it to him and he confirmed that it looked good. But I will attach it for you if you'd like to see.
- Levi Walls

Timothy Jackson Mar 13, 2020, 6:04 PM
Yes, I should eyeball it once to see if there are any small issues.

Walls, Levi Mar 13, 2020, 6:05 PM
Sure thing. Thanks for the extra set of eyes!

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday,
March 13, 2020 4:04 PM

Timothy Jackson Mar 13, 2020, 6:06 PM
Just between us, I like Pelligrin's response, which I find thoughtful and intelligent. I understand Clark's point, but she completely misconstrues and misunderstands Schenkerian analysis.

Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Mar 13, 2020, 6:26 PM
to me
I quite liked his as well. Rich and I discussed his response when I sent notes. I had suggested some minor rhetorical additions that better connects the defense of hierarchy to Ewell's ideas (in the middle, some time goes by without mentioning Ewell). But he expressed a discomfort toward pushing back too much against Ewell *specifically* because he didn't want his response to be misconstrued as racist. Of course, I said that I understood and it was entirely up to him. It would have been nice if he had included a refutation of Agawu's Schubert argument (as mentioned in Clark); but I couldn't have suggested that to him, because I would have been stacking the deck against Clark. And I'm meant to be impartial.
Yes, the idea that Schenkerian analysis inherently ignores parts of an analysis that don't fit into the fundamental structure is a severe misunderstanding. The focal point of many good graphs is how works *don't* adhere to that stucture; if the goal was always simply "let's show how this piece expresses the *Ursatz*" (as many non-Schenkerian believe), such an analysis would most likely be unnuanced and boring.

From: Timothy Jackson <shermanzelechin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2020 4:06 PM
To: Walls, Levi <LeviWalls@my.unt.edu>
Subject: Re: [EXT] Pellegrin
Could you make one last addition to mine

38