves to *his* piano (they would never share one) and invites me to sing while he plays “Ev’ry time we say goodbye.” He looks at me with a twinkle in his eye and asks, “did you bring your score?”

FROM RACHEL BERGMAN (PH.D. 2001; FA69)

I was first introduced to the venerable Allen Forte in the summer of '91, just before my senior year of college. This was not the flesh and blood Forte, mind you, but his seminal book *The Structure of Atonal Music* (1973). As a double major in music and math at a small liberal arts college, I was embarking on an independent study of pitch-class set theory, later to become a senior thesis for my math major entitled "A Mathematical Approach to Pitch-Class Sets." I was fascinated by Forte's book and—several months later—applied to Yale for graduate school.

My first in-person encounter with "Papa Forte," as we affectionately called him, was taking his graduate course on Post-Tonal Analysis (with many other courses to follow). Once I got over being star-struck, I found him to be a very amiable and humorous professor. As my coursework came to an end in the spring of '95, it seemed only natural that I ask Forte to be my advisor.

From that point forward, our relationship became more personal. We met at his home in Hamden, and I got to know him and Madeleine as well as the family, both through extended conversations and through the photographs covering the walls. During one of our earliest meetings he asked me about my dissertation title, which I hadn't yet thought about. While I was somewhat surprised by the question, I now pose the very same question to my own doctoral students, as it helps focus the research and writing process immensely.

As I continue to introduce the next generation of music students to the intriguing world of set theory, I am eternally grateful and proud to tell these young undergraduates that *I* got to work with the great Allen Forte. I only hope that I can inspire them the way Allen has inspired me.

FROM PHILIP EWELL (PH.D. 2001; FA70)

My situation is uncommon in that I had not heard of Allen Forte when I came to Yale in 1994. Until then I had committed myself to cello performance. When I decided to go the academic route I applied to Yale and entered not as a theorist but as a musicologist. Then I took classes with Allen, and his outstanding teaching, attention to detail, and wry sense of humor won me over. I finally realized that I was really a theorist! As I continued my studies at Yale, the more I read his superb writings the more I understood what a revolutionary thinker he is to the field of music theory. I ended up taking three of his classes and, ultimately, did an independent study with him on the music of Alexander Scriabin that turned into my dissertation topic. So I guess Allen not only made a theorist of me but also pushed me in the direction of Russian music and music theory.

The seminar that stands out most of all in my mind was that on the American popular ballad. Allen's intimate knowledge of this repertoire—all but unknown to me at the time—made me realize that music theory was, above all, really just “talking about music.” For the final project he allowed us to either write a paper or compose a model ballad. (I intentionally split my infinitive in that last sentence with Allen in mind—he first brought this matter to my attention and told me not to do so, yet sometimes I think it makes sense.) Most of us wrote songs—mine a sappy tune entitled “If You Were in Love with Me”—that we listened to at the end of the term. (And in this last sentence I intentionally used relative “that” instead of relative “which,” another grammatical pearl of wisdom from Allen). I had never had so much fun in a class before, and I learned many of Allen's wonderful teaching techniques, which I myself now use successfully in the classroom.

Whenever I mention to my colleagues in Russia that I studied with Allen Forte, they all stand in awe. In other words, virtually all theorists from Russia are familiar with his work, which, for those who know Russia well, is really saying something. (For example, in Russia they often call set theory the “Theory of Sets of Babbitt–Forte.”)

In closing, much of who I am today I owe to Allen, and I am honored and humbled to count myself as one of his advisees. Thank you Allen—you are a truly remarkable person.

FROM MARK S. SPICER (PH.D. 2001; FA71)

Like most of his doctoral students, I came to Yale already knowing that I wanted to work with Allen Forte. He was, after all, the Godfather of Music Theory. Luckily for me, my first class with Allen was not a course on Schenker or set theory, but a seminar on the American Popular Ballad of the Golden Era that he offered during the year he was completing his monumental book on the same subject. As with all Allen's graduate courses, this class was a veritable boot camp in music analysis: each week we had to write a short analytical paper on a different song, which he would subsequently critique with his trademark clarity and razor-sharp eye for detail. I have so many fond memories of that class—not the least of which is that I met Sara, my wife-to-be, at the seminar table—but what inspired me most was watching and listening to Allen at the piano, with that characteristic gleam in his eyes, teasing out and explaining musical features in songs that he obviously loved and had carried close to his heart for many years. I quickly learned from Allen that good music analysis, like a good musical performance, requires forging a deep intimacy with the piece in question.

Allen fully supported me when I told him after two years of working on my dissertation that I wanted to change topics and focus solely on British pop and rock. He knew how much that music meant to me. He even confided that he wished he could have felt free to write about the music of Porter, Kern, and Gershwin much earlier in his own career, but, alas, the academy had not yet taken popular music seriously.

There are many other Allen tales I could tell, but I will close with one more from towards the end of my studies with him. It was the summer of 2001, and I emailed Allen late on a Saturday afternoon to say that I had a draft of the final chapter of my dissertation ready for him to peruse. As is usual for me on weekends, I was playing a gig with my band the Bernadettes that night, so Allen told me to drop off a hard copy in the mailbox outside his home in Hamden on my way to the gig. This was a hefty chunk of music-analytical prose and I expected it would be several days before Allen responded to me with any feedback. Yet, to my astonishment, I turned on my computer around 10 a.m. the next day—a Sunday, no less—to find waiting in my inbox a *very* long email with his list of comments and suggestions for revision, all of which, as always, were right on the mark. I can only hope to have the same passion and dedication to my students when I reach my seventies.

FROM DAVID CARSON BERRY (PH.D. 2002; FA72)

Like many who studied with Allen in the later years of his teaching, I first encountered him through writings and theoretical models that had long since established him as a preeminent figure in music theory. Indeed, he was first presented to me as—literally—a *historical* figure in the field. In fall 1992, as my collegiate focus was shifting from composition to theory, I took a one-semester History of Theory course. When we reached the twentieth century and started to survey its landmark works, of course Allen's *The Structure of Atonal Music* (1973) was included; and even before that, when we addressed Schenker's work, Allen's (and Gilbert's) *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis* (1982) was required reading.

In spring 1994, while immersed in graduate-theory studies elsewhere, I read his article on Cole Porter's songs (published the year before). I was commencing a study of Irving Berlin's songs, and I was enheartened to see that such an esteemed theorist shared my interest in the popular music of the period. (The article also provided my first glimpse of Allen's trademark wit: enumerating the features of his Schenker-influenced musical examples, he ended by noting that they "are suitable for framing, as well.") In fall 1995, when I learned that his book on *The American Popular Ballad* had just been published, I set about trying to obtain one of the first copies. The large bookstores in Dallas (near where I lived) did not yet have it, and ordering books on the internet was still a novelty (Amazon.com, for example, had just begun its service in July of that year). But I found out through the SMT-list that Foundry Music Company in New Haven had copies, so I bought one over the phone and had them mail it to me.

Shortly beforehand, Allen and I met for the first time. In mid June 1995, I visited the Yale campus in advance of applying there as a doctoral student, and one of my professors arranged our tête-à-tête. I arrived early at the Music Department—which was in a rather prosaic brick building at 143 Elm—and was seated outside the main office when Allen walked through the back door and down the corridor toward me. I wasn't quite sure what he looked like until I found myself face to face with him; Yale's site on the fledgling World Wide Web contained no pictures of him, and although his Popular Ballad book would feature his photo on the dust-jacket flap, that was still a few months away. He invited me into his surprisingly small, rectangular sliver of an office (which branched off from the back of the main office), and for thirty minutes or so I was enthralled by his charming demeanor and dry wit (both conveyed in part through his

genial yet knowing smile). I'm sure he imparted some useful information about the program, but as I left I really only recall thinking to myself: "Wow, that was Allen Forte!"

When I enrolled at Yale, in fall 1996, he was not offering a graduate course. But the subsequent term I had him for *two*: the second semester of "Post-Tonal Analysis," and "The American Popular Ballad, 1924–1950." The latter proved important to both my personal and professional association with Allen. On the personal front, as the once-a-week class ended around noon, he would typically ask if any of us wanted to join him for lunch. A few of us always did, and doing so afforded a great opportunity to get to know him apart from the proprieties of the classroom. As the semester progressed, our rapport grew. (Which led, incidentally, to his coming to my home for dinner, where it was my cat's turn to be enthralled by him: the whole time he was there, she stood very quiet and still, and gazed at him as if in admiration. As he left, he smiled and noted that "Animals tend to like me.") On the professional front, I took advantage of the seminar to develop further my paper on Berlin's songs. That April I delivered it at a conference, and Allen was very helpful in preparing me; at one point he invited me to his home—the first of many times to come—where we sat and discussed my work. The seminar was also important in kindling my enthusiasm for the songs of Jimmy Van Heusen, and thus my first two published articles—one on Berlin and the other on Van Heusen—were influenced in varying ways by my work with him.

In spring 1998, I took the second semester of Schenkerian analysis under Allen. He did not use his and Gilbert's textbook, but instead led us through a different piece each week. On occasion, our assigned piece was also analyzed in the book, and naturally we would consult the given interpretation. Yet, in class the following week, sometimes Allen would present a view that differed from it. If we said, "But that's not the way you analyzed it in the book," he would flash that now-familiar smile and respond, "No, that's not the way the *authors* analyzed it in the book." Ah, we would think; so Gilbert did that one.

That fall, after my coursework and final exams were completed, I began developing a dissertation prospectus and asked Allen if he would be my advisor—not on a topic I had actually studied with him, but on another passion of mine: Stravinsky's music. He agreed, and thus it happened that I became both the last person to start and the last person to finish a dissertation under him. It was completed in May 2002; a year and a half later, he retired.

The years in which I was at Yale (1996–2002, plus an additional, post-graduate year as a Lecturer in the Music Department) were naturally monumental for me. But they happened to be personally consequential for Allen, too, as it was during this time that he married the pianist Madeleine Hsu, whom he had met in 1995. The union definitely gave him a new lease on life. And if it meant that we advisees perhaps had fewer opportunities to socialize with him (simply because he was eager to be at the side of his bride), it also meant that we found a new friend and supporter in Madeleine. The two became inseparable; to see one was to see the other, whether on campus at special events (such as in late 2000, when Yale’s newly endowed Allen Forte Professorship in Music Theory was celebrated) or in sunny Aruba where they enjoyed swimming. (Alas, I only saw them at the latter location through photographs.) And when I was trying to secure my first tenure-track job, both were helpful in their own ways: Allen with professional (yet caring) advice, and Madeleine with maternal (yet pragmatic) advice.

In the acknowledgments of my dissertation, I declared that to study with Allen was the reason I had journeyed to Yale, and added: “to join the ranks of his advisees is a great honor.” It still is and always will be.

ABSTRACT

Testimonials are collected from forty-two former doctoral advisees of Allen Forte, whose Yale graduation dates range from 1968 to 2002. Although the style and focus of individual tributes vary, many convey something about Forte, both professionally and personally, at the time in which the advisee studied with him. The results are ordered chronologically (by Ph.D. dates) so that collectively they suggest the evolution of Forte himself, as well as North American music theory, across the decades. The contributors include (in alphabetical order): Baker, James M.; Ballan, Harry R.; Beach, David W.; Bergman, Rachel; Bernard, Jonathan W.; Berry, David Carson; Black, Leslie; Boss, Jack F.; Brown, Stephen C.; Chapman, Alan; Check, John; Chrisman, Richard; Damschroder, David A.; Ewell, Philip; Galand, Joel; Girton, Irene M. [Levenson]; Graziano, John; Greer, Taylor A.; Hamao, Fusako; Hanson, Jens L.; Harrison, Daniel; Horlacher, Gretchen; Kowalke, Kim H.; Krebs, Harald; Latham, Edward D.; McNamee, Ann K.; Moreno, Jairo; Neumeyer, David; Nolan, Catherine; Rothgeb, John; Rothstein, William; Russom, Philip; Schmalfeldt, Janet; Schwanauer, Stephan M.; Shaftel, Matthew R.; Spicer, Mark S.; Stein, Deborah; Straus, Joseph N.; Wason, Robert W.; Wheaton, J. Randall; Yeston, Maury; and Yih, Annie K.

This article is part of a special, serialized feature: *A Music-Theoretical Matrix: Essays in Honor of Allen Forte (Part V)*.

HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE

(An example based on a humanities-style note citation)

Whole Collection:

“To Allen Forte from His Former Advisees: Tributes and Reminiscences,” in *A Music-Theoretical Matrix: Essays in Honor of Allen Forte (Part V)*, ed. David Carson Berry, *Gamut* 6/2 (2013): 267–338.

Individual Tribute:

[Author’s Name], testimonial from “To Allen Forte from His Former Advisees: Tributes and Reminiscences,” in *A Music-Theoretical Matrix: Essays in Honor of Allen Forte (Part V)*, ed. David Carson Berry, *Gamut* 6/2 (2013), [specific page(s)].

This article uploaded to the [Gamut](#) site on 4 May 2014.