

(p. 85). Assuredly, one sentence is of little value; but perhaps the rest of the paragraph from which the quotation was lifted would elucidate matters, particularly since I continue after the above quote that this would be discussed later.

"We find that Hughes neither articulates any specific hypotheses about Skriabin's preludes nor puts the data to any significant use" (p. 86). The hypotheses concerning my thesis are clearly stated on p. 14. The question arises as to what Mr. Kassler expected my thesis to prove. I intended it to show concise amounts of what I call and define as tonal complexity.

"And surely Hughes deserves criticism for having become engaged in a data-collection procedure . . . without justification of the unconventional measurement criteria" (p. 86). Apparently, Mr. Kassler is undecided in this criticism. After having stated my main concern, namely, "tonal orientation" versus "tonal organization", Mr. Kassler continues: ". . . the necessity for unusual measurements should cause no surprise" (p. 85).

". . . and with hardly any comment on the results other than 'they are here'" (p. 86). Any analysis can only show what is *there*. The question, however, is *what* is there?

MATT C. HUGHES  
Austin, Texas

## REPLY TO MATT C. HUGHES

*Michael Kassler*

Mr. Hughes's reply accuses me of inaccuracies, but the accusation appears to be gratuitous, for he mentions none.

Some comments by way of surrebuttal:

1. The phrase 'information theory' has come to mean specifically the field whose development stems from the classical Shannon articles and whose current state is illustrated by the content of such journals as the *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*. To speak today of information theory not in the Shannon tradition is oxymoronic.

2. Re Opus 11, No. 1: Footnote 2 of my review indicated the presence of a rhythmic problem caused by the composition's being noted not in the current common musical notation (CCMN). Hughes has interpreted (for instance) the measures excerpted in Ex. 1 as if Ex. 2 were their CCMN equivalent; in my review, I said that "the bar placement seems to disallow Hughes's 'five-against-three' interpretation"—if the bar had been placed after the second note of the left-hand group of three notes, rather than before, I would have left Hughes's interpretation unquestioned. Example 3 is the CCMN equivalent of Ex. 1 I would tentatively propose (based only on consultation of the Edward B. Marks reprinted edition). Since my version clearly does not have the right hand finishing before the left and does have a left-hand note 'bit value' of  $2/5$ , Hughes's finding of an error in my commentary must be 'lost'.

3. Hughes apparently believes that merely by naming the results of his internal-evidential procedures a 'measure of tonal complexity' he has

endued his procedures with the power to make significant musicological determinations. In fact he has provided no demonstration that his calculation procedures explicate any *a priori* notion of complexity nor has he shown that they give insight into the Skriabin preludes or into any traditional formulation of tonality theory.

Ex. 1 Skriabin, *Prelude*, Op. 11, No. 1

Ex. 2

\* Hughes would give this chord bit value  $1/3$  but surely this is a mistake.

Ex. 3