are now unknown. Eduard Hanslick seems to have brought the poem in question to Brahms's attention (see Brahms/Herzogenberg, Briefwechsel, 2: 135n); perhaps he lent Brahms a copy of Lingg's Gedichte as well. In any case, the transcription here follows the poem as found in Hermann Lingg, Gedichte. Dritte vermehrte Auflage (Stuttgart and Augsburg: Cotta, 1857), 56. The poem is reproduced identically in both the second and fourth editions (published by Cotta in 1855 and 1860, respectively).


PART VI

TRANSFORMATION, ANALYSIS, CRITICISM

It has been variously noted that neo-Riemannian theory emerged as a force to be reckoned with at exactly the time when the project of music theory and analysis in the Anglo-American academy had to parry a fundamental critique of its aims and assumptions. This is hardly a coincidence. Certain positions of neo-Riemannian theory can be seen as direct responses to the main points of criticism: tonal unity, the all-encompassing claims of analysis, and ultimately the deep connections with the idea of the musical work. It is especially these points that neo-Riemannian theory has scaled back and rethought, and it is these points, one might further add, that are most at odds with (paleo-)Riemann's own theoretical project.

As a consequence, it is rare to find neo-Riemannian theories being applied beginning to end in a piece of music. Yet some of the most powerful insights can be gained through the interaction of neo-Riemannian theories with other music-theoretical approaches. Indeed, it is the very flexibility of the approach that gives neo-Riemannian analysis its innovative strength. At the same time, a few fundamental questions have remained unanswered—or have received answers that are tailor-made to specific situations. The question of what kind of tonality, if any, neo-Riemannian theory represents has occasionally been raised. Similarly, the question of repertoire—predominantly, from Schubert to Strauss—is intriguing: do the triadic and chromatic works for which neo-Riemannian theory works best form a coherent
reertoire of their own? The essays in this section seek to address some of these questions that lead us into the wider aesthetical realm. In addressing how ideas that originated with Riemann may respond to contemporary analytical challenges, the essays in this section open up new paths and offer suggestions for further work.

In the opening essay, Steven Rings considers a work that was the topic of Riemann's first published analysis: Schubert's triadic but highly chromatic Gb-major Impromptu. Rings compares Riemann's own analysis of the work with a neo-Riemannian view inspired by the writings of Richard Cohn, assessing the differences in analytical methodology and technology, and locating those differences within the divergent ideologies of the two approaches. Rings's central concern, however, is not with the analytical technologies themselves, but rather with the assumptions and values that underlie the distinct analytical perspectives. Rings focuses on analytical values with an eye toward synthesis: an enrichment of the neo-Riemannian perspective through an engagement with the ethical and methodological concerns of the paleo-Riemannian approach.

In the following chapter, Robert Cook performs a virtuosic hermeneutic analysis of César Franck's Le chasseur maudit, which serves further as an extended and elegant reflection on the potential and limitations various analytical frameworks. Cook situates his analysis with respect to notions of chromatic music, in particular the idea that chromaticism poses analytical difficulties that Riemannian and neo-Riemannian perspectives are particularly well suited to address. After considering the work from both functional and linear perspectives and examining the conceptual problems that attend each, Cook illustrates how a contextual, neo-Riemannian view can capture the work's salient gestures, and offers a balance between a desire to understand the work as a reflection of an orderly, conceptually coherent relational system and the need to engage the aural experience of the music.

Daniel Harrison closes this part of the book with a three-section essay, exploring certain interrelated themes and questions central to the transformational and neo-Riemannian enterprise. Part one problematizes the natures of musical objects and relations within the transformational worldview, and asks what happens when we try to imagine tones and chords not as objects but as transformations, the products of movement, or—to employ more Kurthian language—not as sensuous but as energetic entities. Harrison delves further into the object/transformation dichotomy in the second section, deftly exploring the structural and functional differences among dissonant and consonant trichords in a particular nonatonic cycle. The essay, a fantasy on a variety of speculative and historical themes, explores how voice leading, functional, and set-theoretical implications of the cycle might be profitably engaged by a transformational perspective as a means to impart "sensuous distinctions" among otherwise indifferent transformations. The third section investigates the analytical ramifications of the first two sections. Vaughan Williams' neo-modal triadic Fantasia on a Theme by Thomas Tallis provides the soil in which these considerations can take root.
The tonal bottom seems to drop out of the music here: in just over two measures we progress from the tonic Gb major, through B minor, to G minor. A menacing bass trill on C in measure 79 announces the imminent arrival of the latter—we hear the G-minor chord coming before it sounds. (Such a menacing trill could hardly be preparing us for G major.) Miraculously, this forecasting does not lessen the shock of the chord when it actually arrives.

The G-minor chord of course admits of a tonal interpretation: it is the minor Neapolitan, enharmonically respelled. The chord nevertheless emanates a surplus of harmonic energy, overflowing the bounds of such a familiar tonal category. This surplus registers not only sonically, but also in the notation. Spelled “correctly,” the chord would be Ab minor; as a tonic, its key signature would have 14 flats (that is, double flats on every diatonic pitch). Schubert has already begun from a point of flatward extremity: given his six-flat signature, any motion flatward will exert pressure on the notation. In the passage in question, the flatward pressure is so great that it forces an enharmonic snap in the music, creating visual fissures on the page where the six-flat signature is cancelled in measure 79 and then reinstated halfway through measure 80. The reinstatement coincides with a G flats augmented-sixth chord which effortlessly hauls the music back from its G-minor nadir, leading to a confirming cadential progression in Gb.

The passage is a great intensification of a gesture Schubert has traced throughout the piece, beginning with the first phrase: a bass descent in thirds from the tonic into subdominant regions, with a return by ascent at the last minute, under dominant energy. The descent in example 18.1, however, proceeds so far in the subdominant direction that it has the character of a tonal crisis or trauma, the intensity of which registers visually on the page, in the fissured notation. We can indeed hold the Gb tonic in our ears throughout the passage—thus retaining the minor-Neapolitan hearing—but it takes some effort to do so. If we listen while looking at Schubert’s fractured score—perhaps while playing the piece—we may be encouraged to give up that effort altogether, opening our ears to the chord’s extratonic surplus.

How we respond to such a passage analytically says much about what we value in music—and in musical analysis (the two are not necessarily the same). Given its harmonic complexities, Schubert’s passage provides an especially fruitful context for exploring some of the divergent values inherent in (echt-)Riemannian and neo-Riemannian approaches to harmonic analysis. The various technical differences between Riemann’s harmonic theory (in its many iterations) and neo-Riemannian theory (in its many iterations) are, by now, relatively well known. Less attention has been paid, however, to the theories’ strikingly different attitudes toward the analytical act itself, including the different ways they seem to value music (in both senses: “cherish music” and “invest music with value”). Such differences are, it need hardly be said, products of the theories’ highly distinct historical, ideological, and cultural moments.

In what follows, I will take an initial step toward mapping some of these divergences in value (and uncovering some unexpected points of contact), taking Schubert’s G flats Impromptu as a point of reference. Section II compares a model neo-Riemannian analysis of the passage—based on the work of Richard Cohn—to Riemann’s own analytical comments about the piece, which bookend his career, appearing first in the early Musikalische Syntax (1877) and then in the sixth edition of the Handbuch der Harmonielehre (1917). Section III then explores the methodological and ethical contrasts between the two approaches in depth, tracing aspects of the intellectual and ideological contexts in which they arose. The chapter concludes in section IV by considering some ways in which a technical rapprochement between the theories might open our ethical horizons, providing new ways in which we can value music through Riemann-inspired analytical activity.

II

It seems safe to say that the music in example 18.1 would catch the ear of any neo-Riemannian analyst, perhaps even providing the first point of analytical entry into the piece. (One thinks here of the many analytical forays into Parsifal that have begun not at the work’s outset, but with the most chromatically distorted version of the Grail motive, very near the end of act III.) Neo-Riemannians have often explored such passages by turning attention away from the traditional categories of tonal harmony and toward voice-leading efficiency, in an effort to detect pattern and regularity where there might otherwise appear to be tonal strain or disorder. By invoking enharmonic equivalence, such approaches further sidestep enharmonic compliances such as those discussed above. Example 18.2 sketches aspects of the Schubert passage from this perspective.

The grand staff at (b) shows a reduction of the passage. The single staff at (a) extracts Klänge from the music. A key at the bottom of the example explains the noteheads in (a), which indicate whether the note in question is a common tone from the previous chord or has moved by ici or ic2. A quick scan of the noteheads reveals that every chord maintains at least one common tone with its predecessor; furthermore, motion by ic1 predominates.

The annotations above staff (a) tally the results of the total voice-leading between the chords. DVLS is Richard Cohn’s “directed voice-leading sum.” It measures the directed voice-leading motion between chords, distinguishing between “up” and “down.” Thus, the first entry in the row, +2, indicates total voice-leading of two semitones “up” from G flats to the B: the two filled noteheads in the B—Klänge indicate the two voices that have moved up by semitone from G flats. The −2 that follows indicates total voice-leading of two semitones “down” from B to D flats, as one voice descends by whole tone. And so on. A clear pattern emerges: DVLS values alternate between +2 and −2 until the B flats (= D flats) chord of measure 80 proceeds to the G flats of measure 81, yielding a DVLS value of 0: here two voices move by semitone, but in opposite directions, canceling each other out. This is the very moment at which the G flats augmented-sixth chord wrenches the music back to a cadential progression in Gb. The “wrenching” registers here in the contrary motion of DVLS = 0, which ends the +2−2 tailspin.
The row below DVLS is labeled AVLS for "absolute voice-leading sum." This measurement takes no account of the direction of the voice-leading, instead measuring only the absolute distance traversed in interval classes, registering what Joseph Straus calls the total voice-leading "work" or "exertion" of the progression. Again, there is a clear pattern: AVLS is 2 for all entries until the cadential oscillation between $G^+$ and $D^+$, where it increments to 3. This reading notes a continuity in the progression from $B^+$ to $G^+$, which traverses the same absolute voice-leading distance as all of the preceding progressions. The wayward chromatic successions of the first part of the phrase thus all show AVLS = 2, while the key-reaffirming cadential tag in $G$ projects AVLS = 3.

The prevalence of 2s in the AVLS row suggests a particular voice-leading space which Cohn calls a "Weitzmann region." All of the chords in such a region relate to one another by AVLS = 2. Example 18.3(a) shows the Weitzmann region containing $G^+$. The solid, undirected edges circling the perimeter of the network indicate the transformations that relate adjacent triads within the system: $N$ and $R$. The former is Cohn's transformational label for Weitzmann's nebenuervandt relation; the latter is the familiar neo-Riemannian relative. Dashed edges indicate transformation between nonadjacent triads: Klänge "two apart" on the cycle are related by $PL$ or $LP$ (neither of which is common to the system), and those opposite one another are related by Lewin's SLIDE. These five transformations—$N, R, LP, PL,$ and SLIDE—are the only neo-Riemannian transformations (out of 24) for which AVLS = 2.

All of the Klänge in example 18.2(a), with the sole exception of the dominant $D^+$, reside in this Weitzmann region. Example 18.3(b) shows the passage's progression through the region, up to the $G^+$ cadential six-four in measure 81. The progression begins with $G^+$ at 12 o'clock and proceeds clockwise around the outer edge until it reaches $G$ at 6 o'clock. Along the way, an LP arrow leads from $B^-$ to $G$, indicating that the $D^+$ chord that intervenes in the second half of measure 79 plays a passing role between the two harmonies on the downbeats. On the "return trip" counterclockwise from $G$ back to $G^+$, a similar LP arrow leads from $D^+$ to $G^+$; this is the "wrenching" LP motion associated with the resolution of the augmented sixth to the cadential six-four. (The return trip bypasses $B^-$ altogether.) After returning to $G^+$, the music leaves this Weitzmann region to engage in the confirming cadential progression via AVLS = 3.

Other passages in the Impromptu also trace out significant portions of a single Weitzmann region. Most notable among these is the other highly "purple" patch in the piece—the sojourn to $C^+$ major and $B^+$ major within the B section (measures 32–53). This is mapped in example 18.4, which presents the three Weitzmann regions containing $G^+$, $C^+$, and $D^+$, labeling them $T, S$, and $D$ in a manner analogous to Richard Cohn's labels for hexatonic systems in his analysis of Schubert's Bb Sonata. The example first shows the move to $B^-$ and its dominant at the opening of the B section (measures 25–31); these harmonies still reside in the tonic region. Then, at measure 32, there is a move to the subdominant region's $C^+$, via an interregional $L$ transform of $B^-$: the first "purple" motion traced in the subdominant region is the alteration between $C^+$ and $B^-$ in measure 35. The dashed edges then link these chords to the next local tonic in the section, the $E^+$ that enters in measure 48, which leads to the transitional $A^-$ in measures 52–53. From here the music progresses to the dominant $D^+$, which is highlighted within its network on the right-hand side of the example. Notably, no other node is "lit up" within the dominant network—in fact, none of the other Klänge in the dominant region sound prominently anywhere in the Impromptu.
This is indicative of the way in which the Impromptu thoroughly explores the subdominant side of G\# but not its dominant side.15

To be sure, there are several infelicities in the analysis in example 18.4. For one and most obviously, the analysis leaves out many harmonies within the B section that do not fit into its regions, most notably all of the stormy diminished-seventh-based music in measures 40–45 and some local dominants. Furthermore, it leaves the question of the relationship between voice-leading efficiency and harmonic function (T, D, and S) somewhat undertheorized, conflating the two in a way that causes the distinction between chord and key to break down (e.g., by treating syntactical harmonies in the same way that it treats tonicized harmonies). Similarly, the separation of the tonic, dominant, and subdominant triads into separate regions seems to do violence to their local syntactic connectedness at the level of the phrase. These are familiar problems in certain strands of neo-Riemannian analysis. Yet, despite these shortcomings, the analysis provides a suggestive heuristic for tracing the piece’s voice-leading activity, showing the ways in which it navigates via AVLS = 2 in its most ear-catching passages.

This neo-Riemannian reading—only the beginning of a fuller analysis—has proceeded as such readings often do, beginning with the most chromatically exceptional moment in the piece and moving outward from there to construct a broader interpretation of the movement. Cohn takes a similar approach, for example, in his analysis of Schubert’s B flat Sonata, beginning by observing the hexatonic-polar relationship between the work’s B flat tonic and its F sharp secondary key area, then seeking out other hexatonic-polar progressions (such as the one at the transition into the development section), and ultimately constructing a hexatonic analysis of the entire movement.

The contrast with Riemann’s own analytical practice could hardly be more stark. We can see it by consulting his analysis of the G\# Impromptu, published in Musikalische Syntax in 1877. This is not only Riemann’s first published analysis, but also one of his longest, at seven pages. Not until the Beethoven piano sonata analyses from the end of his career would he publish further analyses of comparable scope and technical detail. His primary concern is the Impromptu’s phrase structure and its demonstration of the principles of harmonic syntax that he develops in the book, based on an arcane terminology developed from Oettingen.16 Riemann’s descriptions are often minutely detailed; he devotes an entire paragraph to the first phrase, and two paragraphs to measures 17–24.

And about the phrase in example 18.1 he says…almost nothing. The passage gets only a very brief passing mention in his main prose, but it is not singled out; it is simply listed as one of several progressions in the coda: “The final consolidation of the primary key through progressions [Thesen] to C minor, G major, A\# minor, and G major has a wholly excellent effect.”17 Riemann is referring here to the music in measures 74–81; note that he analyzes the piece in G major.18 The progression to A\# minor—the minor Neapolitan in measure 80—is given no special emphasis: it is merely the goal of one of the four Thesen that Riemann mentions. Even more strikingly, Riemann cites these progressions as playing a role in the “consolidation of the tonic” [Festigung der Haupentonality]. This is in vivid contrast to the comments at the head of this chapter, in which I suggested that the music in example 18.1 can be heard to lead to a tonal crisis, creating a harmonic surplus that overflows the tonal frame. Riemann, by contrast, hears in these measures nothing more than a final confirmation of the global tonic, a confirmation that, moreover, has an “excellent effect” [vorzüglicher Wirkung]. It is hard to tell exactly what aspects of the passage Riemann finds vorzüglich, but whatever they are, they seem to have little to do with any undermining of the tonal order. His language instead suggests a celebration of the piece’s confirmation of eternal tonal laws—its exemplary establishment and reinforcement of a Haupentonality. Thus, the passage that received so much attention in the neo-Riemannian account, serving as the starting point from which all other observations radiated, is little more than a footnote for Riemann, a negligible chromatic ripple on the surface of an exemplary tonal masterwork.

Indeed, Riemann frames his analysis in just this way, describing the Impromptu as a model citizen of the tonal realm, a “formally rather clearly structured composition.”19 He praises the piece’s orderly construction: “The whole is a masterpiece as regards not only melodic form and metric structure, but especially as regards the ordering of its progressions [Thesenordnung]. And over all of it reigns the tonality of G major, the principal key.”20 The second sentence makes clear Riemann’s firm commitment to monotonality. (Modern readers will be struck by the pre-echoes of Schenker and Schoenberg.) Ten years later he voiced a similar sentiment in a more general context in his Systematische Modulationslehre.

One is constantly struck by the controlling force [Geltung] of the main tonic, even during the boldest and most wide-ranging modulations. When we find ourselves at the end of the path, looking back, we know that we have learned how to trace ever wider circles around the unshakeable center.21
Though he is not specifically discussing the Impromptu here, this passage clearly applies to Riemann’s understanding of the piece, in which a single tonic not only controls the whole, but does so in model fashion. The piece’s harmonic excursions do not weaken the tonic, but instead contribute to its greater glory, concentrically expanding its domain. (Again, the Schoenbergian resonance is striking.)

There is only one other passage referring to the minor Neapolitan of measure 80 in Riemann’s extensive discussion of the piece. In a tabular overview of the piece’s harmonic progressions, he writes beneath the chord symbols for measures 79–80: “NB. Modulation to the antilogic antinomic third-key: g’—es.”22 The Oettingen-inspired terminology simply means a progression from G major to the minor harmony whose dual root is a major third below—that is, a progression from a G over-triad to an Es under-triad (i.e., A♭ minor). Again, it is not entirely clear just what we are to “note well” about the passage. The annotation could be taken for an exclamation of surprise, and perhaps admiration, at Schubert’s harmonic audacity: “Note well: A remarkable progression!” But the invocation of the arcane theoretical nomenclature might also suggest something quite different. We are to note not simply a striking progression, but the fact that the music proceeds to the antilogic antinomic third-key. This yields a very different sentiment: “Note well: My theory even has a name for this chord.”

Read in this latter sense, the statement seems to betray an anxiety, an attempt to contain the harmonic extravagance of the moment within the rational bounds of the theory.23 It suggests a desire to demonstrate that no part of the Impromptu eludes the theory’s explanatory reach: all of its harmonic maneuvers are easily contained and rationalized within the theory’s bounds. Riemann himself explicitly materializes the notion of spatialized boundaries to harmonic possibility in the book’s closing pages. Here he suggests that he has mapped out a spatialized realm of tonic order, comparing it to a harmonic Garden of Eden:

Thank God the combinations [of harmonies] are inexhaustible in number, and one cannot explore the area of harmony in its entirety by walking across it step by step but only by flying over it and surveying it from a bird’s-eye view. It is sufficient, however, to recognize the chief paths through this magnificent Garden of Eden, which Heaven has left us after the Fall; everybody may then find new side paths for himself leading to ever new perspectives on regions never entered before.24

Schubert’s progression would seem to represent one of the exotic, “new side paths” within this realm, off of the beaten track of the Hauptwege, but nevertheless admirable. Yet, as Alexander Rehding has noted, Riemann’s passage belies a profound worry: he presents the Garden of Eden as universal and transhistorical, but his language “implies at the same time a premonition—conscious or not—of its actual contingent nature...the whole theory is built on an angst of feeling, a Spenglerian feeling that the end of an age—the end of German music—is imminent.”25 The harmonies on the borders of the Garden are thus fraught with peril, and perhaps temptation. After all, the invocations of the Garden and the Fall vividly suggest the possibility of harmonic sin. To sin against the tonal order could bring about permanent banishment from the Garden—that is, banishment from the realm of tonal order into the atonal wilds.

Did Riemann have doubts as to whether Schubert’s minor Neapolitan might represent just such a harmonic sin? He may have. For we find him preoccupied with the chord forty years later, when revising his Handbuch der Harmonielehre for its sixth edition. His foreword to this edition of the Harmonielehre contains the last addition to the theory of functions, which he had first introduced in 1893’s Vereinfachte Harmonielehre. Rehding observes that the theory of functions represented a way to control and corral the overly permissive possibilities for harmonic progression in some of Riemann’s earlier harmonic theories, including that in Musikalische Syntax, thus better fortifying the boundary around the Garden of Eden.26 It thus makes sense that he would return to the Schubert chord to make sure its energy was contained within his new system.

In the foreword to the Handbuch, Riemann adds symbols for direct third relations, as well as a symbol for the modal Variante of any function—a ν after a function symbol, which simply switches the triad’s mode.27 The single example Riemann adduces for the new symbol is the minor Neapolitan from Schubert’s Impromptu, which he now analyzes as F7: the variant of the leading-tone change of the minor subdominant.28 Even with the new symbol, the chord clearly puts a strain on Riemann’s functional system, as it requires three alterations to the initial S function, which are made visible in the three accretions to the S symbol:

1. Major to minor (v);
2. Leading-tone change of that (>);
3. Variant of that (ν).

As Rehding has noted, Riemann otherwise seemed wary about admitting multiple alterations to a function symbol.29 And indeed, his wariness is apparent here: he calls the chord “exceptional” (an Ausnahmerscheinung) and otherwise uses the ν symbol only rarely in his later analyses.

Nevertheless, the sense of Riemann’s symbol is quite clear, and it is not that far from the way in which the chord would be analyzed in a modern American theory classroom using Roman numerals. Example 18.5 compares a Roman-numeral analysis of the passage at (a) with a full Riemannian-functional reading at (b) and the neo-Riemannian reading at (c). In order to make the progression’s correspondence to the tonal readings more legible, I have adjusted the enharmonic spelling.

The Roman-numeral interpretation constructs the chord on the downbeat of measure 80 as an alteration of a harmony built on the lowered second degree scale, while Riemann constructs it as a modification of subdominant function. There are important conceptual distinctions between the two theoretical concepts,30 but overall, the readings at (a) and (b) are quite similar: both trace a descent from tonic, via applied dominants,31 to an exotic, “subdominant-side” harmony, before pulling back to the dominant at the downbeat of measure 81. Both analyses show the greatest amount of cognitive work at the downbeat of measure 80 (though Riemann’s
This returns us to the broader question of value. The contrasts are as obvious as they are vivid. Riemann analytically constructs chromatic passages so that they show conformance to his tonal theories, which he portrays as universal laws.32 The neo-Riemannian analyst, by contrast, constructs chromatic passages so that they appear tonally "disunified," and thus require nontonal explanation. Riemann's theory thus places a high value on order and conformance to putative universals of tonal harmony, while neo-Riemannian theory, it would seem, values crisis and disruption of that order.33

We can better understand this sharp divergence if we briefly survey the intellectual and ideological contexts that nurtured Riemann's theory, on the one hand, and neo-Riemannian theories on the other. Riemann's context has been masterfully reconstructed by Alexander Rehding, so I will merely summarize his argument here. Rehding characterizes Riemann as seeking to define a universal "classicism"34 that transcends history and thus acts as a brake against further historical change in music, clearly demarcating the boundaries beyond which music should not progress. For Riemann, music theory had an ethical responsibility to set limits for composers, acting as "a bastion against historical change."35 Appeals to the burgeoning natural sciences allowed Riemann to provide "hard" support for his claims of universality,36 while institutional and pedagogical factors played a role as well, as he sought to develop a harmony pedagogy that would displace Roman-numeral based Weberian approaches, thus allowing him to influence future musicians directly, instructing them in the laws and limits of musical possibility. The result was a conservative theory shot through with a "relentless normativity."37 In short, Riemann sought, through this theory, to stem the tide of historical change in music, which seemed to him (rightly, it turns out) to be perilously close to transgressing the boundaries of the tonal Garden of Eden.38

By the time of the American revival of interest in Riemann's theoretical ideas in the 1980s and 1990s, that transgression had of course occurred long ago. Indeed, the crossing of music over the atonal threshold was one of the primary factors leading to the disciplinary consolidation of music theory in the American academy: theorists had taken advantage of the challenges posed by posttonal music to argue for the institutional necessity of music theory as a research discipline. Atonality, which before had been a looming threat to Riemann, to be resisted at all costs, now enjoyed great institutional privilege and prestige, especially among theorists in the second half of the twentieth century. That neo-Riemannian theorists would value tonal crisis far differently from Riemann should thus come as no surprise. If a given passage by, say, Wagner was perceived to veer perilously close to tonal incoherence, it could now be embraced analytically using the technologies of atonal theory, thus inheriting the institutional values associated with avant-garde atonal musics through a sort of ethical transitive property.

This is only part of the story, however. In the new, institutionalized theory of the American academy, analysis became an end in itself—a means of engaging
deeply with individual works via various technical hermeneutic genres, often with a liberal humanist focus on interpreting the telling compositional idiosyncrasy. Such a practice carries with it a strong element of Romantic ideology, with the individual work valued for its originality and uniqueness, as a product of genius. Neo-Riemannian theory clearly participates in this ideology, with its almost exclusive focus on the compositionally extraordinary. (The chromatic Grail motive is a classic case.) This is in stark contrast to Riemann's own practice, in which analysis serves first and foremost to illustrate and validate his theory. His analytical emphasis is not on what makes a work remarkable or individual, but on the ways in which it exemplifies the normative, law-like aspects of his theory. As Rehding observes, regarding Riemann's analysis of the "Waldstein" Sonata:

"It seems that Riemann is not interested in the special features of [the sonata's] opening. Rather—it would appear—he plays down the particularity of this opening in favor of its general features. While we have come to appreciate the first few bars of the "Waldstein" sonata as a paradigm of Beethoven's harmonic boldness, Riemann's analysis of this passage is actually a demonstration of its ordinariness."

Riemann's ability to find the ordinary within the compositionally extraordinary extends to all aspects of his theory, from harmony, to rhythm, phrase structure, and form. For example, he says of the first movement of Beethoven's op. 130: "Correctly interpreted, the movement offers no cause to speak of disruption and formal difficulty, but instead clearly shows the normal framework of sonata form." This breath-taking may not be anathema to Riemann: those associated with the atonal avant-garde on the one hand, and with postmodern critical practices on the other.

But, as Cohn makes clear, any commitment to the latter is trumped by more familiar music-theoretical concerns:

Both paradigms [neo-Riemannian theory and post-structuralist music criticism] recognize the potential for tonal disunity in music that uses classical harmonies, and accordingly resist shoehorning all chromatic triadic music into the framework of diatonic tonality. For the post-structuralist, the recognition of tonal disunity leads immediately to an ascription of disunity "tout court," and from there to a cluster of cognate terms:..."unstructured," "incoherent," "indeterminate," "coloristic," "disjunct," "arbitrary," or "aimless." The recognition of tonal disunity could instead lead to a question: "if this music is not fully coherent according to the principles of diatonic tonality, by what other principles might it cohere?"

Thus, despite nods to postmodern sensibilities, the most time-honored value of modernist music theory remains firmly intact: the demonstration of coherence through formalism. And here we find common ground with Riemann himself. For is the "coherence" of the neo-Riemannian analyst really that far removed from the "logic" or "syntax" of Riemann? Despite some obvious differences in philosophical underpinnings, both projects are undertaken by a drive toward systematization and logical rigor; a penchant for elegant, symmetrical theoretical structures; and a desire above all to detect order in complex music, containing harmonic extravagances in controlled, rational spaces. These values, it would appear, are pan-Riemannian.

But neo-Riemannian theory contains methodological tensions not present in Riemann. The high value it places on both disruption and coherence leads to a peculiar sort of hybridity or double focus. Surely a prime reason for the success of neo-Riemannian theory is the fact that it allows analysts to dwell on the most remarkable sounding passages in a chromatic work, those moments when the tonal fabric is stretched or torn. But it is not the remarkable sound of those passages that is analyzed; it is their coherence. One thus begins to wonder what the relationship is between the sound and the analysis. Is the "coherence" that the method detects responsible for what it is that makes these disorienting passages so aurally captivating? Or are the two unrelated? In other words, do we value the analysis for the same reasons that we value the music?
This question could surely be made of any style of systematic music analysis. But if it has a special urgency in neo-Riemannian practice, as critical responses to the theory attest. Charles Fisk, for example, states that Cohn’s analysis of Schubert’s Impromptu, Sonata runs the risk of “making even the most extraordinary progressions in Schubert seem ordinary—or at least, in some respects, normative.” (The echoes of Rehding’s interpretation of Riemann are striking, suggesting further pan-Riemannian similarities.) Fisk is concerned that Cohn’s theory does not do justice to the sound of Schubert’s music, making the aurally arresting seem theoretically commonplace. Cohn responds by invoking what amounts to a music-theoretic fact/value distinction, arguing that theoretical categories do not necessarily correlate with sonic effects in a simple one-to-one fashion, even in traditional theory. Cohens writing on the uncanny effects of hexatonic-polar progressions is an eloquent testament to this.

Nevertheless, Fisk’s criticism is hard to dismiss. The Schubert passage in example 18.1 sounds extraordinary, but the analysis of examples 18.2–4 does not tell us about that, instead revealing order and pattern in its voice-leading. We are thus left to wonder just what it is that this music does to us after it enters our ears, why it thrills and captivates us. Reflecting on this matter, we might come to value Riemann’s original theory a bit more. For Riemann throughout his career intended his theories to provide an answer to the question “Wie hören wir Musik?” That the question was always framed in normative terms (“How should we hear music?”) and that the answers were therefore tinged with a sense of prescriptive “ought” does not diminish greatly the value of his approach in this regard. Riemann’s focus was indeed on what happens to the music after it enters our ears, and despite his many theoretical and rhetorical excesses and detours, some of his ideas hit the mark so successfully that they remain with us, in some form or another, to this day. Chief among these is of course the idea of tonal function, whose influence is still felt, not only in Germany’s Musik Hochschulen, but also in many strands of Anglo-American Roman-numeral-based harmony, even in some Schenker pedagogy (however obfuscated the debt to Riemann may be). In the concluding section of the chapter, I will thus explore one way in which Riemann’s functional ideas can be reanimated in a transformational context, thus shedding some light on the remarkable sonic effect of Schubert’s passage, and narrowing the neo-Riemannian fact/value gap, if only slightly.

IV

Riemann’s functions model the relationship of harmonies to the tonic, either directly or via one of its two dominants. One way to interpret his function symbols is thus not as labels for chords, but as descriptions of the actions that listeners perform as they interpret sounding harmonies with respect to the tonic center. In this understanding, to hear a chord as a subdominant is to perform the subdominant operation (S), directing awareness from the sounding chord to the tonic via S. The S-ness of the perception resides not in the sounding harmony (the raw acoustic signal) but in the action whereby the listener relates it to the tonic.

We can trace such Riemannian intentional acts on various species of Tonnetz. Example 18.6 shows one such space that is useful in exploring Schubert’s Impromptu: a dual of the familiar neo-Riemannian Tonnetz that Michael Siciliano calls the “LRP map” and Douthett and Steinbach call the “Chicken-Wire Torus.” The edges represent the three canonical neo-Riemannian operators (P, L, and R), as shown by the key to the left. The network is rotated 90° from its usual presentation in neo-Riemannian studies (and in historical Tonnetze), so that fifth-related triads are on the vertical axis, capturing the familiar metaphor of dominants residing above a specified tonic, and subdominants “below.” Dominant (D) and subdominant (S) arrows can be added to this vertical dimension as necessary, to indicate direct functional relationships, while the P, L, and R dimensions allow for the modeling of Riemann’s Parallele (R), Leittonwechsel (L), and Variante (P) functional modifications. If enharmonically conformed, the network wraps around into a torus; it is arranged on the page here so that G#—the tonic of Schubert’s Impromptu, shown with a double border—has a central position.

Example 18.7(a) demonstrates the intentional paths traced by two modified subdominants in the Impromptu: the Es in measure 2, the second chord in the piece; and the Gb (= C-) minor Neapolitan of example 18.3, measure 30. The relevant Klänge are indicated with crosshatching, while solid dark arrows show the intentional paths traced by their Riemannian interpretations. The Es chord is
Ex. 18.7. (a) Intentional paths traced by two different subdominants in the Impromptu.
(b) Modal vectors within the functional space.

interpreted as a subdominant leading-tone change, or \( \text{\texttt{s}} \), suggesting an intentional path of \( \text{\texttt{LS}} \) back to the \( \text{\texttt{G}}^+ \) tonic, passing through the subdominant \( \text{\texttt{G}}^+ \) along the way. Note that if the same \( \text{\texttt{Klang}} \) were interpreted as a tonic parallel, \( \text{\texttt{TP}} \), it would trace out a different intentional path: directly back to the \( \text{\texttt{G}}^+ \) tonic via \( \text{\texttt{R}} \). Riemann's different interpretations of the same sounding chord thus traverse different paths in the space, making clear that, in the present interpretation, the function describes not the chord, but the path whereby it is related back to the tonic.

The minor Neapolitan, \( \text{\texttt{Alb}} \), is analyzed following Riemann's interpretation of it in the sixth edition of the \( \text{\texttt{Handbuch}} \) as \( \text{\texttt{S}} \), that is, the \text{\texttt{Variante}} of the leading-tone change of the minor subdominant. This suggests a considerably more complex intentional path back to the tonic: \( \text{\texttt{PLPS}} \). The initial \( \text{\texttt{P}} \) models Riemann's \text{\texttt{Variante}} (\( \text{\texttt{v}} \)); that is, it traces our interpretation of the chord as a \text{\texttt{Variante}} of the "proper..."
itself, it is not a property solely of the raw acoustic signal (i.e., the minor triad). We can experience this by clearing our ears of the harmonic context of the Impromptu and simply playing a G-minor chord alone, hearing it as a tonic. The effect is one of stripping away the layers of shading that are present when we hear the chord in the context of example 18.1, as though we have stripped away the many layers of Rembrandt's deep browns, revealing the blank canvas of the minor triad beneath. In this sense, the G chord of measure 80 has not less tonal character than the more traditional tonal harmonies in example 18.1, but more.

Example 18.8 integrates the two chords from example 18.7(a) into their respective progressions. Dashed arrows show the chord-to-chord progressions within the passages; these are numbered to indicate their order. Solid arrows show the intended path back from each chord to the tonic. Example 18.8(a) analyzes the opening phrase up to the G chord of measure 4; 18.8(b) analyzes the phrase in example 18.1 (measures 78–82). The opening phrase remains largely vertical within the space of 18.8(a), moving first down into the subdominant region, and then balancing this with a motion to the dominant. Note that this reading takes advantage of the tonal possibilities of the space, reinterpreting the Ab–chord in a manner analogous to Rameau's double emploi. Example 18.8(b), by contrast, spreads out horizontally and chromatically—across the network, dipping into its darkest corner. Note the intentional interpretation of the Eb chord: It is heard not as the relative (or Riemannian Parallele) of the previous C–chord (Riemannian esSp). Instead, it is heard as the dominant of the upcoming C–, consistent with the Riemannian analysis in example 18.5(b). This is the chord that contains the “menacing bass trill on C,” which announces the imminent arrival of the Ab–/G– chord, which we can thus hear coming before it sounds. The sense that we can “hear it coming” is reflected in the PD arrow chain that departs from Eb+ to the right and down, directing our attention toward the coming Ab– via its dominant. The “menace” of the chord resides partly in the fact that it is pointing us further into the darkest regions of the space—further to the right and downward.

As I noted above, both progressions trace a similar T–S–D–T progression, via altered subdominants; this similar trajectory is evident visually on the two examples, as the progressions move first to the subdominant side, below the tonic, then return to the tonic from above, “under dominant energy.” Unlike the progression in 18.8(a), however, the flip to the dominant side in 18.8(b) does not occur through a Rameauian reinterpretation. Instead, there is simply a snap from one extreme of the network to another, as the Ab– chord moves to “Ab+” via arrow 4. The snap from one edge of the space to the other coincides with Schubert's ff dynamics and the second key-signature fissure, as the augmented-sixth “effortfully hauls the music back from its G-minor [= Ab–] nadir.”

This reading values the music in example 18.1 by tracing something of a middle path between the Riemannian and neo-Riemannian positions sketched above. As in neo-Riemannian accounts, I have sought here to valorize the remarkable in this passage; as in Riemann, I have done so by situating the harmonies within a tonal space. But I have not invoked that space in order to contain the music—at least, that was not my intent. Instead, I wished to show the ways in which the Impromptu's harmonies are invested with qualitative intensity via their tonal context and the ways in which we as listeners participate in generating that qualitative intensity. The not-so-implicit claim is that the tonal context is responsible for the extraordinary sound: the latter results from the ways in which the music moves toward the outer, benighted realms of C# major, or better, the ways in which we work to interpret its harmonies from those realms back to the tonic. This restores a sense of extremity—both harmonic and emotional/expressive—to the music. This extremity is also captured by
the fragility of the intentional path from $A^b$ back to $G^+,$ reflecting the danger we face of losing cognitive contact with the music’s rational center.

The analysis seeks to narrow the fact/value gap between the sounds we cherish and the analyses we construct. However successful or unsuccessful it is in that effort, it is clear that the gap is not closed. No formal model can capture all aspects of our musical experience, even when we limit ourselves to one parameter, such as harmony. For myself, I find that the picture in example 18.8(b) turns what had been a flickering and contingent experience into something more fixed and stable, even overdetermined. In my prose I have sought to mitigate this, reinstating the formal model with some sense of fragility. But this represents an intervention from outside the space of the formal theory, suggesting the continued persistence of the fact/value split. The present approach has a signal merit, however, in that it gives the “value” side of the equation specific hooks to attach to in the formal model, allowing our evanescent aural sensations to interact with the model in suggestive ways.

We are lucky in that our historical position allows us, unlike Riemann, to relish those moments in which chromatic works threaten to overflow the rational bounds of our tonal theories, or in fact do overflow those bounds. As I suggested above, the relishing—indeed, valuing—of those moments seems to be one of the defining traits of the neo-Riemannian habitus. Yet, in the desire to detect coherence at all costs one notes a continued reluctance to step over the next threshold, to relish that unruly part of musical experience that resists formal containment. Perhaps this is only a matter of time, however—the neo-Riemannian turn has introduced a new flexibility into tonal analytical thought, moving us toward a highly salutary methodological self-awareness and interpretive pluralism. This shift may ultimately lead us to relinquish coherence (and its implicit sense of rational containment) as music theory’s ethical lodestar, allowing us to employ our analytical methods freely in the exploration and construction of manifold musical experiences, without feeling the need to claim comprehensiveness for any one of them. For sure enough we can welcome music is to acknowledge that it will always exceed the manicured gardens of our theories.

---

The cited chords occur on the downbeats of measures 78, 79, and 80. The passage expands a previous gesture in measures 74–77, which had already traversed part of this path, from $G^+$ major to $C^+$ minor and back. As Charles Fisk has noted, the $C^+$ minor harmony in both passages recalls the $C^+$ minor middle section in the previous Impromptu in $E^b,$ Charles Fisk, Returning Cycles: Contexts for the Interpretation of Schubert’s Impromptu and Last Sonatas (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 118. For further discussion of the $E^b$ Impromptu, see my Perspectives on Tonality and Transformation in Schubert’s Impromptu in $E^b$, D. 899, no. 2,” Journal of Schenkerian Studies 2 (2007): 33–63: on the intertextual resonances of Schubert’s B-minor harmonies, see 47 n. 26 in the latter article.

---

2. On notational “pressure” forcing enharmonic shifts, see Daniel Harrison, “Nonconformist Notions of Nineteenth-Century Enharmonicism,” Music Analysis 21.2 (July 2002): 140–142. On the historical importance of the six-flat signature in Schubert’s Impromptu, see Hugh MacDonald, “[Six-Flat Key Signature, 9/8],” Nineteenth-Century Music 11.3 (Spring 1988): 221–237. MacDonald calls the Impromptu “a breakthrough toward a new concept of the key” of $G^+$ (p. 225). The Impromptu was first published by Haslinger in 1857 in $G^+$ major; Hugo Riemann seems to have based his discussions of the piece—about which, more below—on Haslinger’s (or a later) G-major edition.

3. For an overview of some of the most salient technical differences between paleo- and neo-Riemannian theories, see David Kopp, Chromatic Transformations in Nineteenth-Century Music (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 150–151.

4. For example, Richard Cohn states that neo-Riemannian theory seeks to answer the question, “If this music is not fully coherent according to the principles of diatonic tonality, by what other principles might it cohere?” Cohn, “Introduction to Neo-Riemannian Theory: A Survey and a Historical Perspective,” Journal of Music Theory 42.2 (Fall 1998): 169.

5. I mean Klang here—and throughout this chapter—in the familiar neo-Riemannian sense of major and minor triads (not in Riemann’s sense of a dualistic emanation of overtones and undertones from a single pitch). The Klang in Example 18.2(a) omit chordal sevenths and the one augmented sixth. The omissions would need to be addressed in a broader transformational analysis, but they are not consequential here. For a transformational model that integrates members of SC 3–11 and 4–27 see Julian Hook, “Cross-Type Transformations and the Path-Consistency Condition,” Music Theory Spectrum 29.1 (Spring 2007): 1–39.


7. The scare quotes make clear that DVLS values obtained in pitch-class space, in which the concepts of “up” and “down” are traditionally considered problematic. I have nevertheless retained those words in the text for their intuitive immediacy. I have also replaced the directed pitch-class intervals of Cohn’s DVLS with positive and negative integers, for the same reason. These numbers should be understood as substitutes for their mod-12 equivalents. (Recently, Clifton Callender, Ian Quinn, and Dmitri Tymoczko have recuperated the notions of “up” and “down” in pitch-class space; I do not, however, rely on their formalism here.)


9. This lends a consistency of voice-leading distance to a Weitzmann region that is not present in a hexatonic cycle, in which AVLS values range from 1 to 3. On Weitzmann regions, see Richard Cohn, “Weitzmann’s Regions,” My Cycles, and Douthett’s Dancing Cubes,” Music Theory Spectrum 22.2 (Spring 2000): 89–103. See also “Square Dances,” 390–395. Cohn’s Weitzmann regions arise from a transformational interpretation of ideas in Carl Friedrich Weitzmann’s pamphlet Der übermäßige Dreiklang (Berlin: T. Trautwein, 1853). All of the triads in a Weitzmann region share two tones with a single augmented triad. Interestingly, several augmented triads appear prominently on the surface of Schubert’s Impromptu—[$D^b, E^b, A^\#$] in measures 4 and 58; [$G^b, B^\#, D^\#$] in measure 24; and [$G^\#, E^b, G^\#$] in measure 73. The sense that the piece tends toward an augmented-triad sound world—especially in moments of transition—is suggestive, but I would not push the idea
too hard: all of these chords operate in ways far more traditional than the Lisztian possibilities that Weitzmann had in mind.

10. In this and later networks, undirected edges are a shorthand for a symmetrical pair of arrows (or more colloquially, double-headed arrows). I have drawn the region in a hexagonal format analogous to Cohn's images of his hexatonic systems in "Maximally Smooth Cycles, Hexatonic Systems, and the Analysis of Late-Romantic Triadic Progressions," *Music Analysis* 15.1 (1996): 9–40, and in "Weitzmann's Regions," 95, ex. 7. This approach essentially reverses Cohn's graph-theoretic priorities in "Weitzmann's Regions," in which it is the hexatonic cycles that are drawn cyclically, with Weitzmann regions joining them via a mediating augmented triad.

11. "Weitzmann's Regions," 92 and 98. N inverts a triad about its Riemannian (NB) root, for example, C +→ F-. In more familiar Anglo-American tonal terms, N maps a major triad to its minor subdominant (and back) or a minor triad to its major dominant (and back). Weitzmann's nebeverwändt relation is formally the same as Riemann's Seitenwechsel and Oettingen's Wechsel, which also exchange triads that share the same dual root.


14. For Riemann, B- in the key of Gb major could act as either a tonic (TP) or a subdominant (♭). We will explore the differences between Riemann's function theory and neo-Riemannian regional analyses such as that in example 18.4 below.


17. Riemann, *Musikalisches Syntaxis*, p. 69. "Die schließliche Festigung der Haupt- und Sekundität durch die Thesen von "g", "is und "es" ist von ganz vorzüglicher Wirkung." Riemann uses the word *These* (a holdover from his earlier Hauptmann-inspired work in "Musikalisches Logik") throughout the book to refer to motions away from, or back to, the tonic, via its upper and lower dominants. It comes to mean little more than "progression," and that is how I have translated it above.

18. As observed in n 2, the Impromptu was first published in 1857 in G major, only twenty years before Riemann's book. It is curious, however, that Riemann continued to refer to the piece in its G-major version even in the sixth edition of his *Handbuch der Harmonielehre*, published in 1917. The volume of the Schubert *Alte Gesamtausgabe* including the present Impromptu in the correct key of Gb had been published in 1888, and the correct key was surely well known to Riemann by 1917. It is tempting to speculate that he retained the G-major version not only for pedagogical clarity, but also as it does not exhibit the same notational disruption as the Gb version does: there is no shift in key signature in measures 79–80 in the Haslinger edition, thus removing any notational sign of tonal disruption and visually clarifying the minor-Neapolitan hearing of the harmony in measure 80.
32. On universality in Riemann’s thought, see Rehding, Hugo Riemann, chapter 4. Riemann’s analytical practice cuts both ways, of course: he also uses his theory to demonstrate the alleged violation of his universal laws in composers like Berlioz. See ibid., 152–156.

33. It is important not to monumentalize neo-Riemannian theory as a single practice—there are notable instances of transformational approaches to chromatic harmony that do not fit this description. David Lewin, for example, never speaks of “disunity” (or “unity,” for that matter) in his harmonic-transformational writings; both he and David Kopp further employ transformational approaches to explore specifically tonal characteristics of chromatic passages (as I have in my work). I base my discussion here on the influential species of neo-Riemannian analysis made popular by Cohn, within which the values outlined above have been remarkably consistent.

34. Riemann’s “universal” classicism is of course simply Viennese classicism (the roots of which he repeatedly traces back to the Mannheim symphonists, especially Stamitz). On the nationalist motivations behind this project, most explicit in the 1890s, see Rehding, Hugo Riemann, chapter 4.

35. Ibid., 110.


38. In addition to the Garden of Eden passage, the idea of spatialized boundaries to compositional possibility emerges vividly at the end of Riemann’s history of nineteenth-century music, published in 1901. After a negative assessment of Richard Strauss, he writes: “But one hopes that this trend toward program music has reached a boundary with Strauss, at which it must turn back.” Hugo Riemann, Geschichte der Musik seit Beethoven (1800–1900) (Berlin: W. Spemann, 1901), 735. “Doch steht zu hoffen, daß diese Richtung mit Strauß an einer Grenze angekommen ist, die zur Umkehr zwingt.”


43. The rise of neo-Riemannian theory can be read in one sense as a savvy disciplinary response to the challenge of New Musicology, in which the analytical tools of a credentialed high-modernist canon are turned toward new interpretive ends in the very repertory prized by critical musicologists, with certain buzzwords retooled along the way.


48. Allen Cadwallader and David Gagné, for example, introduce the functional categories T, int (for “intermediate”), and D in their Schenker textbook without once mentioning Riemann by name. Allen Cadwallader and David Gagné, Analysis of Tonal Music: A Schenkerian Approach, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

49. As Riemann put it in the fifth edition of his Musik-Lexikon: “Functions... describe... the various significances that chords possess, depending on their position [with respect] to the tonic.” Translated in Rehding, Hugo Riemann, 188. See also Kopp, Chromatic Transformations, 99.

50. This discussion raises a perennial question in Riemannian exegesis: Are his functions labels for chords, relations, or syntactic categories? The present study opts for the second choice, interpreting functions as symbols for relational paths from the sounding chord to the tonic, following Lewin (Generalized Musical Intervals and Transformations, 177) and Hyer (“Tonal Intuitions,” 99–107). Cogent discussions of the function-as-chord versus function-as-category/relation problem may be found in Mooney, “The Table of Tonal Relations,” 102–108; Daniel Harrison, Harmonic Function in Chromatic Music: A Renewed Dualist Theory and an Account of Its Precedents (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 266–276; and Rehding, Hugo Riemann, 61 and 78–79.


53. I maintain the neo-Riemannian transformational letters here (R, P, J) for familiarity, even though they create some dissonance with Riemann’s own terms. A formal note: once a D or S is added to the network, its underlying graph is downgraded from “path consistent” to “uniformly realizable,” per Julian Hook’s terminology in “Cross-Type Transformations and the Path-Consistency Condition,” 29.

54. The latter represents the German-sixth chord, which, as we noted, Riemann would interpret as an applied dominant; the notes around the A± node in the example indicate that the alterations to the chord have significantly obscured its triadic basis.

55. It is hard to gain a sense of such extremity without a tonic center from which to measure such things, as in many neo-Riemannian “de-centered” spaces. The present approach thus restores the “distortions” created by a tonic that Brian Hyer— in an influential move—explicitly eliminated from his renewed, de-centered Tonnetz in “Reimsg(in)ing Riemann,” Journal of Music Theory 39.1 (Spring 1995): 127–128.