

Reflections on *Intégral*: Its Inception and Early Years

David Beach

Congratulations are in order to the Editors on the publication of the first ten volumes of *Intégral*. Over the years you have published many fine articles and throughout have maintained a high professional standard. And with Volume 10 I note one great improvement—the change of design. I must admit that I always found the original design rather “amateurish,” not in keeping with the quality of the content. So, thanks very much for this change.

It was interesting for those of us who observed the gestation and birth of *Intégral* to have followed its growth over the early years. I remember very well that day in 1985 when Jack Adrian broached the subject of the graduate students in the Theory Department at Eastman publishing a journal. The basic argument was that they (the students) needed professional experience, something to put on their CVs, to be competitive on the job market. After all, so the argument went, the students in Ann Arbor published *In Theory Only*, and those in Bloomington had the *Indiana Theory Review* to keep them occupied. I must admit to having been less than receptive to this idea at first. My arguments to the contrary, as I recall, were as follows. (1) Advanced doctoral students should put their energy into writing first-class dissertations, something that will secure their reputations as promising scholars, rather than publishing other people’s work. (2) Publishing a journal, particularly a good one, requires a major investment of time and energy. Anything less than total commitment leads to various problems, including falling behind in production schedule (as Jack and his successors subsequently learned). (3) Introduction to the professional world should be through reading papers at local and national meetings of professional societies, and in the event that research is of publishable quality, it should be submitted, after faculty supervised revisions, to one of the existing professional journals. Finally, I pointed out to Jack and his colleagues, graduates of our department were doing just fine on the job market. Well, despite

the irrefutable logic of my arguments, it is clear who won that debate, though in my defense I will say that it took several meetings to win me over. In this instance I am happy to have been proven partially mistaken in my original position. Clearly, it is possible to do all of the above (my points 1–3) plus publish a journal. It has been an interesting experience for those involved, and the result has been a positive contribution to the field.

Having been convinced of the efficacy of this endeavor, the job fell to me to convince the keeper of the purse, Robert Freeman, the Director of the Eastman School at the time, to support the project financially. Freeman was very much an advocate of integrating the research and practice of music, and in this regard it became clear that he would support this project only if a special effort was made to include articles that related analysis and theory to performance. It is that orientation which led to the publication of the statement by the Editorial Board in the front of the first volume, and I suspect it was Freeman's influence that led to the subtitle *The Journal of Applied Musical Thought*, which, along with the Editorial Board statement, curiously disappeared after the publication of Volume 1. Though I would be willing to argue the value of analysis and theoretical research for its own sake (a debate for another time), I believe Freeman was fully justified in nudging us in this direction. Several important contributions to *Intégral's* success fall under this category: articles by Edward T. Cone, Abram Loft, and Robert Wason in Volume 1; the joint effort by Marie Rolf and Elizabeth West Marvin in Volume 4; the contributions by Cynthia Folio and Robert Hatten in Volume 7; and the essays by Alexandra Pierce and William Rothstein in Volume 8. Several others, while primarily analytical/theoretical, including my own two-part contribution on Beethoven's op. 110, touch on performance issues.

It is not my intent here to offer a review of the contents of Volumes 1–10, but I would like to make a few observations. First, I note that there is a healthy mix of household names from the music theory community with those of newcomers, some of them the recognizable names of the future. Second, despite the inherent difficulties of doing so, I believe it is possible to group

the contents of Volumes 1–10 into broad categories. (Here I will exclude those mentioned above under the general analysis-performance category.) A large number of contributions—perhaps unusually so—deal directly with or apply Schenker's theories. Included in this group are the essay by Kevin Korsyn and the analytic studies by Jack Adrian, David Beach, Allen Cadwallader, Howard Cinnamon, Warren Darcy, Edward Laufer, William Rothstein, and Gordon Sly. Four other articles—those by Robert Gauldin, Christopher Lewis, Heather Platt, and Lauri Suurpää—deal with tonal repertoires from different perspectives. Two studies, those by Richard Cohn and Robert Gjerdingen, address issues of rhythm, meter and, in the latter case, cognition. The articles dealing with twentieth-century music and related theoretical issues cover a wide spectrum of topics, from Schoenberg to Steve Reich, from twelve-tone theory to minimalism. Included in this large group of analytical and theoretical studies are contributions by Michael Cherlin, Lora Gingerich Dobos, Jeffrey Gillespie, Richard Kaplan, Tiina Koivisto, J. Philip Lambert, Andrew Mead, Robert Morris, Roberto Saltini, Yayoi Uno, and Dan Warburton. That leaves three articles that are less easy to classify. The first is Jay Rahn's study, in which he proposes a behavior framework connecting theory with practice for the study of music. Gregory Marion's contribution combines a Schenkerian reading of the opening of Beethoven's op. 53 with an examination of the same passage from the perspective of transformational theory. Finally, Robert Morris's essay in Volume 9 examines the structure of first-species canon in a wide variety of repertoires.

Listing contributors as I have done above hardly does justice to what they have written. My reason for doing so is simply to provide in a short space a sense of the scope of what is contained in these ten volumes. Along with the book reviews they constitute an important contribution to music-theoretic inquiry. That is why Jack Adrian and his cohorts were right, not because of the line or two it may add to a number of CVs.

Sign me up for another ten years!