quarter of a century ago, William Rothstein first employed a now common phrase when he spoke of the “Americanization of Schenker”—that is, the accommodation that had to be made to bring Schenker’s ideas into the American academy, a process that involved expunging (or at least reconstituting) “those elements of Schenker’s thought [that clashed] most spectacularly with the American mind.”¹ Rothstein focused mainly on émigrés displaced by the Second World War (e.g., Oswald Jonas, Ernst Oster, and Felix Salzer), and on Americans a generation younger (e.g., Milton Babbitt and Allen Forte). However, it seems that the earliest attempt at “Americanizing” Schenker came—logically enough—from an American-born music pedagogue who had not studied with Schenker or his pupils: George A. Wedge, a theory teacher at New York’s Institute of Musical Art (a precursor to The Juilliard School). In a prior article, I briefly acknowledged Wedge’s role as a “satellite figure” in early Schenkerian work in America.²

In the sense of mainstream work, this characterization is certainly true. Nonetheless, his activities were significant in the context of their particular time and place. Wedge started teaching something about Schenker as early as 1925, before any of the latter’s pupils had arrived on American


shores. He took some of Schenker’s concepts and incorporated them into a popular harmony textbook in 1930–31. Later in the 1930s, he distilled certain ideas for “the capacity of the average [person],” and in conjunction with Olga Samaroff Stokowski advanced a generalist agenda through books and at the Juilliard Summer School. This work was allied with the broader “middlebrow project” of the 1920s and ’30s, which in music was manifested largely in “appreciation books.” Thus, through Wedge’s various efforts, Schenker’s route to Americanization took some previously unrecognized and “home-grown” turns along the way to the process outlined by Rothstein.

In this essay, I will document and elaborate the preceding assertions in five principal sections. First, I will present details about Wedge’s career, and investigate how he came to encounter Schenker’s ideas. Second, I will explore his writings, in order to discern their Schenkerian influences (which, in turn, will necessitate filtering out some related elements of American pedagogy). Third, I will consider Wedge’s (and Samaroff’s) pedagogical agenda of the 1930s, which involved bringing musical education to a mass audience. Fourth, I will contemplate how Wedge’s work was a portent of the “Americanized” Schenker pedagogy that developed in later years, with a focus on how it embodied the assimilation (rather than just the accommodation) of Schenker’s ideas. Fifth and finally, I will demonstrate how—even beyond Wedge—the Institute of Musical Art became a conduit for learning about Schenker, especially between 1925 and 1936/37, and I will argue that its name should be added to the list of early institutions in New York at which Schenkerian ideas were communicated.

---

I.

Wedge and His Career.

George Anson Wedge (whose photographs appear in Figure 1) was born in Danbury, Connecticut, on 15 January 1890, the only child of Anson Curtis Wedge and Cora Belle Wedge (née McHan). His father, who was around fifty-four years old when George was born, died in 1898, and thus he was raised by his mother alone. Wedge studied piano and organ in his youth, and earned money for lessons by playing for a dance school, and at the Danbury Methodist Episcopal Church (1903–09). He recalled that because “[w]e had no good music in our small town,” he would save money so that “about once a year” he could “go to New York for a few days” and attend “the opera twice a day” as well as “a few fine concerts.” As his high school years drew to a close, he debated whether to attend college or study music—then mutually exclusive choices, for the most part—and he opted for the latter after hearing the Belgian-born organist Gaston Dethier play at a festival in Norfolk, Connecticut, in 1908. Dethier had been a faculty member at New York’s Institute of Musical Art (IMA) since its opening in 1905, and that is presumably why Wedge chose to attend that school. While there, he earned diplomas or certificates in organ

---

4 Apparently, Anson Wedge had had another family years earlier. The 1870 US census shows that a person of that name—a farmer living in Bridgewater Township, in northeastern Pennsylvania—was married to Avis Wedge and had a son, Arthur (age two). The Pennsylvania location is in keeping with George Wedge’s later note, in his passport application of 30 July 1924, that his father was from that state (although the 1870 census actually indicates that Anson had been born in Connecticut). The 1880 US census shows that Anson was then living in Plymouth, Connecticut (about forty miles northeast of Danbury), and was a house painter. In addition to wife Avis and son Arthur, there was now also a daughter, Alice (age nine); both children had been born in Pennsylvania. Unfortunately, records of the 1890 US census, which was conducted around the time of George’s birth, were largely destroyed in a 1921 fire.

5 Other jobs also filled George’s youth: he sold newspapers in the afternoons, and worked in a printing office on Saturdays and during the summer (Dorothy Crowthers, “Where Dreams Come True: Reminiscences of Celebrated Personages,” The Baton 2/8 [May 1923], 3).

6 The Baton, “Reflections of Yesterday,” vol. 4/4 (Jan. 1925), 19. New York is approximately seventy miles southwest of Danbury. Although most towns in Connecticut would have been considered “small” next to New York, it should be noted that Danbury was hardly minuscule: according to the 1900 census, its population was 19,474.

FIGURE 1. Three faces of George A. Wedge (1890–1964)

Left: Photograph from *The Baton* 5/2 (Nov. 1925), 11, The Juilliard School Archives
Middle: Photograph by Kubey-Rembrandt Studios (1932 or before), The Juilliard School Archives
Right: Photograph by James Abresch (by 1947?), The Juilliard School Archives
During and after this period, Wedge was active as a performer. As a church organist, he
served at St. Stephen’s Episcopal Church in Ridgefield, Connecticut (1909–11), and at the
Madison Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church in New York (1911–24). He was also the accom-
panist (1913–18) of New York’s Musical Art Society, a professional choral group under the
direction of its founder, Frank Damrosch, who was also the founder and director of the IMA.
Indeed, Wedge’s first experience teaching was in Damrosch’s IMA choral class, which was
handed over to him while Damrosch was briefly away. “After that,” Wedge recalled, “I think I
substituted for everyone in the school and just grew like Topsy into being one of the regular
faculty.”

Over the years, Wedge gained renown as an educator and author in the areas of theory
and ear training. At the IMA, he had completed “all but one year” of his theory studies with
Percy Goetschius. (His other teacher was Daniel Gregory Mason.) Sometimes called “the father
of American theory,” Goetschius (1853–1943) had studied at the Stuttgart Conservatory with
Immanuel Faisst and others (1873–76), and had taught there (1876–90) before returning to the
US to teach at Syracuse University (1890–92), the New England Conservatory (1892–96), and

---

8 Ridgefield is roughly ten miles from Wedge’s home town of Danbury.
9 The Musical Art Society held about sixty concerts between 1894 and 1920, expanding during the time from a chorus of about fifty-five to about seventy members.
10 The story of Wedge’s nervousness, before taking charge of the chorus upon his first teaching assignment, seems to have been a standard anecdote about his early days. It was recounted on two occasions in The Baton: Crowthers, “Where Dreams Come True,” 4; and [Anon.], “Reflections of Yesterday,” 19.
11 The Baton, “Reflections of Yesterday,” 19. The phrase “grew like Topsy” is perhaps unfamiliar to many readers today. It refers to the character of that name in Harriet Beecher Stowe’s Uncle Tom’s Cabin (1852), and suggests great growth—originally, unplanned growth. Both senses fit Wedge’s growth into a faculty member.
12 Wedge, quoted in The Baton, “In Tribute to Dr. Goetschius,” vol. 4/9 (June 1925), 3.
privately (1896–1905). In 1905 he became part of the inaugural faculty of the IMA, where he remained as a teacher of composition and theory until his retirement in the spring of 1925. Goetschius’s fame and influence spread especially through the numerous textbooks he authored over the decades, on harmony, melody writing, counterpoint, and form. Wedge followed in his footsteps as both teacher and author.

As a teacher, Wedge was primarily associated with the IMA, where (as noted above) he segued from student to faculty, after Goetschius retired, Wedge became the head of the theory department. As a principal instructor at a prominent New York music school, he taught many who would later achieve acclaim, including composers such as Broadway’s Richard Rodgers and Meredith Willson, Hollywood’s Alfred Newman, and Louise Talma. In later years, Wedge moved to administration, becoming acting director of the IMA in 1937, director in 1938, and

---


16 Wedge’s transition from IMA student to faculty is difficult to demarcate. He is cited as being an instructor there in 1909, in his entries in *Who’s Who in New York City and State, 11th ed.* (New York: L. R. Hamersly, 1947), 2500–2501; and *Who Was Who in America with World Notables, Vol. 8, 1982–1985* (Chicago: Marquis Who’s Who, 1985), 418. However, in an article issued upon his appointment as director of the IMA, it is noted that he “became a member of the faculty . . . in 1910” (*New York Times*, “Notes of Musicians” [3 July 1938], 102). In contrast, Wedge’s obituary in *The Juilliard Review Annual* ([1964–65], 10) states that he “became a faculty member” “upon graduation in 1918”—an appointment date also noted in his *New York Times* obituary ([4 Nov. 1964], 39). The problem with this later date is that Wedge graduated in composition in 1915 (after doing so in organ in 1910, and piano in 1914), which would leave a three-year gap before 1918; and this contradicts his remark that he had “always been at the Institute” (i.e., progressing from student to faculty; see *The Baton*, “Reflections of Yesterday,” 19).

17 Newman (1900–70), Rodgers (1902–79), and Willson (1902–84) all studied at the IMA before the mid 1920s, which (as will be shown) was the time at which Wedge began to be influenced by Schenker. Talma (1906–96), on the other hand, continued her studies there until the end of the decade.
dean in 1939. He occupied the last position until the school was dissolved as a distinct entity in 1946, in favor of a newly reorganized Juilliard School of Music.¹⁸ For his final year before retirement, he was Director of Admissions (1946–47).

During these decades, Wedge was simultaneously active at other institutions, mostly in New York City, as shown in Figure 2. He taught at the Herbert Witherspoon Studios, headed by the namesake singer and educator;¹⁹ at St. Agatha’s School for Girls, sister school of the noted Trinity School; and at the Settlement Music School in Philadelphia. He was on the faculty of Philadelphia’s Curtis Institute of Music during its first two years of existence (a school whose founding was associated with the aforementioned Settlement School);²⁰ and for two decades he was involved with the theory department of the Neighborhood Music School (renamed the Manhattan School of Music during this time).²¹ He was active in summer classes at New York

---

¹⁸ One must be aware of the institutional evolution of the IMA in order to understand some of the references made in this essay. The IMA opened in 1905, and the Juilliard Graduate School (JGS) opened in 1924. In 1926, the two schools were combined under one President and Board of Trustees, in an entity called the Juilliard School of Music. In 1931, the JGS moved into a new building adjacent to the IMA building. Despite the organizational and physical commingling, the IMA and the JGS maintained distinct identities until 1946, when the cited reorganization commenced under the presidency of composer William Schuman. Afterwards, there was just a single, unified Juilliard School of Music. In 1968, it was renamed The Juilliard School, to reflect better the fact that it also included a Dance Division (established 1951) and a Drama Division (established 1968).

¹⁹ Wedge would work with Witherspoon again: for the 1935 Juilliard Summer School, it was announced that “George A. Wedge and Herbert Witherspoon will present courses in the Essentials of Musical Understanding and Appreciation Through Analysis” (New York Times, “Contemporary Music Festival” [14 Apr. 1935], X6).

²⁰ The Settlement Music School (SMS, founded in 1908) established a Conservatory Department in 1922, for advanced and professional students. In 1924, this department “became the nucleus of The Curtis Institute of Music, the organizing of which institution was one of [the SMS’s] activities” (Settlement Music School, Report of the Settlement Music School / 416 Queen Street, Philadelphia / 1908–1928 [(Philadelphia?): s.n., 1928], 8). The founder of the Curtis Institute, Mary Louise Curtis Bok, had been president of the SMS for a decade before the Institute was formed (i.e., 1914–24). Regarding Wedge’s departure from Curtis in 1926, it should be noted that it roughly coincided with Goetschius’s retirement from the IMA and Wedge’s promotion to head of the department. Accordingly, it may be that leaving Curtis was his decision, due to IMA allegiances. Or, it may be that Curtis solicited his services only to help launch their program, and that he was never intended to be a permanent faculty member. Whatever the case, he was succeeded at Curtis by Reginald O. Morris, a noted textbook author who had previously taught at London’s Royal College of Music, and who would rejoin the latter after just two years at Curtis.

²¹ Janet D. Schenck, founder of the Manhattan School of Music, wrote: “One of our earliest friends had been George A. Wedge, who for a number of years acted as advisor to our theory and composition departments. One of the most gifted teachers I have ever known, his experience and his interest were of the greatest help” (Schenck, Adventure in Music: A Reminiscence: Manhattan School of Music 1918–1960 [New York: Manhattan School of Music, 1961], 37). The school’s name changed in 1938.
University and Columbia University, and he was the director of the Juilliard Summer School from its founding in 1932 through his retirement in 1947.\(^{22}\) Moreover, when the Columbia-affiliated Teachers College decided to offer music theory classes, it essentially imported Wedge’s IMA program: in 1927 it hired his colleague, Howard A. Murphy, to teach the core classes, for which Murphy used Wedge’s curriculum; and meanwhile “the advanced ear training, sight singing, dictation and advanced keyboard harmony offered to Teachers College students” was taught by Wedge at the IMA, from 1927 through ’37.\(^{23}\)

\(^{22}\) Wedge also lectured at various places, including at the Ithaca (NY) Conservatory of Music (now Ithaca College) in the early 1920s, and at “the Schirmer Music School” in the summer of 1931. (References to these lectures are from, respectively, Crowthers, “Where Dreams Come True,” 4; and Elizabeth Phillips, “Improvisations between Seasons,” *The Baton* 11/1–2 [1931], 36.) Wedge also served on the advisory committee of the Bronx House Music School, at least in 1938 (see *New York Times*, “Of Music Schools and Courses” [11 Sept. 1938], 189).

\(^{23}\) Richard Norman Olsen, *Howard A. Murphy, Theorist and Teacher: His Influence on the Teaching of Basic Music Theory in American Colleges and Universities from 1940 to 1973* (Ed.D. dissertation, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, 1973), 29. Olsen points out that “Wedge continued to be a dominant influence in the [Teachers College] program until about 1937” (29). As an additional acknowledgment that Wedge’s work was being presented simultaneously at both the IMA and Teachers College, consider the dedication written by Wedge in a copy of his
As for his writings, Wedge was not the only former student of Goetschius to publish pedagogical texts (Benjamin Cutter, Donald Tweedy, and the aforementioned Murphy also did),24 but he was the most prolific, placing him in the company of IMA authors Goetschius and A. Madeley Richardson.25 Wedge’s six textbooks are cited in Figure 3. The first four avoided treading on the main subjects of Goetschius’s books, which was a necessary tactic while they were both at the IMA. Even when their topics intersected, there were differences. For example, Wedge’s 1924 text addressed harmony, but in terms of its application at the keyboard; thus it could be used “in combination with any standard text on Harmony.”26 On the other hand, *Applied Harmony* (1930–31), which clearly competed with Goetschius’s harmony texts, was issued

---

24 See Benjamin Cutter, *Exercises in Harmony* [“Supplementary to the Treatise on Harmony by G. W. Chadwick”] (Boston: New England Conservatory of Music, 1899), and Cutter, *Harmonic Analysis* (Boston: Oliver Ditson, 1902); Donald N. Tweedy, *Manual of Harmonic Technic based on the Practice of J. S. Bach* (Boston: Oliver Ditson, 1928—a book dedicated to Goetschius); Howard A. Murphy, *Form in Music for the Listener* (Camden, NJ: Education Division, Radio Corporation of America, 1945), and Murphy and Edwin John Stringham, *Creative Harmony and Musicianship: An Introduction to the Structure of Music* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1951). Cutter studied composition with Goetschius in Stuttgart, around the late 1870s, and was teaching at the New England Conservatory while Goetschius was there. Tweedy (who, like Wedge, was born in 1890 in Danbury, Connecticut) studied with Goetschius at the IMA, perhaps in the mid 1910s. Murphy studied with Goetschius at the IMA, 1915–20. Another Goetschius student was the above-cited Daniel Gregory Mason, who studied with him around the mid to late 1890s. Mason did not author theory textbooks *per se*, but he is known for his appreciation books, e.g., *From Song to Symphony: A Manual of Music Appreciation* (Boston: Oliver Ditson, 1924).

25 A. Madeley Richardson was at the IMA from 1912 to ca. 1939, during which time he published five books, with four issued beforehand; only some of these were related to theory. See Richardson, *Choir Training based on Voice Production* (London: Vincent Music, 1899); *The Psalms, Their Structure and Musical Rendering* (London: Vincent Music, 1903); *Church Music* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1904); *Modern Organ Accompaniment* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1907); *The Choirtrainer’s Art* (New York: G. Schirmer, 1914); *Extempore Playing: Forty Lessons in the Art of Keyboard Composing* (New York: G. Schirmer, 1922); *Helps to Fugue Writing*, based on Bach’s *Das wohltemperirte klavier* (New York: H. W. Gray, 1930); *The Mediaeval Modes, Their Melody and Harmony for the Use of the Modern Composer* (New York: H. W. Gray, 1933); and *Fundamental Counterpoint* (Boston: American Book Co., 1936). Other IMA faculty members who authored theory books included Franklin W. Robinson (*Aural Harmony*, Part I [New York: G. Schirmer, 1918] and Part II [New York: G. Schirmer, 1923], and *A Practice Book in Harmony* [New York: Sprague-Coleman, 1938]), and piano faculty member Carl M. Roeder (*A Practical Keyboard Harmony* [New York: Schroeder and Gunther, 1939]).

26 George A. Wedge, *Keyboard Harmony: A Practical Application of Music Theory* (New York: G. Schirmer, 1924), v. Wedge also noted that the book could “be used for the study of Harmony by the pupil who does not care to write,” by which he presumably meant to write *exercises*, as the book was directed mainly toward *playing*. 

---
s several years after the older theorist retired.

As both teacher and author, Wedge’s fame grew. Already by the mid 1920s, articles in the IMA magazine *The Baton* were hailing him as an alumnus of distinction: “our most illustrious representative in the teaching field” (1925) and “the Institute’s most prominent graduate in the field of educational enterprise” (1930).²⁷ IMA founder Damrosch proclaimed that his “work at the Institute and [his] textbooks have given him a national reputation” (1924),²⁸ and later *The Macmillan Encyclopedia of Music and Musicians* would also assert that “[h]is theoretical books . . . are widely known” (1938).²⁹ Indeed, a 1932 advertisement by his publisher (reproduced in Figure 4) suggests that his was something of a “brand name” in the textbook market.³⁰ Although complete sales figures are unavailable, a sense of just how successful his books were is indicated

---


³⁰ From *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 18/3 (1932), 43.
If you do not know the
BOOKS ON MUSICAL THEORY
by
GEORGE A. WEDGE
you have missed
an outstanding series of
contributions to
American Music Education

Ear-Training and Sight-Singing...............Cloth, 2.50
Advanced Ear-Training and Sight-Singing....Cloth, 2.50
Rhythm in Music..................................Cloth, 1.50
Keyboard Harmony ................................Cloth, 2.50
Applied Harmony: Book I, Diatonic.........Cloth, 2.00
Applied Harmony: Book II, Chromatic.......Cloth, 2.00

These books have received the enthusiastic endorse-
ment of leading educators the country over, including:
Peter W. Dykema, George Matthews, James T.
Quarles, Melville Smith, and many others.

Among the institutions using books by George A. Wedge
are: Yale University School of Music; Institute of Musical
Arts, Cleveland; Western Reserve University; Teachers'
College of Columbia University; New York University
School of Music Education; State Teachers’ College, San
Jose, California; Normal School, Potsdam, New York;
University of Missouri; University of Wisconsin; Pasad-
ena Junior College; University of Texas; Institute of
Musical Art of the Juilliard School of Music; Secondary
Schools of Los Angeles; St. Lawrence College, Canton,
N. Y.; Coker College, Hartsville, S. C.

Send for free descriptive circular

G. SCHIRMER
INCORPORATED

3 East 43rd Street       New York, N. Y.
by a 1970 article, which states that his first book, *Ear-Training and Sight-Singing* (1921), had sold 160,685 copies.\(^{31}\) Another sense is provided by a 1939 survey of textbooks used in American harmony courses: Wedge’s *Applied Harmony* was the most popular, with roughly 23% of the reported usages; Goetschius’s book(s) ranked second, with roughly 15%.\(^{32}\) Although the serviceability of *Applied Harmony* inevitably waned over the years, it was still second in reported usages in a 1947 survey, falling just behind Walter Piston’s *Harmony* (1941), which became the dominant book for many years.\(^{33}\) And Wedge’s book still had currency in a 1964 survey, where it ranked eighth on a list of thirty-nine entries (placing it just under Allen Forte’s recently released textbook, and just above Roger Sessions’s).\(^{34}\)

For his many accomplishments, Wedge was awarded an honorary Doctor of Letters degree by Ursinus College (Collegeville, Pennsylvania) in 1941.\(^{35}\) On a personal level, he was

---


\(^{32}\) See Frank W. Hill, *Survey of Harmony Courses in American Colleges and Universities* (Cedar Falls: Iowa State Teachers College [now Univ. of Northern Iowa], [1939]). Hill notes that he sent questionnaires to 125 schools, and tabulated results “on a basis of the eighty-seven returns.” His ranked list gives only authors’ names followed by the number of usages (headed “frequency”). The usages add to 92, even though only 87 responses were received (of which “9% use[d] no text”), meaning that some schools used more than one book. Because only authors’ names are given, it is possible that the cited usages might include more than one book by that author (for example, in the case of Wedge, perhaps *Applied Harmony* and *Keyboard Harmony*; and in the case of Goetschius, perhaps *The Material Used in Musical Composition* and *The Theory and Practice of Tone-Relations*). All that can be said with certainty is that “Wedge” has a “frequency” of 21, and “Goetschius” of 14. Of the 26 authors on the list, a majority (16) had a frequency of just 1.

\(^{33}\) This survey was also done by Frank W. Hill (see n. 32). I could not find an existing copy of the complete survey, but excerpts are provided in Howard A. Murphy, *Teaching Musicianship: A Manual of Methods and Materials* (New York: Coleman-Ross, 1950), Appendix 3 (245–248). According to Murphy, there were seventy replies, and he lists only those books used in more than one college. Remember that the majority of books on the 1939 list (n. 32) were used in only one college; thus usage percentages, as entered into the main text with regard to the earlier survey, cannot be calculated here with the same specificity. All that can be said is that Walter Piston’s *Harmony* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1941) has a “frequency” of 19, and Wedge’s *Applied Harmony* (1930–31) has a “frequency” of 15. As the cited (but incomplete) usages add to 105, the percentages would be Piston, 18%; and Wedge, 14%.

\(^{34}\) For the survey, see George Thaddeus Jones, *Symbols Used in Music Analysis* (Washington, DC: Catholic Univ. of America, 1964), 11. The rankings are based on 228 replies from members of the National Association of Schools of Music. Wedge’s book had a tally of 11 under “number of schools” (Forte’s had 13, and Sessions’s had 10; Piston dominated with 91). As with the previously cited surveys (see nn. 32 and 33), some schools clearly used more than one book, for although 228 schools responded, the “number of schools” total is 393. The other books cited by author are: Allen Forte, *Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962); and Roger Sessions, *Harmonic Practice* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1951).

\(^{35}\) Wedge, it should be recalled, lacked an academic degree, as the IMA did not offer degrees when he was a stu-
also well liked by both faculty and students. His IMA colleague Murphy observed in 1925 that
“Wedge . . . enjoys an enormous popularity at our Institute and . . . holds an enviable place in
the esteem and affection of all those who have had the privilege of coming in contact with
him.”36 His summer home on the coast of Maine, in North Brooklin, was a popular destination
for visitors from the school.37 And long before his official appointment as director and dean of

36 The Baton, “Reflections of Yesterday,” 19. Murphy also noted that Wedge “no doubt [has] a regular matinee
idol’s life as a dashing young bachelor in a school replete with beautiful girls,” a comment to which Wedge was
reported to have “chuckled knowingly” (ibid.). Indeed, in the early 1920s, when The Baton was more of a student-
oriented and sometimes informal magazine, there were several references to him as “Gorgeous Wedge” (a play on
his first name; see, e.g., Frank Barber, “To Gorgeous Wedge,” 1/3 [1922], 11; the character named “Gorgeous
Wedge” in a report on “The 1922 Show Presented by Students of the Institute of Musical Art,” 1/6 [1922], 4;
[Anon.], “Illiterature,” 3/1 [1923], 9; [Dorothy Crowthers?], “Sharps—Flats—and Naturals,” 1/6 [1922], 10; and
Crowthers, “Where Dreams Come True,” 2/8 [1923], 3). The following notice is also revealing: “Will the feminine
portion of the student body please take notice? Mr. Wedge has granted an interview which confirms the conjectures
of the observant. He admits, first, that he never appears twice in one week in the same suit before the same class;
secondly, that he believes in the psychology of color and its emotional cause and effect,—not color applied to tone,
but color in reference to neckties; thirdly, he solemnly assured the enraptured interviewer that he wears a cle

37 In The Baton 5/1 (Oct. 1925), 10, there is a cartoon illustrating how “[t]he popular Mr. Wedge found himself
host for a long line of house guests” at his Maine home. Other IMA faculty also had summer homes in Maine,
including “[Fran]k Damrosch at Seal Harbor, [and] Gaston and Edouard Dethier at East Blue Hill” (The Baton,
“Improvisations on Institute Themes,” vol. 9/1 [Nov. 1929]: 14).
the IMA, Juilliard president John Erskine recalled how “Damrosch had [already] employed [Wedge] as a sort of dean . . . , and he had proved himself resourceful.”38 He was, as noted in The Baton in 1932, “a man of constant and varied activity.”39

*The Wedge–Schenker Connection.*

Turning now to Wedge’s interest in Schenker’s ideas, the earliest published reference seems to be in a March 1932 issue of a short-lived New York magazine called *Arts Weekly.*40 Music critic Irving Kolodin contributed an article on Schenker’s idea of the *Urlinie,* for which he interviewed Schenker’s student Hans Weisse. The latter had been in the US just six months, teaching at the David Mannes Music School (now Mannes College and part of The New School).

In the article, Kolodin noted that he had first learned of the *Urlinie* from Wedge, whom he called “a pioneer” in Schenker’s work in the US. Kolodin, then twenty-four years old, had studied at the IMA in 1927–31, and during the last year of that time (1930–31) had also taught “theory and related subjects” there.41 Thus, he would have had prolonged contact with Wedge, during which time he could have learned something of Schenker from him.

An earlier (unpublished) reference can be found in Schenker’s diary. On 8 October 1925, he recorded the receipt of a letter from Weisse, in which the latter passed on some information that had come to him: “an American named Wedge is lecturing on the *Urlinie* at the Damrosch

---

41 These dates, and the quoted description of his teaching duties, come from his entry in *The International Cyclopedia of Music and Musicians,* 11th ed. (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1985), 1177–1178. Kolodin was a contributor to this edition, and thus I take its description of his years at the IMA—which differs slightly from that found elsewhere—to be more accurate.
Conservatory [i.e., the IMA].” This had been brought to Weisse’s attention through a letter from Gerald F. Warburg, a New York musician who had studied with Weisse in Vienna, and who had attended the IMA before that. This 1925 notice helps explain a passing reference to New York made by Schenker on 1 June 1927, in a letter to his student Felix-Eberhard von Cube. Schenker noted that his ideas continued “to be felt more widely,” and as proof he cited several cities in which they were circulating: Duisburg (where von Cube was), Leipzig (where Reinhard Oppel was), Munich (where Otto Vrieslander was), Stuttgart (where Herman Roth was), and of course Vienna (where Weisse and Schenker himself were). Outside of Austria and Germany, he cited Edinburgh, in reference to John Petrie Dunn, who had translated part of Schenker’s Kontrapunkt for his students at Edinburgh University. Then he added, parenthetically, “also New York.” The latter reference was likely to Wedge, and the parentheses enclosing New York (despite it being a city of greater world significance than Edinburgh) may have been because Schenker had had no direct contact with Wedge, whereas he and Dunn had personally corresponded.

42 “[F]ührt eine Stelle aus einem Brief von Warburg an, womann im Damrosch-Konservatorium ein Amerikaner, Wedge, die Urlinie vorträgt” (Schenker, diary entry of 8 October 1925, Schenker Documents Online, transcribed Marko Deisinger, translated William Drabkin, with a minor modification by the present author). Schenker was evidently pleased to learn of this, as two days later he mentioned Wedge in a letter to Wilhelm Altmann, director of the music division at Berlin’s Preussische Staatsbibliothek. (The letter to Altmann is noted in Schenker’s diary entry of 10 October 1925; regarding Wedge, it is only stated that he was “mention[ed]” [“erwähn[t]”] in the letter. See the cited diary entry in Schenker Documents Online, <http://www.schenkerdocumentsonline.org>, will be abbreviated SDO.

43 The relevant portion of the letter reads: “Die Wirkung breitet sich mehr u. mehr aus: Edinburgh, (auch New-York), Leipzig, Stuttgart, Wien (ich und Weisse), Vrieslander in München (er schreibt eine große Monographie über mich), Sie in Duisburg, u. Halm usw usw.” [“The effect continues to broaden: Edinburgh (also New York), Leipzig, Stuttgart, Vienna (myself and Weisse), Vrieslander in Munich (he is writing a long monograph about me), yourself in Duisburg, and Halm, etc., etc.”] (Handwritten letter from Schenker to Cube, dated 1 June 1927, SDO, transcribed and translated William Drabkin.) Note that although Schenker refers to August Halm, he does not cite a city; this was probably because Halm was in Wickersdorf, Thuringia, a city of less significance than the ones named.

44 There survive eight letters from Dunn to Schenker (dated 1926–30; see the Oswald Jonas Memorial Collection [Univ. of California, Riverside], box 10) but only one copy of a letter from Schenker to Dunn, in Schenker’s wife’s hand (dated 1928; see the Ernst Oster Collection [New York Public Library], file 30). In subsequent references, the Jonas and Oster Collections will be abbreviated JC and OC (respectively).
Learning that Wedge was communicating something of Schenker’s concepts in New York classrooms as early as 1925, we naturally wonder how he came to encounter these ideas. One possibility is that he was among a few American musicians who had learned of Schenker largely on their own, through reading his works (rare though they were in the US, at the time). This group included Arthur Waldeck, who began corresponding with Schenker in 1929, proposed translating the latter’s *Harmonielehre* in 1932, and (with Nathan Broder) published an article on his theories in 1935;\(^{45}\) Israel Citkowitz, who authored a 1933 report on Schenker’s ideas;\(^ {46}\) and Roger Sessions, who wrote about Schenker in the periodical *Modern Music* in 1935 and ’38, and who employed Schenker’s analyses in his composition lessons (as he did in 1935, in his first lesson with then-student Milton Babbitt).\(^ {47}\)

Another possibility is that Wedge was introduced to Schenker’s work by someone with a direct connection to Schenker or one of his students. There are two likely suspects:


\(^{46}\) Israel Citkowitz, “The Role of Heinrich Schenker,” *Modern Music* 11/1 (1933): 18–23; reprinted in *Theory and Practice* 10/1–2 (1985): 15–22. Citkowitz had studied with Roger Sessions on occasions in 1927–31, and thus it is possible that Sessions could have communicated something of Schenker’s ideas to him (see subsequent comments in the main text and in n. 47). Also, Citkowitz apparently engaged in some degree of study with Weisse, but it seems to have *followed* publication of his article; see comments in a letter from Weisse to Schenker, dated 15 March 1934 (JC, box 15, folder 16).

\(^{47}\) See three articles by Sessions: “Heinrich Schenker’s Contribution,” *Modern Music* 12/4 (1935): 170–178; a review of Schenker’s *Der freie Satz*, *Modern Music* 15/3 (1938): 192–197; and “The Function of Theory,” *Modern Music* 15/4 (1938): 257–262. Sessions claimed to have first encountered Schenker’s work around 1926—earlier than the citations I have given for Waldeck and Citkowitz—but this was while Sessions was living not in the US but in Florence, Italy, where his friend and neighbor was the artist Victor Hammer, an associate and advocate of Schenker. Sessions has stated that it was Hammer who first told him about Schenker— “with tremendous enthusiasm”—and that he then “began reading [Schenker’s] books” (Edward T. Cone, “Conversation with Roger Sessions,” *Perspectives of New Music* 4/2 [1966], 33–34). The 1926 date is based on a letter to Arnold Schoenberg, dated 14 December 1949, in which Sessions states that “I have since 23 years been acquainted with the work of Heinrich Schenker and I have read all of his books” (Sessions, *The Correspondence of Roger Sessions*, ed. Andrea Olmstead [Boston: Northeastern Univ. Press, 1992], 370–371).
The first is the previously cited Gerald Warburg—the person who had informed Weisse that Wedge was teaching about the *Urlinie*. Warburg (1901–71) was the son of Felix Warburg, a noted German-American banker and philanthropist. Gerald had attended Harvard for a year before turning to musical studies at the IMA (1920–21 or '22);\(^{48}\) his uncle, Paul Warburg, had been a member of the school’s board during its initial decade. Beginning in August 1922, Gerald intermittently studied music for a few years in Austria. An aspiring cellist, he studied in Vienna with Friedrich Buxbaum, who had just founded the Wiener Streichquartett in 1921, having been a member of the Rosé Quartet beforehand; he was also a cellist with the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra. Warburg was additionally interested in composition, and thus he came to study with Weisse. According to Schenker’s diary entry of 24 August 1922, Weisse mentioned Warburg to him, and noted the income he was to receive for the lessons. Schenker and Warburg perhaps met personally in early 1923, when Schenker agreed to “receive” [*empfangen*] him upon Weisse’s request;\(^{49}\) and the two definitely had contact in September 1924, when their American and German viewpoints collided in a heated argument.\(^{50}\) Nonetheless, Warburg remained interested in Schenker’s ideas: in January 1925, he told Schenker that he sent “copies of *Tonwille* to America whenever he [found] the opportunity,”\(^{51}\) and in May 1925 he asked Schenker, “What should I do

---

48 A biographical sketch of Warburg states that he attended the IMA in 1920–21 (*Who Was Who in America, with World Notables, Vol. 5, 1969–1973* [Chicago: Marquis Who’s Who, 1973], 755). However, the IMA periodical *The Baton* has two references to him from the first half of 1922. The first and more substantive one refers to his contributions to the annual student revue of that year; see several pages in *The Baton* 1/6 (June 1922): 1 (where he is included in a photo of the show’s members), 3 (which quotes reviews from the *New York Times*, *New York Evening Globe*, and *Musical Courier*), 4 (which provides the show’s program), and 5–7 (where *The Baton*’s own review appears). The second and more trivial reference is a “student-happenings” kind of report, about how Warburg was found searching “every corner and underneath every chair” at the IMA for a misplaced key (Hamilton, “Accidents,” 12). It is of course possible that Warburg was no longer studying at the IMA in the 1921–22 year, but simply returned to contribute to the show.


50 See Schenker, diary entries of 12 September and 26 October 1924, *SDO*, transcribed Marko Deisinger, translated Scott Witmer.

51 “Der junge Warburg erzählt mir, daß er bei jeder Gelegenheit *Tonwille*-Hefte nach Amerika schicke.” [“The
for you in America?"\textsuperscript{52} Given that Warburg was intermittently back in the US between 1922 and ’25, he might have had contact with his former theory teacher, Wedge, during this time; and it is also possible that Wedge was a person to whom Warburg sent copies of Tonwill.

A second potential conduit between Schenker’s ideas and Wedge is Henriette Michelson, who taught piano at the IMA.\textsuperscript{53} Michelson (1883–1958) was born in Warsaw when it was part of the Russian Empire, and came to the US in 1892, around the age of nine. Four years later, when she was thirteen, she was “led . . . to adopt a musical career” by Betty Loeb.\textsuperscript{54} Loeb, a pianist herself, was the mother of James Loeb, a New York banker and arts patron who helped endow the IMA in Betty’s memory.\textsuperscript{55} Michelson studied in various cities: in New York with (Leopold?) Winkler and Ferdinand von Inten (the latter of whom had also taught IMA founder Damrosch); in Vienna with Emil Sauer, at the Conservatory’s Meisterschule für Klavierspiel; in Paris for a year with Harold Bauer; and in London for a year with Tobias Matthay. In April 1923, with Weisse as intermediary, she arranged to study with Schenker. The studies were brief, confined to

\footnotesize{young Warburg tells me that he sends copies of Tonwill to America whenever he finds the opportunity.”\textsuperscript{[Schenker, diary entry of 19 January 1925, SDO, transcribed Marko Deisinger, translated Scott Witmer.]}\textsuperscript{52} “[Warburg:] ‘Was soll ich für Sie tun in Amerika?’ Ich: ‘Gar nichts; ich sehe keine Möglichkeit.’” \textsuperscript{[‘[Warburg:] ‘What should I do for you in America?’ I: ‘Not a thing; I do not see any possibility.’’’] (Schenker, diary entry of 29 May 1925, SDO, transcribed Marko Deisinger, translated Scott Witmer.)}

She perhaps also went by “Henrietta”: she was identified in this manner in the byline of an article she wrote for The Baton 6/8 (June 1927), 11, and in a notice in The Baton 8/3 (Jan. 1929), 18. This naming may or may not have been a mistake; whatever the case, Henriette is the name that appears on legal documents. Despite Michelson’s other accomplishments, she seems to be mentioned most often today for having been the teacher of film-music composer Elmer Bernstein, who began studying piano with her around the age of twelve (ca. 1934).

\footnotesize{[Molly Pearson?], “Around a Tea Table,” The Baton 4/5 (Feb. 1925), 13. Michelson repeated her indebtedness to Loeb in Margaret Kopekin and Frank Cirillo, “What Do You Speak: The Institute’s Tower of Babel,” The Baton 10/6 (1931), 15.}

\footnotesize{The Loeb family were a part of the Warburgs by business and marriage. Solomon Loeb (Betty’s husband) was a founder of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., an investment bank. Felix Warburg (Gerald’s father) later became a leader of the firm. Nina Loeb, a daughter of Solomon and Betty Loeb, married Paul Warburg (Felix’s brother and Gerald’s uncle). Morris Loeb, a son of Solomon and Betty, married Eda Kuhn; when she died, she left part of her estate to Gerald Warburg (her great-nephew), who donated it for the Harvard Music Library, which was named in her honor (The Eda Kuhn Loeb Music Library).}
April and May (the number of lessons is not clear);\textsuperscript{56} they focused on Beethoven’s Sonatas in D Minor, op. 31/2, and F Minor, op. 57 (the “Appassionata”).\textsuperscript{57} Michelson apparently studied with Weisse around this time, too.\textsuperscript{58} She tried to arrange further lessons with Schenker in 1924 and ’25, but due in part to scheduling conflicts (arising from the fact that he did not teach in the summers) these seem not to have taken place.\textsuperscript{59} Michelson was a member of the IMA faculty even longer than Wedge, serving from 1906 to 1948; and after her lessons with Schenker, she seemed interested in sharing his ideas at the school. For a 1927 issue of \textit{The Baton}, she contributed a brief essay (ca. 550 words) on Schenker’s work toward “the discovery and formulation of the laws [that] underlie [the] elemental forces” of music—an essay that is, to my knowledge, the earliest in English to address this topic.\textsuperscript{60} Given that her studies with Schenker preceded the 1925 announcement of Wedge’s teaching about the \textit{Urlinie}, and that even four years after her lessons she wrote favorably of Schenker’s ideas, it seems reasonable to suspect that she might have communicated something about these ideas to her IMA colleague, Wedge.

Whether Wedge came upon Schenker’s work on his own, or through Warburg or Michelson, he clearly remained interested for many years. In October 1931, less than a month after

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{56} See Schenker’s 1923 diary entries of 13 April, 18 April, 25 April, 5 May, 30 May, and 2 June (all available at \textit{SDO}).
  \item \textsuperscript{57} This according to Schenker’s lesson book containing notes from 1914–1928 (OC, file 3). Michelson’s entry appears at the end of the notes for the 1922–23 “Saison” (i.e., season, in the sense of a teaching year). It records that she studied “Beethoven: Sonata in D Minor, [Ur]Linie and performance. Appassionata: [Ur]Linie of the complete first movement” (“Beethoven: Sonate Dmoll, Linie u. Vortrag. Appassionata: Linie vom 1. Satz ganz”).
  \item \textsuperscript{58} “Michelson sagt für Juni ab, da sie nach Gastein muß; Weisse gibt ihr bis dahin so viele Stunden als sie wünscht!” [“Michelson cancels for June, since she has to go to Gastein [a spa town about 250 miles from Vienna]; Weisse is giving her as many lessons as she wishes until then!”] (Schenker, diary entry of 30 May 1923, \textit{SDO}, transcribed Marko Deisinger, translated Scott Witmer [bracketed portion mine,].) As it was through Weisse that Michelson contacted Schenker—and given also the number of American pupils Weisse had in the 1920s—it is possible that Michelson had studied \textit{initially} with Weisse, as well.
  \item \textsuperscript{59} See Schenker’s 1925 diary entries of 2 March, 12 March, 30 June, and 4 July (all available at \textit{SDO}). There are no entries for Michelson in the lesson books after 1923.
  \item \textsuperscript{60} Henrietta \textit{sic?} Michelson, “Special Characteristics of Works of Art,” \textit{The Baton} 6/8 (June 1927), 11. In contrast, the earliest such entry in David Carson Berry, \textit{A Topical Guide to Schenkerian Literature: An Annotated Bibliography with Indices} (Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2004), is from 1931; see subsection XIV.c.ii., “Reception through English-Language Writings, Prior to 1954” (437–443).
\end{itemize}
Weisse first arrived in New York, Wedge asked to meet with him. Weisse told of the impending meeting, scheduled for the 16th, in a letter he wrote to Schenker, in which he characterized Wedge as a person who had been teaching for some time according to Schenker’s books, and who was eager to learn more. Shortly thereafter, Schenker himself mentioned Wedge: first to Emil Hertzka (managing director of the publishing firm Universal Edition), to illustrate how his ideas were spreading even in the US; and then again to conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler, in proclaiming how his “cause” was being advanced.

II.

Whatever Wedge may have communicated in the classroom about the *Urlinie* (or Schenker’s other ideas), his subsequent *writings* also bear traces of Schenker’s influence. Thus,

---

61 “Morgen treffe ich Mr. Wedge, den obersten Leiter des Institute of Musical Art, der schon längere Zeit nach Ihren Bücher unterrichtet und schon darauf brennt mich kennen zu lernen um mehr zu erfahren.” (“Tomorrow I meet Mr. Wedge, the chief director of the Institute of Musical Art, who for quite some time has taught according to your books and is eager [lit: burning] to get to know me so he can learn more.”) (Letter from Weisse to Schenker, dated 15 October 1931, in JC, box 15, folder 16; the word “brennt” was added above the principal text line). I am indebted to Hedi Siegel for providing me with a copy of this letter.

62 “[D]er ‘Mannes-Konservat’ in New-York lernt—dorthin ist unser Dr Weisse berufen worden—auf meine Theorie um (in allen Disziplinen), desgleichen das ‘Institut of musical art’ unter Mr Wedge . . . .” “[T]he ‘Mannes Conservatory’ in New York— to which Dr. Weisse has been invited—is getting to know my theory for the first time (in all disciplines), likewise for the ‘Institute of Musical Art’ under Mr. Wedge . . . .” (Letter from Schenker to Hertzka, dated 1 November 1931; archived in the Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek [now Wienbibliothek im Rathaus].) I am indebted to Ian Bent for providing me with a transcription of this letter.

63 “In New-York gelang es ihm [Weisse] binnen Stunden die gesamte Lehrerschaft des Mannes-Konservatoriums für sich u. meine Sache zu gewinnen. […] Auch Mr Wedge, der Leiter des ‘inst. for musical art,’ der schon früher nach meinen Büchern lehrte, näherte sich ihm.” (“In New York, he [Weisse] managed in no time at all to win over the entire teaching faculty of the Mannes Conservatory to his way of thinking and to my cause. […] Even Mr. Wedge, the Director for Musical Art, who was teaching according to my books at an even earlier stage, has approached him.”) (Letter from Schenker to Furtwängler [second draft in Schenker’s wife’s hand], dated 13 November 1931; in SDO, older site, <http://mt.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/schenker/>, transcribed Christoph Hust, translated Ian Bent, with a minor modification by the present author.)

64 Although the extent of Wedge’s classroom teaching is not known, Warburg’s notice that Wedge was “lecturing on the *Urlinie*” could be interpreted as metonymic for Schenker’s theories in general. Milton Babbitt observed in 1952 that, “[f]or many, there is associated with Schenker’s name the concept of the *Urlinie*, and often nothing more” (Babbitt, “Felix Salzer. Structural Hearing [review],” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 5/3 [1952], 260). But even those familiar with Schenker’s work often used the term as a shorthand for his broader theories and analytical approach. For example, in a 1949 letter, Arnold Schoenberg referred to Schenker as one “who has pub-
even though they do not cite Schenker by name, they helped to circulate certain approaches to music that were not common at the time, but that would later become widespread. In this section, we will consider three such writings: Wedge’s final two books, and an article issued in between.


Like Wedge’s earlier books, *Applied Harmony* was developed in classes at the IMA.\(^6\) However, in this case the development followed two signal events: first, he had become head of the theory program that Goetschius had led previously; and second, he had begun teaching something about Schenker. Indeed, these two events followed in close succession: Goetschius retired in spring 1925, and Warburg reported that Wedge was “lecturing on the *Urlinie*” the following fall. Even if Wedge had known something of Schenker before 1925, this sequence was probably inevitable. While Goetschius was in charge, Wedge might not have had the freedom to teach classes in a manner that deviated from the former’s prescribed methods. But once Wedge controlled the program, he could reconsider the approaches taken, and incorporate new influences (including Schenker’s). Of course, one should not infer that *Applied Harmony* is fully consistent with Schenker’s views; in fact, it is at odds with them in some obvious ways. For example, seventh and ninth chords are presented as stacked thirds, without mention of their origination in voice leading. And illustrated among the seventh chords “in common use” are such

\(^6\) The acknowledgments of four of his first five books indicate that they were developed in IMA classes. The only exception is *Rhythm in Music: A Text-Book* (New York: G. Schirmer, 1927), which lacks acknowledgments of any kind.

---

*Berry: Schenker’s First “Americanization”*
entities as the augmented triad with major seventh, and the minor triad with major seventh, which never would have been treated as autonomous units by Schenker. Nonetheless, some of the core ideas presented in *Applied Harmony* resonate with Schenkerian conceptions of musical structure. I will focus on two of these below.

**Concept #1:** Wedge takes a broader, monotonal view of local key areas; and relatedly, he conceives of chromatic chords (including what we would call secondary or applied dominants) as embellishments of a diatonic underpinning.

In discussing diatonic modulation in Book I, Wedge notes that one may “expand any chord in the key by temporarily treating [it] as a key-center and resolving chords into it. This is known as modulation. This establishing of a new center does not upset the feeling of the original tonality” (I: 153). If one were to omit the sentence labeling the process as “modulation,” the view would be akin to Schenker’s—especially the idea of “expand[ing]” a chord, which suggests its composing-out (*Auskomponierung*) or prolongation. In the preface to Book II, the sense of “modulation” is explicitly countered as Wedge further advances a monotonal viewpoint. There he asserts that “[t]he ear . . . does not agree with the theorist who registers four modulations in the introduction to Beethoven’s First Symphony.” Instead, if “[a]n entire section of a composition” is in “a contrasting tonality, i.e., the dominant, subdominant, relative major or minor, etc.[, . . . t]he ear comprehends this temporary tonality as an expanded harmony of the original theme. In this way the amount of harmonic detail it must grasp is reduced, and harmonic unity and balance is brought to the entire composition” (II: iv).66

---

66 It must be recalled that such a monotonal view was not characteristic of the times. Adele T. Katz summarizes the prevailing counterview in *Challenge to Musical Tradition: A New Concept of Tonality* (New York: Knopf, 1945), at the beginning of chapter I. It should also be noted that Wedge is not as concerned with this perspective in the chapter on *chromatic* modulation (later in Book II). There, secondary V and vii° chords, and chord pivots, are
The notion of “expanding harmonies” persists throughout Book II, which is principally devoted to the explanation of chromatic chords as embellishments of diatonic chords. Many of these chords could be described as conventional secondary or applied dominants: Wedge addresses “dominant embellishments” and “diminished-seventh embellishments” that function as secondary \( V^7 \)s and \( vii^7 \)s; and he pays special attention to neighboring motions in the bass between these chords and their resolutions (in various inversions). Similarly functioning forms of the preceding chords are also addressed: half-diminished sevenths, and dominant-sevenths with raised fifths. Augmented-sixth chords are likewise used to “embellish” various chords—not just dominants, but local tonics as well; and not just by conventional semitone expansion to an octave, but with plagal-sounding resolutions in which the bass falls a fourth. Still other chromatic embellishing chords—although of standard sonority types—might be better categorized as voice-leading chords that resolve parsimoniously to their diatonic linchpins (i.e., through a combination of semitone motion and the retention of common tones). Thus, there are common-tone diminished-seventh chords, dominant-seventh sonorities that do not resolve like \( V^7 – I \), and various enharmonic forms of dominant-seventh (and sometimes minor-seventh) sonorities.\(^{67}\)

Wedge introduced as a way of gaining entry into any other key, without reference to large-scale organizational principles. Finally, regarding Beethoven’s First Symphony, Wedge asks students to analyze this opening a few pages later (Applied Harmony, II: 5–6), and he provides a brief analysis of his own in The Gist of Music: A Ready Key to Musical Understanding and Enjoyment (New York: G. Schirmer, 1936), 63–64.

\(^{67}\) Some of Wedge’s embellishing chords are introduced in brief voice-leading schematics that make a broader tonal context difficult to grasp (although subsequent exercises may help to suggest appropriate contexts). After discussing a chord type and its immediate uses and resolutions, Wedge provides a series of exercises that generally proceeds as follows: (1) outer voices are given with at least some figured-bass and chord-quality symbols, and two middle voices are to be added; (2) a figured bass is given, and three upper parts are to be added; (3) a melody is given (without chord symbols) and it is to be harmonized in four parts; (4) an excerpt is given—or perhaps a piece is cited by name, without excerpt—and it is to be analyzed, usually in terms of chords (embellishing and otherwise) and perhaps also with regard to form (for longer excerpts); (5) a melody is to be harmonized and arranged in the style of a given accompaniment (usually for piano alone, or perhaps for violin and piano); and (6) various composition projects are described, including those in which a given measure (with a specific motive and accompaniment) is to be continued into a longer piece, and in which one creates original motives and composes a short piece using the materials learned previously. Additionally, some arrangement projects are given (for piano, pipe organ, solo or mixed chorus with piano accompaniment, etc.); and there is a degree of ear-training when the student is asked to look at the figured basses and sing the indicated chords “in arpeggio-form.”
considers all of these to be “embellishments” of (and thus subordinate to) the following chord. They are distinguished analytically by symbols used to indicate chord qualities. For example, “$X_7$” and “$†X_7$” represent dominant-seventh and “augmented dominant seventh” embellishments; “$ɔ7$” and “$ө7$” represent diminished-seventh and half-diminished seventh embellishments; and the standard augmented-sixth chords are represented by “$†6$” (Italian), “$†⁷5$” (German), and “$†⁶₃$” (French).\(^{68}\)

To some today, it may seem indubitable that Schenker inspired Wedge’s presentation of monotonality and chordal subordinance, given the similarity of their core ideas. But Wedge’s approach also has precedents in American textbooks; and as the issue of influence is significant, we will need to address both possibilities, in turn.

First let us consider precedents in the work of American pedagogues. Similar to Wedge’s notion of embellishing chords is the idea of “Attendant chords” developed by Frank H. Shepard and George Coleman Gow. Shepard (1863–1913) introduced the concept in an 1889 book on modulation, and recapitulated it in textbooks of 1896 and 1914.\(^{69}\) Initially, in referring to the $V_I$ relation within a key, Shepard calls $V_7$ “the Attendant or Associate chord of” the tonic, and the latter the “Primary chord.” The $vii^{⁰⁷}$ chord is also accepted as a dominant-functioning Attendant chord. He then extends the Attendant–Primary relation to diatonic triads other than the tonic, and points out that the resulting chromatic chords can exist without indicating modulation, as long as the erstwhile new key is not reinforced and continued. At this point, Shepard’s notion may be

\(^{68}\) Additionally, figured bass is used in conjunction with the various symbols to indicate inversions, and “en” is placed under a symbol to indicate an enharmonic spelling.

\(^{69}\) See Frank H. Shepard, How to Modulate (New York: G. Schirmer, 1889); Harmony Simplified (New York: G. Schirmer, 1896); and Graded Lessons in Harmony (New York: G. Schirmer, 1914). Most of the following comments are based on two passages in How to Modulate: from the “Preface” through p. 7; and pp. 24–31. As a whole, Harmony Simplified is much lengthier than How to Modulate (vii, 242 pp. versus only vi, 66 pp.); however, the coverage of attendant chords is not enlarged (see chs. 12–13, pp. 163–184).
thought of as the secondary-dominant idea in different wording. Still, this wording is evocative: “attendant” suggests that the designated chord is subordinate to, dependent upon, or in service of the adjacent superordinate chord. Accordingly, a sense of both embellishment and hierarchy is suggested. Moreover, as “attendant chord” is a more inclusive term than a secondary (or applied) dominant, Shepard is able to include +6 (augmented-sixth) chords in the category. The common dominant-resolving +6 chords are taken to be altered forms of V’s Attendant chord (i.e., altered forms of $V^7/V$ or $vii^9/V$); and like all Attendant chords, +6 chords may be applied to any chord. In sum, for Shepard, all of the common chords with (secondary) leading tones—those functioning as $vii^{7(7)}$, $V^{(9)}$, and +6—are Attendant chords, and all are labeled with an “[A]” underneath the staff (placed alongside any Roman numerals).

Soon after Shepard introduced the concept, Gow (1860–1938) adopted and significantly extended it in a book of 1892 (including it also in books of 1895 and 1910). Gow accepted as Attendant chords a wide array of what he called “chromatic tendency-chords,” including all of

---

70 The specific term “secondary dominant” was not in use at the time, but various synonyms existed over the decades before it became standardized. For a brief summary, see David Carson Berry, “Theory,” §4.ii, in The New Grove Dictionary of American Music, 2nd ed. (forthcoming). An early appearance of the term, consistent with its current usage, is in John Mokrejs, Lessons in Harmony (New York: Odowan Publishing, 1913), 79–84. The term did not begin to gain widespread currency until after its use in Piston’s Harmony (1941).

71 The later term, “secondary dominant,” does not convey a sense of embellishment as much. But neither does it convey the same degree of hierarchy. Recall that “secondary” refers to the dominant itself—that is, it is not the dominant (of I) but the dominant of another triad. In this context, “secondary” does not explicitly refer to the subordinate status of any dominant relative to its tonic. However, the term “Attendant chord” does.


73 George Coleman Gow, A Text-Book on Harmony (Northampton, MA: Press of Gazette Printing Co., 1892); and The Structure of Music (New York: G. Schirmer, 1895). For Attendant Chords, see the former, Ch. 5, 52–66; and the latter, 128–139. Gow also contributed theory units to The American History and Encyclopedia of Music, Volume 2: “The Essentials of Music,” ed. Emil Liebling (New York: Irving Squire, 1910); see “Elementary Theory and Notation: Twelve Lessons” (107–192), “Elementary Harmony in Twelve Lessons” (193–291), and “Advanced Harmony in Twelve Lessons” (293–396). Attendant chords are addressed primarily in the “Elementary Harmony” unit, “Lesson X: The Chromatic Tendency-Chords” (265–273); but scattered references also appear in other lessons, and in the following unit on “Advanced Harmony.” It is interesting to note that Gow did not acknowledge Shepard’s influence in any of these books. However, Gow later noted that the term Attendant chord was “made use of by the late F. H. Shepherd [sic], and afterwards by me with an extension of its meaning” (Gow, “Facing to the Front in
Shepard’s, plus alterations such as $V_{75}$, common-tone diminished sevenths, and many other constructs that defy conventional labels but resolve by semitones and common tones.\footnote{For example, there is a major triad with lowered fifth, also describable as a diminished triad with raised third; the same chord with minor-seventh added; the same chord with diminished-seventh added; an enharmonic form of the German-sixth, which apparently functions more like a common-tone diminished seventh with altered note; and so forth.} Like Shepard, Gow indicated such chords with an “(A)”—albeit with round instead of square brackets.\footnote{This is the system Gow used in The Structure of Music. In the earlier Text-Book on Harmony, no symbols were used, as there were no examples in musical notation. His later entry in The American History and Encyclopedia of Music places the abbreviation “Att.” under the staff.} Gow’s Attendant chords, then, are essentially identical to Wedge’s embellishing chords; the latter differ only in the assortment of symbols Wedge devised to indicate chord qualities, not in the basic concept.

Let us now consider arguments supporting Schenker’s influence. First, circumstances suggest that Wedge turned to these ideas only after he knew of Schenker’s writings (i.e., after 1925). His prior treatment of the topics was decidedly different. In portions of Advanced Ear-Training and Sight-Singing (1922) and Keyboard Harmony (1924), he had labeled local modulations by indicating old and new key areas in immediate sequence (e.g., C:I–V–I G:V\(^7\)–I); and chromatic chords had been labeled in a similarly literal and autonomous manner, as altered entities (e.g., what we might call V\(^7\)/V was simply I\(_3\)\(^7\)).\footnote{These are the only prior books in which the subjects are broached. Advanced Ear-Training and Sight-Singing as Applied to the Study of Harmony (New York: G. Schirmer, 1922) initially deals with diatonic materials; it turns to chromaticism in its second half, but there is very little “theoretical” discussion of the materials. Its final chapter is titled “Modulation and Embellishment,” but the latter term does not mean what it does in Applied Harmony; instead, “embellishment” simply refers to the use of melodies with chordal skips, suspensions, anticipations, and neighboring tones. Keyboard Harmony turns to chromaticism only in its last chapter (roughly 90% through), which is on modulation. Incidentally, David M. Thompson also noted a change between Wedge’s writings of the 1920s, which he characterized as being highly indebted to the work of Goetschius, and Applied Harmony, for which Wedge “developed . . . more independent views on harmonic theory,” especially with regard to his treatment of chromaticism (Thompson, A History of Harmonic Theory, 108 and 112). Of course, Thompson was unaware of Schenker’s influence; but he also seems to have been unaware of similarities between Wedge’s approach and those of Shepard (whose work he does address) and especially Gow (whose work he does not).} Second, Schenker’s and Wedge’s
approaches would later be described as “related” by one of Wedge’s former colleagues: Howard Murphy, who taught alongside Wedge at the IMA and used his materials at Teachers College, and who eventually became something of an advocate of Schenker’s work.\(^\text{77}\) In his 1950 book on *Teaching Musicianship*, Murphy considered different types of analysis,\(^\text{78}\) and drew special attention to Wedge’s idea that “the essential function” of harmonic (as well as melodic) chromaticism is “decoration or embellishment.”\(^\text{79}\) If chromatic chords are “purely decorative” then they are “non-essential in function,” and so Murphy asserted that Wedge’s idea was “definitely related to . . . Schenker[’s] conception of essential and non-essential chords” and to his “system of analysis.” Of course, this does not necessarily mean that Wedge discussed his influences with Murphy, and that Murphy’s assessment was in line with Wedge’s own. But it is telling that a contemporary theory pedagogue, who was both an associate of Wedge and knowledgeable of Schenker’s work, would yoke the two approaches. It suggests that what Wedge did in *Applied Harmony* would have been received in its time as “Schenker-influenced.” Finally, as a complement to the prior observation, it should be noted that the type of analysis demonstrated by Wedge in his *earlier* books—i.e., one more “vertical” in orientation and less attentive to the larger frame of musical action—was precisely the kind about which Schenkerian authors complained in English-language writings of the 1930s and ’40s. Conversely, the new approach demonstrated in *Applied Harmony* hewed more closely to the kind advocated by contemporary Schenkerians.\(^\text{80}\)

\(^\text{77}\) Regarding this last point, about advocacy, see section V of the present essay.

\(^\text{78}\) See Murphy, *Teaching Musicianship*, 98–107.

\(^\text{79}\) This and subsequent quotations come from Murphy, *Teaching Musicianship*, 100–102. Incidentally, despite the asserted relation to Schenker’s ideas, Murphy opines that the idea of chromaticism as embellishment, in “its application to music of the Classic and Romantic periods,” was “developed . . . most consistently” by Wedge (107).

\(^\text{80}\) Consider, e.g., the writings of Hans Weisse and Adele T. Katz. Weisse (“The Music Teacher’s Dilemma,” *Volume of Proceedings of the Music Teachers National Association* [for the meeting of Dec. 1935] [1936]: 122–137) critiqued what he took to be a “typical [example] of harmonic analysis”: a passage from the second movement of Mozart’s Piano Sonata in F, K. 533, as analyzed by Walter Piston (*Principles of Harmonic Analysis* [Boston: E. C. Schirmer, 1933]). Although Piston analyzed some chords as secondary dominants, he thought others suggested
So, returning to the question of influence, was it Gow or Schenker who inspired Wedge’s approach? Following *lex parsimoniae*, the most reasonable answer is that it was Schenker. We know that Wedge was aware of Schenker’s work, whereas we can only speculate about his knowledge of books by his American predecessor Gow. And we know that Wedge was recently aware of what was then *current* work by Schenker, whereas Gow’s approach was already somewhat dated, and had not been picked up by subsequent writers. Of course, given the general equivalence of Gow’s Attendant chords and Wedge’s embellishing chords, the influence of Gow cannot be entirely dismissed. But if Wedge was aware of the Attendant-chord idea, I would

brief modulations, without taking—as Weisse would have—their larger linear/contrapuntal role into consideration. Katz (*Challenge to Musical Tradition*) offered a more extended critique of the customary textbook approach. She considered analyses of a Bach chorale by Donald Tweedy (*Manual of Harmonic Technique*), and of Weber’s Overture to *Der Freischütz* by Piston (*Harmony*). The former was rejected for its labeling of local modulations, and the latter for doing the same, albeit with an alternative analysis that indicated secondary dominants, but of chords Piston deemed “unsatisfactory” within the main tonality (thereby suggesting that the modulatory view was preferable). Katz then offered a conventional, Roman-numeral analysis of her own, of a “clear-cut” diatonic passage of a Bach chorale, and argued that even here the labels demonstrated little about the contextual *function* of the chords. Incidentally, Katz had briefly considered the shortcomings of traditional analysis in “Heinrich Schenker’s Method of Analysis,” *Musical Quarterly* 21/3 (1935): 311–329. There, for example, she complained about interpreting chromatic chords as modulatory, as it made it “practically impossible to hear a work as evolving through a single tonality” (320); and she argued against viewing each chord as if it had “a definite life of its own, apart from its relationships to those other chords which made for a common tonality” (318).

After Gow’s work, American theorists who embraced similar ideas only went as far as the secondary-dominant concept *per se*. That is, quite a number of theorists, in the intervening decades before Wedge’s *Applied Harmony*, came up with their own terms and analytic labels for what we now call secondary (or applied) dominants, while the more inclusive nature of Gow’s Attendant chords was left behind. Moreover, after Gow, the only conventional theory book to have adopted the specific term “Attendant chord” did so while reverting to its earlier and more restrictive definition. Shortly after Wedge’s book was published, Carleton Bullis issued *Harmonic Forms* (Cleveland: Clifton Press, 1933), in which the term was initially applied only to dominant-functioning chords (i.e., forms of secondary Vs and vii°s; see Lessons 109–111, pp. 178–84). A bit later, in discussing chords with a diminished third (which may be inverted to an augmented sixth), Bullis observed that when such a chord “resolves to a triad other than the tonic triad, it may be considered as having an attendant or secondary location, being used similarly to chords borrowed from attendant keys” (188). His view of Attendant chords is thus the same as Shepard’s; it is not akin to Gow’s extension of the concept. This is also true of the only other book (of which I’m aware) to use the term—albeit one a bit off the traditional path, as it is aimed primarily at those writing for dance orchestras of the day; Otto Cesana, *Course in Modern Harmony* (New York: Modern Music Publications, 1939). The book consists of sixty brief “lessons” in nineteen (unnumbered) pages. Attendant chords are addressed in lessons 23–24. Such a chord is defined as one “[that] belongs to, and [that] introduces a new chord or key.” It “is usually the dominant 7th chord of the new key. However, any other chord belonging to the new key may be used as the Attendant Chord. This includes the chromatic chords as well.” The final two sentences somewhat confuse the issue, but Cesana’s examples are in fact restricted to what we would call secondary V7 and vii°7 chords, including in chains (“An Attendant Chord may be introduced by its attendant”).
argue that it appealed to him precisely for its Schenkerian implications. After all, the chords
Wedge labeled as “embellishing” are typically those that would be slurred to superordinate
elements in an analytic graph; and thus by adopting the approach used in *Applied Harmony*,
he could present an interpretation reconcilable with Schenker’s views that was at the same time a
product of existing American theory.

*Concept #2: Wedge’s examples often carry implications for hierarchy and longer-
range hearing, and at times use a form of reduction.*

Hierarchy (beyond that outlined above, regarding the chromatic embellishment of a single
diatonic chord) is suggested in some passages dealing with harmonic progressions. Consider
the progression in C major, shown in Figure 5: C–A\(^4\)–D\(^6\)–G\(^7\)–C, or I–[V\(^4\)]–[V\(^6\)]–V\(^7\)–I (where
brackets enclose the dominant of the subsequent chord). Wedge describes D\(^6\) as “an embellish-
ment of the G-major chord [that] follows,” and A\(^4\) as “an embellishment of the [D\(^6\)]” (II: 15).
Thus, not only are the two secondary dominants not of the same rank, it is suggested that the
entire progression embellishes a more fundamental I–V–I statement, an argument made aurally
stronger by Wedge’s use of only neighboring-tone embellishments in the outer voices of the
central, secondary-dominant portion.

More striking are examples and correlate remarks that suggest longer-range hearing.
Consider some of Wedge’s two-voice frameworks, in which the requisite harmonies are indi-
cated by figured bass and/or his chord-symbol notation (e.g., Drill 16, II: 100–01). In describing
these, he often focuses on broader connections. For example, in the E-minor passage of Figure 6,
Wedge concentrates on the first and second full measures, which are bookended by V\(^7\) chords; in
between is stepwise motion down a third, to a dissonant \(7\) chord, then back up. He describes the
**Figure 5.** Wedge, *Applied Harmony* II (1931, 15): an example of “dominant embellishments”

![Musical notation](image)

**Figure 6.** Wedge, *Applied Harmony* II (1931, 100): an example of “chromatic progression of seventh-chords”

*NB:* § indicates a $\flat II$ (Neapolitan) chord
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**Figure 7.** Wedge, *Applied Harmony* II (1931, 101): an example of “chromatic progression of seventh-chords”
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**Figure 8.** Wedge, *Applied Harmony* II (1931, 100): an example of “chromatic progression of seventh-chords”
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“resolution of the [dominant] seventh-chord” as being “delayed until the end of the phrase.” That is, he posits a connection between the two V\textsuperscript{7} chords; the tension one hears with the first persists through the intermediate chords until the second, after which it finally resolves to the tonic.\footnote{For this example, Wedge includes the attribution “Beethoven,” but without specifying a piece. In a personal communication, Poundie Burstein pointed out that the example has some features in common with the Allegretto movement of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E Major, op. 14/1, although the use of the 6\textsuperscript{4} chord on G is unusual. Indeed, it may be that the 6\textsuperscript{4} is an error, and 6 (i.e., 7\textsuperscript{b}) was intended instead. Whatever the case, I suspect that Wedge was basing this teaching example very loosely on Beethoven’s Allegretto, and that is why there was not a more specific citation.}

Such connections are more expansive in other examples. Consider Figure 7, which is based on a passage from the ending of Chopin’s Mazurka in C\# Minor, op. 30/4.\footnote{This is based on harmonic and contrapuntal events that occur in mm. 101–139.} Wedge describes the “harmonic progression of the last seven measures” (i.e., from the asterisk to the end) as C\#m–F\#–G\#–C\#m, or i–IV–V–i. The i chord occurs on the third beat m. 4, and V–i occurs as the final two harmonic events, in mm. 9–10. It is evident, then, that the IV (F\#) chord to which he refers is not a singular occurrence, but rather a chord that has been unfolded in time: in the bass, F\# passes down to A\textsuperscript{b} between mm. 5 and 9; and in the melody, C\# passes down to F\# during the same time. Through passing motion, IV\textsuperscript{7} becomes iv\textsuperscript{6} before progressing to V\textsuperscript{7}–I.\footnote{In the score, the corresponding expansion of IV (as designated by Wedge) is found in mm. 129–133.}

The idea of a chord being extended through intermediate events is made especially emphatic in Figure 8, which is based on a passage from the first movement of Brahms’s First Symphony.\footnote{This is based on harmonic and contrapuntal events that occur in mm. 13–30 of the movement.} Here Wedge calls the first four measures “an expansion of the G major chord.” That is, the bass’s semitonal embellishment (G\#–Gb–G\#) plus octave ascent (G2–G3), along with the melody’s embellished ascent from D4 to G4, compose-out the V chord of C minor, which finally resolves to the tonic in the last measure.
With these examples, Wedge implicitly focuses the reader’s attention on how to conceptualize broader spans of music. He goes on to offer a reductive view of whole works, which he labels “sketches of the modulatory scheme[s] of complete compositions” (II: 107). For example, Figure 9 shows his “sketch” of a portion of Schumann’s First Symphony, second movement. For reference, above the passage I have provided the correlate measure numbers of the score.

Wedge’s sketch is not a rhythmic reduction in the usual sense, but rather a representation of the principal and certain intermediate harmonies (shown by the two-voice framework and figured-bass symbols), set in a certain metric scheme so that it is playable as a short piece. That is, by playing through the fourteen-measure version Wedge offers, one gets a sense of the principal harmonic motions of first seventy-eight measures of the movement (up to the recapitulation).

Wedge’s example is a musical synopsis of sorts, based on harmony and voice-leading, and to that extent it is in the spirit of Schenker’s own work—albeit without the full analytic apparatus Schenker provides. Along similar lines, Figure 10 shows Wedge’s sketch of Chopin’s Mazurka in B Major, op. 56/1, which represents the first 144 measures (up to the return of the opening section) in a twelve-measure synoptic form.

It is with the prior examples that Wedge’s indebtedness to Schenker is most clearly revealed, both in the nature of his reductions and in his descriptive language. Let us consider the former aspect first. Reductions can be found in prior American textbooks, but they are of different kinds. Some authors restricted themselves to the simplification of melodies only, as did George W. Chadwick in Harmony (1897), and Arthur E. Heacox and Friedrich J. Lehmann in

---

**FIGURE 9.** Wedge, *Applied Harmony II* (1931, 108): “sketch” of Schumann, Symphony No. 1, II

![Image of Schumann's Symphony No. 1, II](image)

**FIGURE 10.** Wedge, *Applied Harmony II* (1931, 107): “sketch” of Chopin, Mazurka in B Major, op. 56/1

![Image of Chopin's Mazurka in B Major, op. 56/1](image)
Lessons in Harmony (1906). For example, Chadwick provided melodies and asked the student to strip away the ornamentation, thereby “rendering the fundamental harmony . . . more obvious.” Other authors engaged the whole setting, as did Benjamin Cutter in Harmonic Analysis (1902), and Lehmann in his similarly titled book (1910). For example, Cutter took passages with florid arpeggiations and simplified them into a texture of melody plus block chords. In this way the harmonic component was made clearer and easier to analyze. Cutter also argued that such reductions provided an aid to memorizing: “it is a wonderful help to the sight player if in a piece of figuration he is able to see through the mass of notes and to behold the backbone, the framework of the whole affair.” In the cited instances, then, the rationale for reductions was made fairly clear: it involved distinguishing principal from ornamental notes, and basic chords from their more florid forms of presentation. Wedge’s reductions, on the other hand, have no precise predecessors in American pedagogy. Both his two-voice frameworks with figured bass, and especially his synoptic sketches, seem much more indebted to Schenker than to anything in the American traditions. Indeed, even his use of figured bass in these reductions—an attribute that probably passes today as unremarkable—is significant. In Wedge’s earlier (pre-Schenker-influenced) books, he followed a trend of the time in eschewing figured-bass notation in favor of

88 Chadwick, Harmony, 211.
89 Cutter, Harmonic Analysis; see, e.g., reductions of Beethoven, Chopin, and Grieg on pp. 52–53, 118, and 64. Also see reductions from Jean Baptiste Cramer’s Fifty Selected Piano-Studies, ed. Hans von Bülow (New York: G. Schirmer, 1899), on p. 84; and some score excerpts for further reductions by the student on pp. 85–88 (some of which also provide the start of solutions).
90 See Friedrich J. Lehmann, Harmonic Analysis (Oberlin, OH: A. G. Comings and Son, 1910), “Lesson 19: Reduction,” 128–136. Unlike in Lehmann’s previously cited book with Heacox (see n. 87), in this text it is stated that “[t]he reduction should be made in four part writing, even though the example to be reduced is only in one, two or more parts” (128).
91 Cutter, Harmonic Analysis, 82.
indicating chord inversions with subscripted numbers (“1” for first inversion, “2” for second inversion, and so forth). Thus it is reasonable to speculate that his embracing of figured bass in *Applied Harmony* was a result of the importance accorded to it by Schenker.

The language used by Wedge to describe his reductions is also significant, not just in its implications for longer-range hearing (which has already been observed) but in its use of one word in particular: “expansion.” It was noted above that Wedge described the first four measures of Figure 8 as “an expansion of the G major chord.” Elsewhere in Book II he refers to “the use of the $X^5_6$ and $X^4_3$ embellishments in expanding . . . chords” (12), to a musical passage that is “extended by expansion of the chords” (41), to a phrase that consists of “an expansion of the dominant” (38), and to an exercise that represents an “expansion of the C chord” (99). The word “expansion” is not used in this way in prior American texts, where instead it is applied to intervals (as when an augmented sixth expands to an octave), or to rhythmic values (as when a motive returns with its durations expanded), or to phrases (as when a consequent phrase is expanded from four to six measures). Most likely, then, Wedge derived the term from

---

92 Given our present-day perspective on the significance of figured bass in analyzing tonal music—a perspective certainly influenced by Schenker’s work—it may surprise some to learn how much it was discounted in decades past. To cite one of many examples, selected simply because it was published in 1931 (the year of Wedge’s *Applied Harmony*, Book II), consider these words from the preface of Carl Paige Wood, *The Texture of Music: A Manual of Elementary Harmony*, Book 1 (Boston: Richard G. Badger/The Gorham Press, 1931): “The ancient system of ‘figured bass’ has no place in this book. The figured bass symbols were useful to express the different inversions of chords, but they were helpless to distinguish between different types of chords or their various functions in the tonality. As a method of teaching the use of chords figured bass is now rather generally discredited. Certainly no other art or language was ever taught in any such way” (7).

93 Recall also the remark quoted from Book I, about how one may “expand any chord in the key by temporarily treating [it] as a key-center.”

94 Some books use the term “expand” frequently, but without suggesting anything like what Wedge does. See, e.g., Preston Ware Orem, *Theory and Composition of Music* (Philadelphia: Theo. Presser, 1924), who uses the term perhaps two dozen times in conjunction with exercises in which the student is given the first two to four measures of a piece, and is then asked to “expand” the fragment into a full piece or section of perhaps sixteen measures; see, e.g., pp. 102–108. Otherwise, a small number of books may use wording that initially seems similar to Wedge’s, but ultimately proves different. For example, see Carolyn Alchin, *Applied Harmony*, Part 2, revised by Vincent Jones (Los Angeles: L. R. Jones, 1930). On p. 45, Ex. 91, various two- and three-chord groups are presented, each with augmented-six chords. The student is instructed to “expand any of the progressions into phrase or period forms.” Two examples are given, and these make it clear that what the student is being asked to do is to incorporate these
Schenker’s *Dehnung*, which occurs frequently in the writings of the 1920s (i.e., those that preceded *Applied Harmony*). Although Schenker often used *Dehnung* in the sense of a rhythmic or metrical expansion, it was also employed in the manner of Wedge, to refer to the expansion (i.e., prolongation) of a chord.\(^{95}\) Indeed, this conjecture about Wedge’s usage is corroborated by the fact that, several years later, when William J. Mitchell wrote the first American textbook to draw explicitly on Schenker’s ideas (*Elementary Harmony* [1939]), he also used “expansion” (interchangeably with “extension”) as a surrogate for prolongation.\(^{96}\)

Before turning the page on *Applied Harmony*, one aspect deserves further contextualization. As noted previously, Wedge makes no explicit mention of Schenker (or his work), and while this fact does not affect the Schenkerian concepts Wedge was communicating, it could lead to negative assessments in other ways. By not giving due credit, some might argue that

---

\(^{95}\) See, e.g., Schenker’s essay on Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, from *Tonwille* 1 (1921), in which he notes that “With the expansion [Dehnung] of IV in bars 84–93, the postponement of the last tone of the fourth-progression, d,—and this is indeed the purpose of the expansion [Dehnung]—requires again a new and special arrangement of the slurs”; the conclusion of his Fifth Symphony essay, from *Tonwille* 6 (1923), in which he observes that “In bars 60ff., the G major chord is expanded [gedehnt] even more than in bars 12–15”; and his essay on Mozart’s Symphony in G Minor, K. 550, in *Das Meisterwerk* 2 (1926), in which he remarks that “The expansion [Dehnung] of scale-step IV is new,” and later, in regard to the same passage, that there was “an expansion [Dehnung] of IV in the consequent of the second subject.” These quotations (italics and bracketed German added in all cases) are taken from the following translations: “Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony [first part],” *Der Tonwille*, Vol. 1 ( Issues 1–5), ed. William Drabkin (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004), 30 (trans. Drabkin); “Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony (conclusion),” *Der Tonwille*, Vol. 2 ( Issues 6–10), ed. Drabkin (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2005), 11 (trans. Drabkin); and “Mozart’s Symphony in G Minor, K. 550,” *The Masterwork in Music, A Yearbook, Vol. 2* (1926), ed. Drabkin (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996), 64 and 71 (trans. Drabkin). The reader should note that the *Tonwille* and *Meisterwerk* translations often use “expansion” (and variant forms) for words other than *Dehnung/dehnen*, such as Vergrößerung, verbreitert, etc.

\(^{96}\) See, e.g., the following passages in William J. Mitchell, *Elementary Harmony* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1939) (italics added in all instances): a presentation of “first, the simple outer voice plan, then its extension by means of a change in register in the connection of the first two chords” (193); “The extension of the G chord in bars 4 to 6 with its passing tones” (219); “[t]he construction of a key upon each degree of a tonality offers a convincing way of expanding or prolonging the chord that represents that degree” (207); an example of stepwise 8–7 motion above a bass, followed by “[t]he expansion of this direct connection” by having the “chord seventh . . . fetched by [a] middle voice” (222); and directions to “[d]escribe the expanded treatment of chord sevenths as transferred, decorated, or prolonged” (248). As for the assertion that Mitchell was “explicitly draw[ing] on Schenker’s ideas,” see subsequent commentary in the main text, and Figure 11.
Wedge withheld Schenker’s name from students and other pedagogues at a time when he could have helped promote the work, and moreover that Wedge implicitly took credit for certain approaches that were apparently inspired by Schenker. The former claim, of course, has merit. But the latter claim is more difficult to settle, for the truth is, when distilling existing knowledge and techniques for textbooks—and especially those directed toward basic classes, such as first- and second-year harmony—authors sometimes don’t enumerate their influences. To demonstrate this in a pertinent way, let us compare Wedge’s book with Schenker-influenced harmony textbooks that appeared subsequently in the US. Figure 11 provides a table of six that were issued from the 1930s (post-Wedge) through the 1960s (after which time books of this type became more frequent).97 There are explicit references to Schenker in only half: those by Mitchell, Sessions, and Forte. And even in these, the references are limited: the former two mention Schenker once or twice in the prefatory text, while Forte cites Schenker’s name in the main text, but only in passing. In the remaining books, references to Schenker are either non-existent (as in Christ, et al.), or very indirect. As examples of the latter, Bauman acknowledges the “interest and advice” of Mitchell and Salzer; and Kohs cites certain books that are either fully Schenkerian (i.e., by Katz and Salzer) or Schenker-influenced (i.e., by Mitchell and Sessions). Although these references are recognizable by knowledgeable Schenkerians today, they would not have been

97 Because the focus is on harmony textbooks, the table excludes Schenker- or Salzer-influenced counterpoint textbooks, such as William L. Graves, Jr., Twentieth Century Fugue: A Handbook (Washington, DC: Catholic Univ. of America, 1962); Neale B. Mason, Essentials of Eighteenth-Century Counterpoint (Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown, 1968); and Felix Salzer and Carl Schachter, Counterpoint in Composition: The Study of Voice Leading (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969). Also excluded is a Schenker/Salzer-influenced textbook on form: Douglass M. Green, Form in Tonal Music: An Introduction to Analysis (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965). Two other Schenker-influenced books from this period are excluded for different reasons: Felix Salzer, Structural Hearing: Tonal Coherence in Music (New York: Charles Boni, 1952), because it transcends a “harmony textbook” and instead aims to “mold [Schenker’s] concepts into a workable, systematic approach for use by teachers, students and performers” (xv); and Adele T. Katz, Challenge to Musical Tradition (1945), because it is not a textbook at all. For more on the books of Figure 11, those cited in this note, and others still, see Berry, A Topical Guide to Schenkerian Literature, I.g. (“Textbooks Influenced By Schenker [Implicitly Or Explicitly],” 63–70), especially I.g.ii. (which includes harmony and voice-leading texts) and I.g.iii. (which includes texts of broader scope).
Reference(s) to Schenker: An *explicit* reference in “Preface”: “I am particularly grateful to Dr. Hans Weisse who, better than anyone else could have done, introduced me to and clarified the writings of Heinrich Schenker, undoubtedly the greatest theoretician of our time. While those few who have read and understood these writings will recognize my indebtedness, it will be apparent that the material has been applied to quite different ends” (viii; note that Weisse was a student of Schenker). An *indirect* reference occurs when the author refers readers to the “more extended discussion of parallel fifths” in Johannes Brahms, *Oktaven und Quinten und Anderes*, as published by Universal in Vienna (he does *not*, however note that Schenker was the editor of this 1933 publication).

Alvin Bauman, *Elementary Musicianship* (1947)
Reference(s) to Schenker: An *indirect* reference in “Preface”: “I am particularly grateful to . . . William J. Mitchell and Dr. Felix Salzer for their interest and advice” (vi; note that Mitchell was a student of Weisse, and Salzer was a student of Schenker).

Roger Sessions, *Harmonic Practice* (1951)
Reference(s) to Schenker: Two *explicit* references. In “Foreword,” the author refers to adopting “tonicization” from Schenker’s “Tonikalisierung” and notes: “Though I am far from subscribing to all of Schenker’s theories, this conception seems to me of the greatest value . . .” (xvii). In “Acknowledgments,” the author notes that “Any book of this nature owes a great deal to a great many people. I have already mentioned my indebtedness to the writings of . . . Heinrich Schenker” (xxiii).

Reference(s) to Schenker: Two *indirect* references. In “Suggested Supplementary Materials” (I: vii; II: vii), two of the three cited textbooks are the ones above by Mitchell and Sessions. Also, under “Analysis of Melodic Structure” (I: 23), two Schenker-oriented books are cited: Katz’s *Challenge to Musical Tradition* (1945) and Salzer’s *Structural Hearing* (1952).

Reference(s) to Schenker: An *explicit* reference occurs only in a passage where the author refers to the “technique . . . called *Übergreifen* [Übergreifen] (after Schenker)” (144). An *indirect* reference occurs in “Preface”: “Grateful acknowledgment of assistance and special thanks are due to . . . my friend, Ernst Oster” (iv; note that Oster studied with Schenker’s pupil Oswald Jonas, and also was entrusted by Schenker’s wife with a collection of Schenker’s papers and scores).

Reference(s) to Schenker: None.
understood by most readers at the time. In sum, these subsequent textbooks show that there was nothing particularly unusual about Wedge’s lack of acknowledgement.

“The Capacity of the Average” (1932).

In December 1932—a year after Wedge had arranged to meet with Weisse, to discuss Schenker’s ideas—Wedge delivered a paper at the annual meeting of the Music Teachers National Association. Titled “The Capacity of the Average in Theoretic Instruction,” the paper (which was subsequently published) addresses fundamental principles of which average music students need to be made aware, in order to “become active or creative listeners.” In it, Wedge reminds his fellow educators that the “first consideration . . . is that we are dealing with sound, and music can never be understood or appreciated unless those sounds are apprehended.” Thus, he develops “a few simple experiments” through which the relatively uninitiated music listener/student may learn more about melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic elements. These involve playing simple materials on the piano, beating rhythms, and so forth, after which the student’s expectations are queried regarding such factors as continuation and conclusion. It is within the context of an extended “experiment” that Schenkerian concepts are suggested.

First, Wedge asks his hypothetical student to sing the first phrase of Stephen Foster’s “Way Down upon the Swanee River” (i.e., “Old Folks at Home” [1851]) in the key of C, as per the notation in Figure 12a. After doing so, he declares, “you will find that all the tones are heard in relation to C E G C,” the tones of the tonic triad. “This is a vertical reaction to pitch. The

---

98 See Wedge, “The Capacity of the Average.” The notion of “creative listen[ing]” (which Wedge cites twice) already conjures one relation with Weisse. During his first year of teaching at Mannes (1931–32), Weisse conducted a course entitled “Creative Hearing.” The title had already been used (in its German form, schaffendes hören) for a lecture he gave shortly before leaving Austria for the US. (See Berry, “Hans Weisse and the Dawn of American Schenkerism,” 111, including n. 27.)
major scale, which fills the gap between these tones, is horizontal, and is measured along this vertical background.” He asks the student to “play or sing” the phrase again, a few times, “[t]hen hum what you hear as a bass. You will find that you have sung C throughout, and G under ‘way’ with possible change to F under ‘River,’” as per Figure 12b. Finally, “[p]laying or hearing this bass mentally, again sing the first [melodic] phrase, and try substituting the pitch B, F, or G for the D at the [ending] word ‘Way.’” The potential substitutes are all members of the implicit dominant-seventh harmony, but “[y]ou will find that your ear rebels, and that D is the only pitch [that] seems correct.” This is not due to mere foreknowledge of the melody, “but because in spite of the fact that the melody moves up and down the scale and skips about, the ear has received at
the beginning a vertical sensation of the C chord with E in soprano [i.e., $\flat I$], and when the chord changes to the G chord, it demands that the E move down to the D [i.e., to $\frac{3}{5}$].” “There are similar natural reactions to pitch association and progression in all movements of chord roots. . . . This controls musical thinking and subconsciously directs musical composition.”

With this “experiment,” Wedge has suggested that melodic tones—a horizontal component—are interpreted vis-à-vis the notes of the tonic triad—a conceptual “vertical background.” Voice-leading is implicit between even those chord changes separated in time, as at the beginning and ending of a phrase, due to perceived connections between the longer-range “vertical sensation[s]” that are projected at those moments. Furthermore, the expectation of these connections “subconsciously directs” one’s musical interpretation. Of course, these ideas resonate conspicuously with Schenker’s own. Indeed, the underlying structure of the examined phrase, as unambiguously described by Wedge, would be translated into Schenkerian notation as the first branch of an interrupted $\flat I$-line, as shown in Figure 13.


Wedge’s conference paper was but a prelude to a monograph that further extended his method: *The Gist of Music*, a guide to “musical understanding” for even the layperson with “no previous knowledge of music.” Here, as before, Wedge emphasizes active listening. He gives musical “experiments” for readers to conduct, by singing and/or playing the piano; he suggests also that they have access to a phonograph and select recordings for further directed listening. Although he instructs his readers on many basics of music, and in different manners, a frequent

---

99 Wedge reuses Foster’s song in *The Gist of Music* (21–22), although the focus there is primarily on phrases, cadences, and form.
A technique is that of musical expansion. An exercise is given and readers are asked to play and internalize it; then it is embellished and extended in various ways, and readers are asked to play these variations and to observe the embellishment techniques. Many examples illustrate the process; e.g., see Figure 14, which shows excerpts from Lesson 7. At (a) is a basic exercise readers are to play and memorize. As an aid to those relatively new to music, pitch-class names are given above the staff, and triad membership is indicated below the staff by R or 8 (for root or its octave), 5 (for fifth), and 3 or –3 (for major or minor third). After playing the material of (a) — the tonic chord of D — readers are given the same material transposed to the levels of IV and V of

Figure 14. Wedge, *The Gist of Music* (1936, 51–52): part of “Lesson 7”
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D. Other exercises are then given through alpha-numeric symbols alone. After one has mastered skips across various major and minor triads, the original passage, (a), is rewritten: first as per (b), with turn-figure embellishments; and again as per (c) and (d), with upper- and then lower-neighbor prefixes. After the three prior embellishment techniques are mastered, readers practice combinations, such as those of Figure 15.

101 For example, play “–3 R –3 5 8” (52).
102 Once more, Wedge devises ways of abbreviating these configurations so that he can represent additional exercises without using staff notation.
103 Wedge had introduced upper, lower, and double neighboring tones, and their applications, in Lesson 4 (35–38). (Passing tones, not used in the present example, had been introduced in Lesson 5, 42–43.) Incidentally, in Figures 14c-d and 15, you will observe that Wedge uses small “eighth notes” to designate incomplete neighbors. I would caution over-zealous Schenkerphiles from associating this notation with the present-day analytic notation of foreground neighbors as “eighth notes” (i.e., flagged, filled-in noteheads). Instead, Wedge surely adopted his usage from the eighteenth-century notation of appoggiaturas. Furthermore, although the “eighth note” analytic notation is common today, Schenker himself was not so consistent. Such notation was used for neighbors in some foreground graphs of Der freie Satz (see, e.g., Figs. 85 and 109,e1; full citation in n. 105), but Schenker also used stemless noteheads in this capacity. Flagged, filled-in noteheads appear in Fünf Urlinie-Tafeln (full citation in n. 111), but there
As for harmonic expansions, readers are subsequently given the variously voiced I–V–I progressions of Figure 16a. The progression is then expanded as in Figure 16b, such that some combination of I, IV, and V is interjected between the initial I and the ending V–I. As the lessons advance, and materials become more chromatic, Wedge introduces the concept of the they are often used to signify events other than incomplete neighbors. Perhaps it is in Schenker’s analysis of Beethoven’s Third Symphony that the “eighth notes” are most clearly associated with foreground incomplete neighbors; although complete neighbors in the foreground are often represented by note values equal to, or a degree less than, the primary (displaced) tones. (See “Beethoven’s Third Symphony: Its True Content Described for the First Time,” trans. Derrick and Puffett and Alfred Clayton, in The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook, Vol. 3 (1930), ed William Drabkin [New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996]: 10–68.) The establishment of the flagged, filled-in notehead as a common symbol for the neighboring note generally came after Schenker. For example, Oswald Jonas’s graphs, in the appendix to the English edition of Schenker’s Harmonielehre, employ this notation (see Harmony, ed. Oswald Jonas, trans. Elisabeth Mann Borgese [Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1954]). Salzer, in Structural Hearing (1952), tends to notate neighboring tones by one note-value lower than the principal tone, whether complete or incomplete, but “eighth notes” are used for the incomplete prefix neighbors (see ex. 477, et al.). And, of course, two more recent Schenkerian textbooks employ the neighbor-as-eighth-note notation frequently: Allen Forte and Steven E. Gilbert, Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis (New York: W. W. Norton, 1982), see exx. 162a, 166b, et al.; and Allen Cadwallader and David Gagné, Analysis of Tonal Music: A Schenkerian Approach, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2011), see exx. 4.20b, 6.4b–c, et al.
“dominant seventh embellishment,” familiar to us from *Applied Harmony*. Thus he is able to offer elaborations of the type shown in Figure 17 (taken from Lesson 9). Notice that the progressions are in pairs: the “a” versions are embellished and expanded to form the “b” versions. Also notice that the uppermost voice within each progression tends to circle around the same pitch, using primarily the neighbor embellishments discussed previously. For example, in the first two passages, the melody’s 5 (so indicated by Wedge’s “5,” above the staff) is either literally retained or just momentarily displaced by its lower neighbor.\(^{104}\)

In considering the above, we can find precedents in both Schenker’s work and in American textbooks. With respect to the melodic expansions, we could say that Wedge was introducing his readers to various diminution techniques, which are related to such Schenkerian concepts as prolongation and *Auskomponierung*, and which Schenker addressed in his essay “Die Kunst der

\(^{104}\) In earlier harmonic examples, Wedge had drawn special attention to neighboring tones in the melody (see, e.g., comments under “8a,” on pp. 39 and 44), but by this time he was refraining from doing so, as it was probably considered implicit.
Improvisation,” as well as in Der freie Satz. But of course, requiring students to add embellishments to a simple melody was fairly common in American pedagogy too; Wedge’s teacher Goetschius, for example, did it in several of his books. On the other hand, the use of harmonic expansions moves beyond typical American practice. A somewhat related exercise can be found in Goetschius’s The Theory and Practice of Tone-Relations (1892), in what he calls a “phrase-skeleton.” As shown in Figure 18, Goetschius provides the beginning I and ending V–I of a four-measure phrase in $\frac{3}{4}$. The intervening quarter-note chords are simply represented by vertical slashes. The student is to fill in these “vacant beats” using I, IV, and V chords in root position. In a very general sense, this exercise is similar to those of Wedge’s Figures 16–17, and certainly could have helped inspire them. There is a notable difference, however. Goetschius was presenting a phrase with missing beats to be completed; that is, he was not providing a true expansion exercise, but instead was testing the student’s ability to insert chords into specific

---


107 Goetschius, The Theory and Practice of Tone-Relations, 26. At this point, the header refers to “The skeleton of a 4-measure Phrase”; it is later (31) that the term “phrase-skeleton” is used in reference to the same example.
metric slots, based on what came before and what would follow.\textsuperscript{108} Wedge, on the other hand, was offering basic progressions to be expanded through the interpolation of subordinate chords; and in doing so he was using a sequence of chords somewhat abstractly—that is, divorced from specific rhythms and phrasing. In this sense, then, his examples are perhaps more akin to Schenker’s illustrations of how a “ground-plan” \textit{[Grundplan]} may be elaborated.\textsuperscript{109}

After additional variations on the expansion techniques, along with discussions of motives, rhythms, and other musical materials, Wedge eventually reaches the series of short analyses that end his book. In his analysis of “Liebestod,” from Wagner’s \textit{Tristan und Isolde}, he represents the seventy-nine-measure section reductively, in what he labels a “graph,” reproduced here as Figure 19a.\textsuperscript{110} He explains that “[i]n each of the lettered sections . . . there is a progression of simple chords, indicated by the [larger-sized] whole notes in the bass.” (He employs a dotted slur to suggest the conceptual connection of these notes, literally separated in the score.)

\textsuperscript{108}Indeed, Goetschius advised that solutions are best made “in retrograde order, from the Cadence backward” (27).

\textsuperscript{109}A concise, early example by Schenker may be found in Figs. 1a–c of “Bach’s Little Prelude No. 1 in C Major, BWV 924,” from \textit{Tonwille} 4 (1923), trans. Joseph Dubiel, in \textit{Der Tonwille}, Vol. 1 (Issues 1–5), ed. William Drabkin (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004), 141 (the word “\textit{Grundplan}” is used here). Another early illustration of I–V–I elaborations is shown by “the gradual growth of the voice-leading prolongations” in Fig. 1 of “Bach’s Little Prelude No. 5 in D Minor, BWV 926,” from \textit{Tonwille} 5 (1923), trans. Joseph Dubiel, in \textit{ibid.}, 180.

\textsuperscript{110}The word “graph” is of course conspicuous because of its now-common use in reference to an analysis in Schenkerian notation. However, it is not clear how common the term was in 1930s Schenkerian discourse in the US. The earliest published use of the term (of which I’m aware) is in Katz, “Heinrich Schenker’s Method of Analysis” (1935). The term is prominent there, being used ten times in nineteen pages (including in the labels of Exx. 13c and 14f). As this article preceded Wedge’s \textit{The Gist} by several months, it could have been a source for his usage, although the timing would have been close. Perhaps the term was used orally by the New York–circle of Schenkerians, including Katz’s teacher, Weisse (with whom Wedge arranged a meeting, as noted earlier). However, in Weisse’s translation of the title and foreword to Schenker’s \textit{Fünf Urlinie-Tafeln}, originally published as \textit{Five Analyses in Sketchform} (1932), he used the term “sketch” instead of “graph” (the former term is also used commonly today). (For more on \textit{Fünf Urlinie-Tafeln}, and on the implications of the word “graph,” see Hedi Siegel, “The Pictures and Words of an Artist (‘von einem Künstler’): Heinrich Schenker’s \textit{Fünf Urlinie-Tafeln},” in \textit{Schenker-Traditionen: Eine Wiener Schule der Musiktheorie und ihre internationale Verbreitung}, ed. Martin Eybl and Evelyn Fink-Mennel [Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2006]: 203–219.) Wedge may have been using the term “graph” generally, simply to mean a visual or graphic representation of Wagner’s music. This is suggested by the fact that, when analyzing a Bach fugue, he also provides what he calls a “graph,” which is actually a grid for tracking subjects, counter-subjects, and key centers within the four voices (see \textit{The Gist}, 88). At any rate, subsequent published uses of the term “graph” by acknowledged Schenkerians were not immediately forthcoming; they appeared in Katz, \textit{Challenge to Musical Tradition} (1945); and in Salzer, \textit{Structural Hearing} (1952).
He describes the smaller notes on the lower staff as being the “actual bass tones which are used, supporting various chords, to accomplish these [larger] progressions as the motive is developed.” He then directs his readers to “[p]lay the harmonic background indicated by the whole notes in the Left Hand and chords in the Right Hand.” These “background” events have been extracted and notated more concisely in Figure 19b (where I have also corrected the two A♭s, implicitly given as A♯s by Wedge). As may be seen more easily in the latter example, Wedge’s “background” events do connect appropriately in terms of voice leading. In short, his reduction results in a reasonable musical passage, as did his synopses of pieces in Applied Harmony, and as would a Schenkerian reduction.

Of course, Wedge’s reduction is not “Schenkerian” in the way we would use the term today; but it does have superficial features in common with some of Schenker’s own graphs. Unlike in Wedge’s Applied Harmony reductions, his commentary makes it clear that the present graph embodies internal hierarchy, in the opposition between the foreground “motives” and the “harmonic background.” In the lower staff, hierarchy is also visually conveyed by the larger size of the “background” whole notes (plus the connective dotted slur) versus the smaller size of the foreground motivic notes. If one compares Wedge’s graph with, e.g., Schenker’s foreground graph of Chopin’s Etude in C Minor, op. 10/12, from Fünf Urlinie-Tafeln (issued in New York a few years before, for Weisse’s classes), one can see where Wedge might have derived his no-
tional inspiration. At any rate, the fact that Wedge was representing the expanded wealth of seventy-nine measures of music through a couple dozen, more skeletal, contrapuntal–harmonic events shows an indebtedness to Schenker.

III.

It is significant that Wedge’s intended audience changed between *Applied Harmony*, which is a textbook for conventional music students, and “The Capacity of the Average” and *The Gist*, which are aimed at so-called average people. Though influenced by Schenker’s ideas, these later writings are directed toward a group known to be beneath his interests: the masses. This topic deserves consideration, as it is related to the kind of pedagogical refocusing of Schenker’s ideas that would eventually happen under the banner of American democratic education. Or, to put it another way, it impinges upon a key aspect of the “Americanization of Schenker.” But


112 Still, it could be illuminating to take the raw voice-leading materials of Wedge’s “background” and, after interpretive contemplation, apply conventional Schenkerian symbols to it. One possible product would indicate a prolongation of B major via a large-scale arpeggiation of its tonic triad, decorated principally by melodic upper and lower neighbors (the very embellishment figures Wedge has treated so thoroughly). Setting aside any debate over whether or not such a graph would offer a reasonable Schenkerian interpretation of Wagner’s passage, it might at least demonstrate that Wedge’s way of thinking about this passage was closer to fundamental Schenkerian notions than one may have imagined.

113 An antipathy toward the masses was in keeping with Schenker’s aristocratic inclinations in both culture and music. See, e.g., comments on the masses in Chapter 1 of *Free Composition* (3–9), where Schenker observes (among other things) that “The masses . . . lack the soul of genius. They are not aware of background, they have no feeling for the future. Their lives are merely an eternally disordered foreground, a continuous present without connection, unwinding chaotically in empty, animal fashion” (3); and “The history of music reveals that music really began and flourished in ecclesiastical, royal, and aristocratic circles. This is confirmed by the fact that music developed polyphony, which must forever remain alien to the masses. For them music has always been and remains only an accompaniment to dance, march, or song: at best, a kind of utilitarian art, if one can accept the inherent contradiction” (4). See also comments on the masses in the following essays titled “Miscellanea”: from *Tonwille* 3 (1922), section beginning with “What is the people?” (131–134 of trans. by Ian Bent, in *Der Tonwille*, Vol. 1 [Issues 1–5], ed. William Drabkin [New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004]); from *Tonwille* 5 (1923), section headed “Epigones” (216–219 of trans. by Joseph Lubben, in *ibid.*); and from *Meisterwerk* 1 (1925), first part (i.e., 115–119 of trans. by Ian Bent, in *The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook, Vol. 1* (1925), ed. William Drabkin [New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994]).
first, to place Wedge’s work in its proper context, we must understand the period’s inclination toward writing for the general reader, both within and outside of music.

The “middlebrow project” and music-appreciation books.

In broad terms, what was happening in the US at the time of Wedge’s work was the expansion of the so-called middlebrow project: “the dissemination of high culture to a mass audience.” This began in earnest in the 1920s, the same decade that saw the word “middlebrow” first appear in the English language, to be situated between the older terms “highbrow” and “lowbrow.” Used metaphorically, the terms originate in theories that correlate greater cranial capacity (or head size) with higher IQs. Thus, highbrows have superior intellect and taste (including in the arts); conversely, lowbrows are neither intellectual nor culturally refined. For literary critic Van Wyck Brooks, writing in 1915, these two “attitudes of mind” were polarizing and undesirable. They divided American life into what he characterized variously as “stark intellectuality” versus “stark business,” “vaporous idealism” versus “self-interested practicality,” and “[d]esiccated culture” versus “stark utility.” He lamented the fact that between the

114 Jonathan Freedman, “Jews and the Making of Middlebrow American Culture,” Chronicle of Higher Education 45/4 (18 Sept. 1998), B4. Freedman’s reference to the “middlebrow project” and its definition is made more or less in passing, but it works well for my purposes, as I wish to distinguish the broader educational enterprise from products of “middlebrow culture” per se.

115 According to both the Oxford English Dictionary and Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary.

116 Thus Joan Shelley Rubin is somewhat misleading when she asserts that “reference to the height of the brow originally derived from phrenology and carried overtones of racial differentiation” (Rubin, The Making of Middlebrow Culture [Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1992], xii [italics added]). Generally speaking, phrenologists held that specific regions of the brain controlled specific characteristics and personality traits; by studying the topography of the cranium—i.e., by “reading” one’s head—a phrenologist would attempt to discern the development of certain faculties. (Cartographic charts or busts of the head were used for reference.) In contrast, craniometry concerns skull measurements, and has been used to support racist ideologies. For a refutation of pseudo-scientific judgments based on cranial size, see Stephen Jay Gould, The Mismeasure of Man, revised and expanded ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1996).


118 Brooks, “‘Highbrow’ and ‘Lowbrow,’” 30, 34, and 22 (respectively).
extremes “there is no community, no genial middle ground,” and thus he anticipated the coming of the middlebrow in positive terms.

Nonetheless, when the breed was sighted in the 1920s, opinions were frequently more cynical. Middlebrows were often defined as only moderately intellectual, with somewhat limited cultural interests, but (most condemningly) with pretensions to more. It was this sense of the word that the satirical Punch magazine embraced in 1925, when it caricatured middlebrows as “people who are hoping that some day they will get used to the stuff they ought to like.”

Beneath this gentle ridicule was a basic truth: a large and growing number of people desired guidance and education, through which they might come to understand and appreciate cultural artifacts and information that previously had been the preserve of the few.

Books were of course the principal means of disseminating this information. As James Steel Smith later noted, the 1920s became a decade ripe for publications “aimed not at the specialist, nor even at the general reader with a special and informed interest, but at the faceless ‘general reader.’” Similar distillations of subjects were published before and afterward, but this period—which saw the initial rise of the middlebrow—stood apart because “the attempt to popularize [was] so intense and vigorous.” Changes in the constitution of the general public probably accounted for the decade being so auspicious for these books. By this time, people had achieved greater literacy and increased educational levels, their vistas had been broadened by new means of mass communication (i.e., movies and radio) and thus there was an awareness of

---

119 Brooks, “‘Highbrow’ and ‘Lowbrow,’” 18.
121 From the issue of 23 Dec. 1925; quoted in the Oxford English Dictionary (as cited in n. 120) under “middlebrow,” definition A.
123 Smith, “The Day of the Popularizers,” 298.
ever-widening areas of knowledge in need of comprehension, and more favorable socioeconomic conditions allowed not only more time to read but increased capital to purchase books.\textsuperscript{124} The best-selling books were, of course, those that addressed topics of broader interest, such as world or American histories.\textsuperscript{125} But books that surveyed musical subjects for the general reader were published quite frequently in the 1920s and throughout the ’30s. Indeed, viewing events in 1931, Percy Scholes argued that \textit{too many} of these books were being issued. He wrote that publishers seem to have “such an exaggerated conception of the size of the market” that anyone who drops into one of their offices with a typescript will receive a contract.\textsuperscript{126} Some of these books used the word “Outline” in their titles or subtitles, or perhaps the more homely phrase “The Story of”—both appellations being ubiquitous among middlebrow books in general. The most frequent title word was probably “Listener,” which automatically suggested to prospective readers that the book was not just for musicians; after all, \textit{anyone} could listen.\textsuperscript{127} But no matter their specific titles, most of these publications became known by a particular label: \textit{music-appreciation books}. Although their popularity was a product of the period’s general infatuation with middlebrow books, the appreciation market was also abetted by two technological boons:

\textsuperscript{124} The summary is mine, based on conditions expressed in various ways in Smith, “The Day of the Popularizers.”
\textsuperscript{126} Percy A. Scholes, “Some Books on Appreciation: A Hint to Book Publishers,” \textit{Musical Times} 72/1066 (1931): 1087–1091; quotation from 1087. Scholes—who became a significant figure in music appreciation in England—was referring specifically to “appreciation” books with these comments.
the advent of commercial radio (and the emergence of nationwide networks), and advances in recording techniques (i.e., new electrical methods using microphones and electronic amplifiers). NBC’s “Music Appreciation Hour” (1928–42) brought guided listening to anyone with access to a radio; and many appreciation books began to cite recordings in order to illustrate the musical selections or genres being discussed.\footnote{For examples, see Dorothy Tremble Moyer, \textit{Introduction to Music Appreciation and History} (Boston: Oliver Ditson, 1925); and Grace Gridley Wilm, \textit{The Appreciation of Music: Ten Talks on Musical Form} (New York: Macmillan, 1928). Also, Van Loon’s \textit{The Arts} (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1937) ended with a section prepared by Grace Castagnetta, titled “A Few Musical Illustrations” (pp. 641–658), which consisted of a list of recommended recordings featuring music from Saint Ambrose to Hugo Wolf. Some books were aimed primarily at radio listeners, such as George R. Marek, \textit{How to Listen to Music Over the Radio} (New York: The Pictorial Review Co., 1937).} Thus, the reader unable to decipher notation or play the piano could gain a better sense of the music at hand. The sound recording or broadcast became an adjunct to the appreciation book, opening up the listening experience to more people.

\textit{The Layman’s Music Book} and its association with \textit{The Gist of Music}.

We are now in a position to understand the book intended as a companion to Wedge’s \textit{Gist}: Olga Samaroff Stokowski’s \textit{The Layman’s Music Book} (1935). The latter was quite significant in its own right. It was popular enough to go through eleven printings before 1947, at which time the twelfth printing substituted the more-common \textit{Listener’s} for \textit{Layman’s} in the title. It not only referred readers to specific recordings, by label and number, but a companion \textit{Layman’s Music Album} was made available through the RCA-Victor Company. Moreover, the book was the product of a music course the author developed for another important component of the middlebrow project: the adult-education market.

Samaroff (1882–1948), a well-known pianist and teacher at the Juilliard Graduate School (which, along with the IMA, constituted the Juilliard School of Music),\footnote{She also taught at the Philadelphia Conservatory. Samaroff was born in Texas as Lucy Mary Olga Agnes Hickenlooper; she adopted the stage name Samaroff from a distant relative, whereas the name Stokowski came from} began developing her
approach to teaching musical “laypeople”—i.e., those not directly involved in music-making—in the late 1920s, when she was asked to instruct privately a young girl from a prominent family of art patrons.\textsuperscript{130} Inspired by these encounters, she continued similar work in classes at Juilliard, and in 1933 founded the Layman’s Music Courses, Inc. (hereafter LMC).\textsuperscript{131} Initially based at Steinway Hall,\textsuperscript{132} the LMC relocated to the Mannes Music School in October 1935, at the invitation of founders David and Clara Mannes. From then until 1939, it co-existed in the same building with Hans Weisse’s Schenkerian instruction.\textsuperscript{133} (See the advertisement and photograph of Figure
This circumstance, plus the LMC’s connection with Wedge (to be described subsequently), raises an interesting question: were any Schenkerian ideas assimilated into the LMC’s curriculum? The Layman’s Music Book gives no indication of this influence, but its content corresponds to just a portion of the introductory course. The LMC offered more advanced classes, and also seems to have integrated Wedge’s work (as we shall see). Thus, some degree of influence is at least possible, although at present the question cannot be satisfactorily answered.

Samaroff wrote her book in order to make available, “in condensed form,” the approach that had proven itself “helpful to many laymen” during the preceding years. She focused quite a bit on musical materials per se, canvassing topics such as polyphony and counterpoint; fugue, sonata form, and opera; and issues of programmatic and modern music. Information presented in the book, along with “correlated ear-training and theory,” formed the basis of the LMC’s “initiation” (i.e., introductory) course. At this stage, Samaroff’s primary goal was to transform laypeople into active listeners—those who could not only enjoy “the spiritual, sensitory, emotional and imaginative experiences” of music, but who had developed their perceptions through study and analysis so as to understand the music more completely. The ability to play

cate people on important issues; it was built by The League for Political Education, a suffragist organization. It became one of New York’s premiere performance spaces for music due to outstanding acoustics and unobstructed views of its auditorium.

134 The 1938 Mannes advertisement of Figure 20a actually lists two students of Schenker: not only Weisse but Carl Bamberger (1902–87), who had come to the US the year before, and who became director of the orchestral and opera departments at Mannes.

135 The Layman’s Music Book (New York: W. W. Norton, 1935); it was later retitled The Listener’s Music Book (New York: W. W. Norton, 1947; reprinted Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1972). The latter was identical to the former edition except for its new, one-page “Preface,” and slight changes to the “Appendix.” Samaroff also authored two books of a more basic nature: The Magic World of Music: A Music Book for the Young of All Ages, with illustrations by Emil Preetorius (New York: W. W. Norton, 1936); and A Music Manual: Containing Certain Things that Everybody Wishes to Know and Remember about Music (New York: W. W. Norton, 1936). The latter was conceived “to complete and extend . . . information contained in” the former book (p. [v]), although it could be used by “any uninitiated listener” (p. ix).


137 “The finest kind of musical enjoyment occurs when a listener not only surrenders himself freely to the spiritual, sensitory, emotional and imaginative experiences great music can give, but is also capable of realizing, through
Figure 20. The association of the Layman’s Music Courses (LMC) and the Mannes Music School

(a) Advertisement in *New York Times* (9 Oct. 1938, 172), citing both Hans Weisse and the LMC

(b) Photograph of “An interested Layman’s Music Course Class at the David Mannes Music School,” from Samaroff, *An American Musician’s Story* (1939)

...a developed artistic perception, the complete significance and beauty of the art work he hears. That is the goal the layman should strive for in developing himself as an active listener” (*Layman’s*, 16). “If the layman undertakes to learn and analyze musical works, whether alone or with a teacher, he should regard it as the practice necessary to active listening” (14).
an instrument was not required; instead she argued that “the phonograph [was] the indispensable practice instrument of the active listener.” Accordingly, at the end of each chapter the reader was referred to “musical illustrations,” meaning specific recordings. The ability to read music was not necessary to understand the book either, although she asserted that those who learned notation would “double [their] possibility of a real activity as . . . listeners because [they could] then follow records with a score.” Studying scores in conjunction with listening permitted one to “obtain a broad and comprehensive experience” of the art.

While Samaroff was developing the LMC, she invited Wedge (her IMA/Juilliard colleague) to conduct his own “experiments in cooperation with her work.” Their resulting approaches were offered to the world outside their classrooms through their books, which were published within a few months of one another, each referring its readers to the other for additional information. Depending on the needs of a reader, the books could be approached in

---

138 Nonetheless, she acknowledged that “[m]ost laymen who have studied with the author have enjoyed making the acquaintance of the piano keyboard and finding out all sorts of things for themselves as they did this” (Layman’s, 13). To that end, she recommended “The Layman’s Keyboard Guide devised by Olga Stroumillo and published by J. Fischer and Bro. [It] will enable the Layman to find his way about at the piano keyboard and includes concrete reminders of musical fundamentals such as scale building, notation, the harmonic series and other important information” (Layman’s, 288).

139 As stated previously, there was also a companion Layman’s Music Album. Samaroff referred to records made for this album even in occasional footnotes in A Music Manual.

140 Quotations from Layman’s, 14 and 13 (respectively). A few examples of music notation are included in the book, mostly in the chapters on counterpoint and fugue (and also where instrumental ranges are addressed).

141 Wedge, The Gist, v. This cooperation must have been forged in the early 1930s, while Samaroff was developing her approach at Juilliard. Whether their cooperative work predated Wedge’s 1932 MTNA article is not known, although its content suggests the possibility.

142 The Layman’s Music Book referred interested readers to “The Gist of Music, by George A. Wedge, published simultaneously with this volume by G. Schirmer, Inc.” (12). However, the publications were not literally coordinated to appear at the same time, as indicated by their differing copyright dates (1935 versus 1936). The Layman’s Music Book was listed among books “published today” on 17 Oct. 1935, in the New York Times (p. 21); whereas The Gist of Music was advertised in May 1936 as “recently published” (Music Educators Journal 22/6 [1936], 6.) Incidentally, although The Gist makes no explicit reference to its being for the layman, it was advertised that way. A 1936 ad by publisher G. Schirmer described it as being “for the fundamental education of the layman” (ibid.); and an ad on the dust jacket of a later printing of Wedge’s Applied Harmony refers to The Gist as a book that “puts into the hands of the layman as well as the music student A Ready Key to Musical Understanding and Enjoyment.”
either order. For example, Wedge informed his readers that Samaroff’s book could provide them with “the necessary background in the history and evolution of music, aid [them] in intelligent listening, and greatly enhance [their] enjoyment of music.” In terms of technical growth, of course, a logical reading sequence would be first Layman’s, then The Gist, as the latter was much more advanced in its engagement with purely musical matters. (This was, in fact, the sequence suggested by Samaroff.) Whereas Layman’s required neither instrumental playing nor the reading of notation, and focused instead on active listening, The Gist demanded active experience: “The reader should follow the instructions given, and actually carry out the experiments.” Recordings were recommended, but also required was the use of a piano; and there was a great deal of notated music (although, as explained earlier, Wedge did devise surrogate forms of notation to help the non-proficient reader).

The two books seem to have been yoked together in a continuous educational approach. In part, this is evident from statements contained in Layman’s. For example, Samaroff indicated that those wishing to organize a course along the lines of the LMC should consult both Layman’s and The Gist: together, the books “should enable any trained musician to use the particular approach and continuity [the courses] contain.” In the 1947 printing, she added that The Gist was useful especially for teachers seeking “practical direction” in conducting ear-training classes, which the LMC’s Initiation Course required of those with “no previous musical education.” She also suggested that the slides used as visual aids in the LMC—and available to

---

143 Wedge, The Gist, iii.
144 Samaroff stated that those “who wish to develop themselves further as active listeners,” beyond the guidance of Layman’s, “can find the necessary practical guidance in” Wedge’s volume (Layman’s, 12).
145 Wedge, The Gist, iii.
146 Samaroff, Layman’s, 279.
147 Samaroff, The Listener’s Music Book, 280. This is evocative of Wedge’s assertion that the purpose of The Gist’s exercises is “not to develop proficiency in [music] writing or performance” but rather “to give information [that] will aid in listening” (The Gist, ix).
others who organized similar classes—were related to both books.\(^\text{148}\)

Most revealing of the connection between the LMC and The Gist is the fact that both had a presence at the Juilliard Summer School (hereafter JSS; a photograph of Samaroff teaching there is reproduced in Figure 21). When the School commenced in 1932, it was open to both students and teachers; it emphasized methods of “public school music,” and additionally had master classes in piano, violin, and voice, as well as instruction for the general music student.\(^\text{149}\)

\(^\text{148}\)“For the benefit of any teachers or study clubs that might wish to use The Layman’s Music Book and The Gist of Music for class work, the [LMC] is prepared to furnish sets of the lantern slides used by the author” (Layman’s, 279). These slides were apparently an important part of the LMC’s teaching strategy: “A regular Initiation Course of the [LMC] comprises twenty lectures given with the distinctive visual aid of specially designed lantern slides and appropriate phonograph records for musical illustration” (Listener’s, 280). It should also be noted that Samaroff borrowed an example from Wedge’s The Gist for her Music Manual (see p. 24 of the latter, in which a diagram and musical illustrations of the pentatonic scale are taken from The Gist, pp. 2–3).

\(^\text{149}\)From the announcement by John Erskine, President of the Juilliard School of Music, in The Baton, “The Juilliard Summer School: A New Enterprise / George A. Wedge, Director,” vol. 11/5 (1932), 3. Erskine would later add that the “summer courses . . . were designed for music teachers from distant parts of the country who might wish to do advanced study at the Juilliard School but who were not free to come during the winter term” (Erskine, My Life in Music, 134).
Wedge’s comments about the JSS, from that first year, already suggest a middlebrow agenda: the purpose of music education is “to meet the demands of [the] new music consciousness of the country,” now that “[m]usic has become a part of the daily life of the majority of people.” He also refers to “adult beginner[s],” and to the studies of “[m]ature people,” and thereby hints at those transitioning from laypeople to musicians. Along these lines, it should be noted that the IMA began offering extension courses the following year, under Wedge’s supervision. They were designed for amateurs, as well as for professional musicians and teachers; and “requests by laymen for such instruction” were cited as catalysts for the courses. As Wedge observed, such requests demonstrated “the general sweep of the country . . . toward cultural things,” and that people wanted “self-education along these lines.”  

The association of Wedge and Samaroff at the JSS had begun by 1934, when both were listed as conducting “a normal course for teachers.” Then, for the first session to be convened after The Gist and Layman’s were published—that of summer 1936—the JSS offered “Special Courses for the Music Educator,” including both the “Layman’s Music Normal Course” and “The Gist of Music.” The former was conducted by Samaroff’s assistant, Harriett Johnson, and the latter by Wedge himself. These courses were then repeated the following two summers. An announcement for the 1937 session fleshes out the details, noting that the JSS

---

150 See *New York Times*, “Activities of Musicians Here and Afield” (22 Jan. 1933), X6; and *New York Times*, “Activities of Musicians Here and Afield” (5 Feb. 1933), X6. Quotations are from the latter.

151 *New York Times*, “Activities of Musicians Here and Afield” (6 May 1934), X5. “Normal schools” (and by extension “normal courses”) exist for the training of teachers; thus “a normal course for teachers” is redundant, unless perhaps it distinguishes a course for current teachers from one for prospective teachers.

152 From an advertisement for the school in *Music Educators Journal* 22/5 (1936), 69.

153 For the 1937 iteration, see *New York Times*, “Planned for the Summer” (13 June 1937), 178, in which Johnson’s course is described as “a course for teachers in methods of presenting music designed primarily for the layman,” and Wedge’s “series of lectures on ‘The Gist of Music’” is described as being offered “[i]n connection” with the former course. For the 1938 iteration, see an advertisement for the JSS in *Music Educators Journal* 24/5 (1938), 11, in which it is noted that the LMC course is to be conducted by Huddie J. O’Brien (not Johnson).
will offer unusual opportunities to adults who wish to study music as an avocation and for teachers who wish to acquire new methods of presenting music and music appreciation to the lay person.

[Among the curriculum’s special courses are the following.] “The Gist of Music” under the direction of George Wedge, will cover the methods and materials for teaching the fundamentals of theory and ear-training necessary for the adult to comprehend music. Combined with this course Harriet Johnson will conduct the Layman’s Music Course. This course was evolved from laboratory classes by Olga Samaroff Stokowski and is designed to develop active listening in the adult layman. The fundamentals of music history are taught from the standpoint of evolution, and illustrated by appropriate musical experience. [. . .]

These courses for the layman are being offered not in the form of courses in appreciation of music classes but with the idea of developing a sufficient understanding and background to acquire appreciation naturally.154

The ending declaration that these were not “appreciation of music classes” should be understood in the context of a growing backlash against such classes (and books), as expressed most notably a couple of years later, in composer and critic Virgil Thomson’s indictment of what he called “The Appreciation-racket.”155 He criticized the appreciation literature for “transmit[ting] no firm knowledge and describ[ing] no real practice,”156 and found the whole enterprise to be a pseudo-educational scheme that existed only to make money for schools and publishers. Such harsh criticism helps explain a rebuttal offered a decade later, upon Samaroff’s death, when a eulogy asserted that “[s]he did not go in for music appreciation,” but instead “tried to teach the layman to hear with awareness. She sought, as she said, for the musical equivalent of literacy.”157

Wherever the line is drawn with respect to coaching one in musical literacy versus perpetuating an educational “racket,” or to providing “technical” and hands-on knowledge versus merely “esthetic” discussions and “passive” experiences (to quote some of Thomson’s words),\(^{158}\) Wedge’s *Gist* would surely fall on the more positive side of the line. Although it was a product of the middlebrow project and the allied appreciation movement, it attempted to communicate some of the principal ideas of music—i.e., its “gist”—through purely musical means. As Wedge noted in the Foreword, although “a superficial knowledge of any art may result from reading about it”—and presumably also from hearing lectures about it—“a real appreciation comes only through active experience in the medium of the art.”\(^ {159}\)

IV.

Having explored a broad range of Wedge’s educational endeavors, let us now return to the topic broached at the outset of this essay: the “Americanization” of Schenkerian theory and analysis, and the ways in which Wedge anticipated it.\(^ {160}\) Generally speaking, to Americanize something means to remake it in terms of characteristics that are emblematic of the customs and institutions of the US; or, to state it negatively, to strip away any elements that are antithetical to those characteristics. In William Rothstein’s “Americanization” essay, for example, he cited several of Schenker’s views that are at odds with traditional American perspectives, including his “aristocratic attitude” toward music and culture (which pitted the German genius against the masses), and the “unbending absolutism” with which he upheld “revealed musical law[s]”


\(^{159}\) Wedge, *The Gist*, iii.

\(^{160}\) Because of the sometimes problematic implications of “Americanization” (and its related forms), in the following the reader should always imagine quotation marks about the word, although I have refrained from using actual quotation marks due to the tedium they would produce.
(which were essentially akin to the Laws of God, and thus inviolable). These views had to be jettisoned—or greatly palliated—in order for Schenker’s followers to be accepted into the American academy.

More generally, Schenkerians had to hew to what Rothstein called Rule One, “the antidogma rule”: the belief that “no tenet should be too fiercely held.” In the academy, “[e]very truth . . . must be provisional; it must be partial, not comprehensive; it must acknowledge the meritorious aspects of competing ideas; and it must be ready to adapt or even give way to new discoveries.” The need to accept Rule One was in fact recognized early on, by the first pupil of Schenker to teach here. In July 1938, Hans Weisse wrote to fellow pupil Oswald Jonas, to offer advice about the latter’s coming to the US. Weisse explained that, although he had lived here several years, he still had “to begin from the beginning” in some ways, as he had “started in ignorance of the American psychology and mentality.” Thus, he implored Jonas to “drop the absolutely uncompromising, overly polemical side of Schenkerian theory.”

Of course, it is easy to imagine why Weisse and Jonas—both born in Vienna in the 1890s—needed to modify their approach in order to teach American students of the 1930s (and afterwards) more effectively. Indeed, given their status as emigrants, we might imagine that it was not just their mode of instruction that needed Americanizing, but their broader temperament as well. With Wedge, who was of the same generation but New England–born, it might seem

---

axiomatic that no Americanization was necessary. But it should be recalled that even American-born advocates of Schenker’s ideas sometimes absorbed his dogmatism and bellicosity along with his theories *per se*. This is true whether one considers comparatively minor figures such as Victor Lytle, a student of Weisse’s who authored an anti-modernist screed in 1931, with some polemical passages drawn directly from Schenker’s own writings,\(^{164}\) or more significant figures such as Adele Katz, who had also studied with Weisse, and whose writing has been characterized as “pugnacious” and “gladiatorial” even by fellow Schenkerian Allen Forte.\(^{165}\) Both writers—though American—ran afoul of an important corollary to Rule One: the need to carefully modulate one’s rhetoric; to “master some form of the American academic dialect, which is sober and dispassionate.”\(^{166}\) In some ways, then, their work was no more Americanized (in Rothstein’s sense) than that of certain émigrés.

To explain the issue more precisely, we need to refine our use of two key words: accommodation and assimilation. In the sociological theories of Robert Park and Ernest Burgess, these are the final two of four stages of interaction (the first two being competition and conflict) in a process that is sometimes taken to be the route to Americanization.\(^{167}\) For them, social *accommodation* is born of conflict. It represents an outsider’s adjustment to a new environment, and the

---


\(^{166}\) Rothstein, “The Americanization of Heinrich Schenker,” 197.

consensus that is reached among the involved parties (insider and outsider). Through accommo-
dation, the “antagonism” of the outside element becomes regulated and overt conflict dissipates, “although it remains latent as a potential force.” Through assimilation, this “antagonism” may be “wholly dissolved.” Assimilation—which in the broader social realm is represented by the “melting pot” metaphor—“is a process of interpenetration and fusion” through which formerly disparate elements become incorporated into a common culture. For many early Schenkerians in the US (whether European- or American-born), the nature of Schenker’s ideas required an overt rejection of other (competing) views of music, and hence antagonism was the norm. To the extent that these individuals could become successful in American institutions of higher learning, accommodation was necessary; however, it often remained an uneasy truce, with conflict latent. Assimilation was perhaps mostly for those of a future generation: those that came of age when Schenkerian and conventional ideas coexisted in curricula, and when the latitude to draw from both was more viable.

Wedge seems to have had no problem presenting Schenkerian ideas in a properly Ameri-
canized manner, not because he was American-born but because he managed to combine Schenkerian and conventional ideas in a way that essentially bypassed “accommodation” and went directly into “assimilation” mode. Perhaps it was due to the fact that he discovered Schenker’s ideas around the age of thirty-five, after years of teaching in more traditional ways; or perhaps it was due to his having a more even-handed temperament, or one more accepting of eclecticism. Whatever the case, unlike Katz or Lytle, he avoided a polemical tone and struck a balance between established and new theories. With regard to Schenker’s ideas, he taught both

---

168 The quotations in this summary are drawn from Park and Burgess, Introduction to the Science of Sociology, 663–665 and 734–737.
melodic and harmonic expansions; he hewed to a monotonal viewpoint that embraced chord hierarchy through the idea of “embellishing” chromatic chords; and he pointed toward longer-range hearing through brief examples that introduced chord “expansions” (i.e., prolongations), through more extensive examples given in a type of metric reduction (which also resuscitated the use of figured bass at a time when others were discrediting it), through the “Swanee River” example, with its $\frac{3}{4} - \frac{2}{4}$ underpinning, and through the “Liebestod” graph that exhibited internal hierarchy. But he did all of this while directing his work—in true American democratic fashion—toward conventional but “average” music students as well as laypeople, and in ways that synthesized the preceding ideas with traditional elements of American pedagogy. Accordingly, Wedge’s work may be thought of as offering a foretaste of the Americanization of Schenker that was to follow in the academy.

V.

In the course of our study of Wedge and his engagement with Schenker’s ideas, we have noted others at the IMA who also shared an interest in Schenker. Therefore, it is only proper that we conclude this essay by broadening our perspective from the individual to the institution. We will now consider the extent to which the IMA—and not just via Wedge—became a conduit through which musicians learned of Schenker, at a time before the latter’s name was prominent in this country.

First let us consider some of the faculty members, other than Wedge, who would have been in a position to impart something about Schenker. (A summary list appears in Figure 22a.) We have already discussed Henriette Michelson (1883–1958), the pianist who studied with Schenker (and apparently with Weisse too) at least in 1923, and wrote a brief essay on
Schenker’s work in 1927. We have also mentioned music critic Irving Kolodin (1908–88), who taught at the IMA for a year (1930–31) before writing a general-readership article on the *Urlinie* in 1932.

Another student of Weisse’s also briefly taught there: the composer Carl Bricken (1898–1971). After completing a B.A. at Yale (1922), he studied variously in the 1920s, including at Mannes with Rosario Scalero (composition) and Ralph Leopold and Berthe Bert (piano); at the
Berry: Schenker’s First “Americanization”

École Normale in Paris (piano diploma, 1926); at the Curtis Institute of Music (composition diploma, 1928); and in Vienna with Weisse (composition, 1929–30). During these years, Bricken also taught: piano at Mannes (1925–29), and theory and keyboard harmony at the IMA (1928–30). He then left New York to become chairman of the music department at the University of Chicago (1931ff.).\(^{169}\) As his studies with Weisse apparently overlapped the last year he was at the IMA, it is possible that he learned of Weisse from Wedge or Michelson (or someone else there); and it’s possible too that he might have had something to impart to students about Schenker’s work (as did Wedge and Michelson). The ideas he learned certainly seem to have stayed with him. In 1936 he delivered a paper (subsequently published) that offered a more “objective” kind of musical criticism, for which he adapted certain Schenkerian concepts to serve as the so-called machinery of his approach.\(^{170}\)

A more significant figure within the world of music theory was Howard A. Murphy (1896–1962). After receiving a Mus.B. degree from Knox College (Illinois) in 1915, Murphy went to the IMA, where he studied organ, theory, and composition (much as Wedge had done a few years before). It is not known to what extent (if any) he had contact with Wedge during his student phase,\(^{171}\) but in 1920 he joined the theory faculty, where he initially acted as an assistant to Wedge, teaching a section of students from the latter’s large theory class. Murphy stayed at the IMA until 1936 (after which time he assumed full-time employment at Teachers College,

\(^{169}\) Of the biographical sources on Bricken, two of the most detailed are the entries found in *The International Who is Who in Music*, 5th ed. (Chicago: Who is Who in Music, 1951), 84–85; and *The National Cyclopedia of American Biography*, vol. 57 (Clifton, NJ: James T. White, 1977), 237–238. The details given here are drawn from these sources, although some of the dates of Bricken’s studies are hard to summarize, as they seem to have been open ended and overlap with other dates. Both sources cite 1929–30 as the period of his studies with Weisse (although of course the 1977 source might have taken its dating directly from the 1951 source).


\(^{171}\) According to Olsen (*Howard A. Murphy*, 26), Murphy studied composition and theory with Goetschius, and ear-training with Helen Whiley and Franklin Robinson.
where he had taught concurrently since 1927); thus, he would have had close contact with
Wedge during and after the time the latter became aware of Schenker’s work.\textsuperscript{172} Moreover, for
many years Murphy hewed closely to Wedge’s teaching syllabus, not only at the IMA, but at
Teachers College;\textsuperscript{173} and he continued to use the second volume of Wedge’s \textit{Applied Harmony}
(with its reductions and descriptions of chord “expansions”) until his retirement in 1961.\textsuperscript{174} Thus,
if Wedge was including something about Schenker in his lectures, then Murphy might have been
too.

There are additional, more concrete examples of Murphy’s interest in Schenker. He
explicitly referred to Schenker in the chapter on “Analyzing,” in his book \textit{Teaching
Musicianship: A Manual of Methods and Materials} (1950), where he advocated using a combi-
nation of Schenker’s “linear approach” and Riemann’s “tonal functions.”\textsuperscript{175} He served on the
committee of Israel Silberman’s Columbia dissertation (1949), which offered a “comparative
study” of the theories of Schenker, Riemann, Hindemith, and Schillinger (with the chapter on
Schenker being twice the length of those devoted to the other three).\textsuperscript{176} He reportedly was the one

\textsuperscript{172} Murphy left the IMA around the time that Wedge moved from teaching to administration, so in a sense their
years actively teaching there ended around the same time. Once Murphy became a full member of the Teachers
College faculty, he ascended the ranks, becoming assistant professor in 1936, associate professor in 1940, and full
professor in 1948.

\textsuperscript{173} Olsen makes several remarks to this effect; e.g., “Murphy adhered closely to Wedge’s theory syllabus at The
Institute of Musical Art, and there is reason to believe that Wedge’s syllabus was in use at Teachers College until
1938” (Olsen, \textit{Howard A. Murphy}, 61; see also 27–29). Olsen also observes that “Murphy’s philosophy, methods
and materials of teaching theory were based partially on his experiences with Percy Goetschius and George Wedge:
Murphy maintained specific references to Goetschius and Wedge throughout his life” (34); and that “[s]everal of
Murphy’s former associates agree that there is a close relationship between the Wedge and the Murphy approaches
to theory teaching, and at least two sources attest that Murphy carried on the work of Wedge as a theorist and
teacher” (62).

\textsuperscript{174} Murphy’s materials for second-year theory at Teachers College (and the Manhattan School of Music) refer to
Wedge’s text; see Olsen, \textit{Howard A. Murphy}, 100, 117, and Appendix 4.

\textsuperscript{175} See Murphy, \textit{Teaching Musicianship}, 99–100.

\textsuperscript{176} Israel Silberman, \textit{A Comparative Study of Four Theories of Chord Function} (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia
Univ., 1949). Weisse’s student William J. Mitchell also served on the committee. Murphy draws on Silberman’s
work by outlining these same four theories in his book \textit{Teaching Musicianship}; see comments on 98–99. In his
“Acknowledgments,” Murphy notes that “he is indebted for permission to use the material on . . . [the] summary of
chord function theories (Dr. Israel Silberman)” (10).
who invited Weisse’s student Adele Katz to lecture at Teachers College in 1946–51, at which time Schenker’s view of music was communicated.\textsuperscript{177} He was one of the people who wrote testimonials for the dust jacket of Felix Salzer’s *Structural Hearing* (1952), in which he proclaimed that he had “long been acquainted with the Schenker approach, and believe[d] in it strongly, [as] it offers one of the most logical and comprehensive explanations of music structures.”\textsuperscript{178} And he was acknowledged for his “sustaining interest” in the preface to Allen Forte’s first book, *Contemporary Tone-Structures* (1955), which offered Schenker-influenced analytic sketches of twentieth-century compositions.\textsuperscript{179}

Although the extent to which Murphy incorporated Schenkerian ideas into “traditional” theory classes is not known, a surviving handout (from around 1960) is provocative. Shown in Figure 23 is Murphy’s “reduction” of a passage from the Finale of Brahms’s Second Symphony.\textsuperscript{180} It is used to illustrate “chromatic sequences at equal intervals” (in this case, a sequence by ascending whole steps). Murphy observes that such sequences “(1) expand either the I or V (that is, the entire sequential passage begins and ends on the same chord), or (2) they move from I to V, or V to I (beginning and ending on different chords).”\textsuperscript{181} He clarifies the tonal function of Brahms’s excerpt by beaming the initial I to the V, and adding a Salzer-influenced arrow from

\textsuperscript{177} During this time, Katz taught an evening course each term entitled “Analysis in Relation to Hearing and Performance.” It was expressly described in the Teachers College bulletins as a course on “The Schenker approach to the problems of musical structure.” Allen Forte (who received his B.A. and M.A. from Columbia in 1950 and 1952, respectively) has told me that Murphy regularly invited Katz to lecture on Schenker at Teachers College. These lectures might have been independent of the cited Schenker course, or they might have been identical to it (Forte did not attend them, so he is unsure).

\textsuperscript{178} The “tributes” (as they are labeled) appear on the dust jacket of the first edition of Salzer, *Structural Hearing*, on the back cover and inside back flap.

\textsuperscript{179} See Allen Forte, *Contemporary Tone-Structures* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia Univ. Teachers College, 1955), vi: “I want to acknowledge my indebtedness to Howard A. Murphy for his sustaining interest.”

\textsuperscript{180} The handout is reproduced in Olsen, *Howard A. Murphy*, 235; it is undated but, based on surrounding dated ones, it is perhaps from 1960. The original has handwritten music examples and typewritten commentary.

\textsuperscript{181} Observe Murphy’s use of “expand”—a significant term discussed previously with regard to Wedge’s usage in *Applied Harmony*. 
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the parenthetical II to the V, to show the underlying directed motion.\textsuperscript{182} He retains Wedge’s “X\textsubscript{7},” indication for dominant-seventh sonorities, and brackets the two $\frac{6}{4}$ chords, presumably to show their subordinate status within the progression. Observe that once the V chord is attained, it is prolonged (as we would say, and as Murphy’s arrow suggests) over a stationary bass.

Thus we have Wedge, Michelson, and Murphy, all of whom were at the IMA for an extended period; and Bricken and Kolodin, who were there briefly. Accordingly, the IMA was a place where one could expect (at least in hindsight) something about Schenker to have been communicated. This would have been especially true during the years 1925–36/37—that is, a period that commenced with Warburg’s notice about Wedge (fall 1925), and ended around the time that Murphy left (1936) and Wedge moved from teaching to administration (1937).

\textsuperscript{182}In \textit{Structural Hearing}, Salzer made frequent use of a line with right-pointing arrow, aligned with the Roman numerals underneath an analysis. As he explained the symbol: “Horizontal, solid arrows (used mostly in regard to bass motions) indicate the direction or driving tendency of the music in general, or passing motions in particular” (II: xiii). Schenker, on the other hand, used the symbol in \textit{Free Composition} only for the auxiliary cadence (\textit{Hilfs-kadenz}), which is a progression that begins with something other than a root-position tonic, and ends V–I (with its initiation being a true “beginning”—i.e., closed off from the preceding harmonies).
(Michelson was there during this whole time, and Bricken’s and Kolodin’s brief teaching stints also fell within this period.)

So, what evidence exists from IMA students, in fulfillment of these expectations? It must be acknowledged first that the IMA was not a research institution (like a university), and thus one would not necessarily expect its students to write articles or leave behind other tangible evidence of Schenkerian influence. And yet, a few did. (A summary list appears in Figure 22b.) Kolodin, it will be recalled, had been a student at the IMA prior to teaching there; and in his article, he claimed to have been introduced to the *Urlinie* by Wedge. Around the same time that Kolodin was at the IMA (i.e., 1927–31), Canadian-American composer Charles Jones (1910–97) was there studying violin (1928–32), and he also claimed to have learned something of Schenker from Wedge (although he did not publish on the subject). More circumstantially, there is Arthur Plettner (1904–99), a conductor and composer who authored a 1936 report on Schenker for *Musical America*. He studied at the Juilliard Graduate School around 1932–35, which was then the sister institute of the IMA, housed in an adjacent building. Plettner’s composition and theory teacher was Bernard Wagenaar, who since 1925 had also taught these subjects at the IMA, as a colleague of department head Wedge. Given these connections, and the fact that Plettner’s article was published the year after he left Juilliard, it seems likely that

---

183 No traces of Wedge’s theoretical program survived his retirement from the IMA, due to the reorganizations of 1946 and afterward by Juilliard’s newly appointed president, William Schuman (see also comments in n. 18). Schuman replaced existing theory instruction with a new and evolving “Literature and Materials of Music” program, staffed mainly by composers. For more on this topic, see William Schuman, “On Teaching the Literature and Materials of Music,” *Musical Quarterly* 34/2 (1948): 155–168; and Juilliard School of Music, *The Juilliard Report on Teaching the Literature and Materials of Music* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1953).

184 See citation in n. 40.

185 Jones mentioned to Carl Schachter that he learned of Schenker from Wedge; Schachter later imparted this information to me in a personal conversation.

someone there was his source for learning about Schenker.\footnote{After leaving the IMA, Charles Jones also studied composition at the Juilliard Graduate School under Wagenaar.} Finally, and most notable of all within Schenkerian circles, there is the theorist William J. Mitchell (1906–71). Mitchell was a student at the IMA in 1925–29, a period that began the year Warburg reported that Wedge was “lecturing on the Urlinie,” and overlapped with the years that Kolodin and Jones were there. Significantly, this period also immediately preceded Mitchell’s 1930–31 studies with Weisse, in Vienna.\footnote{Mitchell returned to Columbia in 1932, where he taught and, in 1938, earned a Master of Arts degree. He rose through the ranks of professorships and eventually served as chair of the music department; he remained there until 1968. His undergraduate textbook, \textit{Elementary Harmony} (1939), is thought to be the first American text to incorporate Schenkerian ideas in an explicit and acknowledged manner (although it is not a text on “Schenkerian analysis”). Several of Mitchell’s articles were Schenkerian in focus, including one on “Heinrich Schenker’s Approach to Detail,” \textit{Musicology} 1/2 (1946): 117–128 (reprinted in \textit{Theory and Practice} 10/1–2 [1985]: 51–62). He was a co-founding editor (with Felix Salzer) of \textit{The Music Forum} series (begun in 1967), which was largely devoted to Schenkerian studies. At Columbia and the affiliated Barnard College, Mitchell introduced Schenkerian materials (e.g., Hedi Siegel has told me that while she was at Barnard, in the late 1950s, Mitchell taught an analysis course that was Schenkerian in approach, and that in the Columbia graduate program he taught a seminar on the history of theory, in which some of Schenker’s theoretical writings were discussed in depth). He also worked with doctoral students whose dissertations engaged Schenker’s ideas; e.g., he was a member of the committee for Israel Silberman’s previously cited dissertation (see n. 176); and he likewise served Sonia Slatin’s Ph.D. dissertation, \textit{The Theories of Heinrich Schenker in Perspective} (Columbia Univ., 1967), which is more notable due to its exclusive focus on Schenker.} Thus, circumstances were favorable for Mitchell to have first learned of Schenker at the IMA (and perhaps to have heard about Weisse there, too); nonetheless, one can only speculate.\footnote{In personal communications with the author, Alice Mitchell (William Mitchell’s widow), John Rothgeb, and Carl Schachter stated that they did not know if a specific person pointed Mitchell in Schenker’s direction (and if so, the identity of that person), or if Mitchell, who was interested in music theory early on, perhaps came upon Schenker largely by himself, through his readings.}

In sum, it is time to add the IMA to the short list of early institutions in New York at which Schenkerian ideas were communicated. The Mannes Music School (later Mannes College) of course commanded an unparalleled position in the dissemination of these ideas; and Columbia was also significant as “[t]he first university at which Schenkerian concepts had a measure of
continuing support.” But both of these institutions trace their Schenkerian beginnings to Weisse’s appointments, in October 1931 (for Mannes) and May 1932 (for Columbia). Activities at the IMA began six years earlier. And while there can be little doubt that the IMA was not a place for full-fledged tutelage in Schenkerian analysis (as Mannes would become), it certainly seems to have been a supportive place for learning about Schenker (and/or some of his key ideas). As Wedge was the person primarily responsible for promoting its Schenker-influenced agenda, it is time to acknowledge him as one who played a hitherto neglected role in the early circulation of Schenker’s approach to music.

---
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ABSTRACT

A quarter of a century ago, William Rothstein first spoke of the “Americanization of Heinrich Schenker,” meaning the accommodation that had to be made to bring his ideas into the American academy. The focus of this process has largely been on activities following the Second World War.
War. However, the *earliest* attempt at Americanizing Schenker seems to have come from an American-born pedagogue who had not studied with Schenker or his pupils: George A. Wedge, a theory instructor at New York’s Institute of Musical Art (a precursor to The Juilliard School). He started teaching something about Schenker in his classrooms as early as 1925, incorporated some of Schenker’s concepts into a popular harmony textbook in 1930–31, and subsequently distilled some of these ideas for the musical layperson, as part of a “middlebrow” or “appreciation” agenda that he and Olga Samaroff Stokowski advanced in books and at the Juilliard Summer School. Thus, Schenker’s route to Americanization took some previously unrecognized and “home-grown” turns along the way to the process outlined by Rothstein.

In this essay, I document and contextualize Wedge’s activities in five principal sections. First, I present details about his career, and investigate how he came to encounter Schenker’s ideas. Second, I explore his writings in order to discern their Schenkerian influences (which must be filtered from related elements of American pedagogy). Third, I consider Wedge’s (and Samaroff’s) pedagogical agenda of the 1930s, which involved bringing musical education to a mass audience. Fourth, I contemplate how Wedge’s work was a portent of the “Americanized” Schenker pedagogy that developed in later years. Fifth and finally, I demonstrate how—even beyond Wedge—the Institute of Musical Art became a conduit for learning about Schenker, especially between 1925 and 1936/37, and I argue that its name should be added to the list of early institutions in New York at which Schenkerian ideas were communicated.

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

---

**HOW TO CITE THIS ARTICLE**

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


---

**ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

David Carson Berry is Associate Professor of Music Theory at the University of Cincinnati’s College-Conservatory of Music. His research interests are wide-ranging and embrace American popular music of the 1920s–60s, including a focus on Irving Berlin and Jimmy Van Heusen; the theory and aesthetics of music of the mid-eighteenth through mid-twentieth centuries, including a focus on Igor Stravinsky; and Schenkerian theory and its reception history in the US. On those and other topics, he has delivered numerous papers at various academic venues in the US and Europe, and has published several articles and reviews.

*This article uploaded to the Gamut site on 18 April 2012.*