City University of New York (CUNY)

CUNY Academic Works

Publications and Research

CUNY Graduate Center

1984

Heinrich Schenker as an Interpreter of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas

William Rothstein
CUNY Graduate Center

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

More information about this work at: https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_pubs/426

Discover additional works at: <https://academicworks.cuny.edu>

This work is made publicly available by the City University of New York (CUNY).
Contact: AcademicWorks@cuny.edu

Heinrich Schenker as an Interpreter of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas

WILLIAM ROTHSTEIN

There was a time when it seemed necessary for admirers of the work of Heinrich Schenker to remind the musical community periodically that it had grown out of a lifetime of practical musical experience—that is, that *Der freie Satz* did not represent a self-contained system of theoretical speculation. Schenker himself tried repeatedly throughout his career to impress this point upon his readers.¹ In recent years, fortunately, this reminder—which had threatened to become merely ritualistic—has become somewhat less necessary. The change in Schenker's reputation may, it seems, be dated precisely to 1975, when Dover Publications issued an inex-

pensive reprint of his landmark edition of the Beethoven piano sonatas. Since that time, increasing numbers of musicians have come to realize that Schenker was one of the founders of modern editorial practice. Those who have looked further have discovered, in addition, that he was an accomplished composer, a prolific critic, and an active performer (as a pianist and a vocal accompanist). That he was also the most influential theorist of this century is by now generally conceded, if not generally celebrated.

Those musicians who have studied Schenker's writings have long been aware of his passionate concern for, and his illuminating observations on, the art of performance.² Both are amply in evidence, for example, in his analytical editions of four late Beethoven sonatas and of Bach's Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue, in his *Essay on Ornamentation*, in his monograph on

Notes for this article begin on page 26.

19th-Century Music VIII/1 (Summer 1984). © by the Regents of the University of California.

Beethoven's Ninth Symphony,³ and in the individual analyses in *Der Tonwille* and *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*. These published works will soon be joined by the much-delayed publication of Schenker's incomplete work *Die Kunst des Vortrags*, which is (as the title implies) devoted entirely to the art of performance. Next year Universal Edition, Schenker's old publisher, will issue the work in German, edited by Heribert Esser; an English edition would certainly be very welcome.

Oswald Jonas said of Schenker's scores, in his introduction to *Die Kunst des Vortrags*:

There are entries in them—not only some concerning textual authenticity and some of an analytical nature, but also the most painstaking entries indicative of performance. These shed light on Schenker's comprehensive musical activity, and they make clear why many practical musicians—among them Wilhelm Furtwängler himself—have time and again consulted Schenker for advice.⁴

I

The materials on which this study is based are housed in the Oswald Jonas Memorial Collection at the University of California at Riverside. In addition to the annotated scores of the Beethoven sonatas, these materials consist of: (1) a manuscript, entitled *Vom Vortrag* ("On Performance"), consisting of eighty-six pages in the hand of Schenker's wife, with pencilled corrections by Schenker; (2) a typescript, entitled *Entwurf einer "Lehre vom Vortrag"* ("Sketch of a Theory of Performance"), consisting of thirty-eight pages, assembled and edited by Jonas from material written by Schenker; (3) numerous notes by Schenker on various sheets and scraps of paper, some in his wife's hand (the latter are often dated, while those in his hand are not)—it was from these that Jonas assembled his *Entwurf*; and (4) a manuscript in Schenker's hand, entitled *Ein Kommentar zu Schindler, Beethovens Spiel betreffend* ("A commentary on Schindler regarding Beethoven's playing"), which was published in 1938 in the final issue of the short-lived periodical *Der Dreiklang*. Of related interest in the Jonas Collection are the text of a 1962 lecture by Jonas on *Die Kunst des Vortrags*, his above-mentioned introduction to an abortive publication of the Schenker work, and various excerpts from Schenker's massive

diary (typed, apparently, by Jonas) concerning performance and performers.⁵

The forthcoming publication of *Die Kunst des Vortrags* will incorporate the first two sources listed above and some parts of the third. Relevant passages from Schenker's published works will also be included.

Judging from its content, the manuscript *Vom Vortrag* seems to have been written about 1910, after the analytical edition of the Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue (1909) but before the Ninth Symphony monograph (1912). Thus it is a relatively early work. The twelve chapters deal with such subjects as the relationship of performance to notation (a topic also addressed in the Introduction to the Ninth Symphony monograph), the nature of the piano, piano technique, the use of the pedal, various types of articulation on the piano, dynamics, various types of rhythmic freedom, and the performance of pre-nineteenth-century music. The manuscript ends with a bitter attack on piano virtuosos of Schenker's day.

Vom Vortrag concerns itself directly only with performance on the piano. This is true of most, though not all, of Schenker's works on performance. However, much of what he has to say about the piano is applicable to other instruments as well; in *Vom Vortrag* this is especially true of the chapters on dynamics and on rhythmic freedom. On the other hand, the chapter on legato is of special interest to pianists. Here, as in his earlier *Essay on Ornamentation*, Schenker refers to C. P. E. Bach's *Essay* to show that legato playing often requires the pianist to hold down certain notes beyond their written values; he develops this idea far beyond the little that Bach has to say on the matter.

The material from which Jonas compiled his *Entwurf einer "Lehre vom Vortrag"* probably dates from various periods in Schenker's life, but most of it seems to postdate the *Vortrag* manuscript just discussed, to judge from its content. Jonas performed a heroic editorial feat—deciphering, editing, organizing, rearranging, supplying examples, and adding footnotes. The backbone of the *Entwurf* consists of a dozen or so pages of notes in Schenker's hand; these are—unusually—written on full sheets of paper, relatively legible, organized into individual points, and titled. The titles include "*Kla-*

vier" ("Piano"), *"Kunst des Vortrags"* ("Art of Performance"), *"Vom Üben"* ("On Practicing"), *"Legato," "Fingersatz"* ("Fingering"), and *"Oktavenspiel"* ("Playing Octaves").

We come next to the principal object of our inquiry, the Beethoven sonatas. Schenker had in his library three more-or-less complete editions of the sonatas. These were (1) the 1898 "Urtext" published by Breitkopf & Härtel, edited by Carl Krebs; (2) the "Akademische Einzel-Ausgabe" published by Universal Edition, edited by Anton Door⁶; and, of course, (3) Schenker's own edition, published by Universal Edition in 1923.⁷ Schenker's copies of all of these editions are heavily annotated, often in various colors of pencil and/or ink. Sometimes he annotated multiple copies of the same sonata in the same edition. Furthermore, several of the sonatas in the Door edition have inserted in them pages of comments in black ink.

The nature of Schenker's annotations varies with the edition. Those in the Door edition are largely editorial; the written inserts also concern editorial matters primarily, but they include comments on voice-leading, on register, and on other miscellaneous subjects as well. The Breitkopf & Härtel edition contains a great many annotations—some editorial, some analytical, and some pertaining to performance. The Schenker edition in four volumes contains minimal corrections only.

Of chief interest to us are the individually published sonatas in Schenker's edition, for it is here that the greatest number of performance annotations appears. Many of these individual copies are dated in Schenker's hand, the dates ranging from 1921 to 1923. Hence the many analytical entries in them reflect Schenker's theoretical stance of the early to middle 1920s, the period of *Der Tonwille*; these entries most often concern details of voice-leading or motivic structure. A few voice-leading graphs (treating short passages) are written in the margins. Large rhythmic or metric units are occasionally delineated, and sometimes, particularly at the ends of movements, the fundamental line (as Schenker understood that concept at the time) is indicated by the familiar carated Arabic numerals.

Schenker's notation is idiosyncratic. The analytical notation he developed is by now widely

known—so widely that one easily forgets how strange it must have appeared at the time. His performance notation is hardly less original. Nevertheless, it is usually possible to determine fairly accurately the meaning of his various arrows, loops, and slurs (sometimes with a little help from his prose). Occasionally one comes across an illegible word or an enigmatic squiggle. The examples in this article are my own transcriptions from Schenker's annotations; unfortunately these are often pencilled too faintly to reproduce well photographically. Several plates are included of some clearer pages.

Although Schenker did not date his other editions, it can be said with some assurance that the entries in his own edition are the latest that he made. In the earlier editions, after all, he had to contend with numerous editorial problems that can only have interfered with his other concerns. In his own edition he was dealing with a text that was as close to Beethoven's original as he could make it; hence he was free to use the manner of notation itself as a factor in his analysis and in his indication of the performance.

II

Before proceeding to an examination of Schenker's annotations, it may prove useful to review his general philosophy of performance, a philosophy perhaps unique in its day. For Schenker, the performance of a masterwork (and only of a masterwork) is an objective and inevitable result of its *structure*. He expresses this view as early as in the Ninth Symphony monograph, long before his own theories came to fruition. There he states, "If, for example, the Ninth Symphony had come down to us—like most of the works of Sebastian Bach—without express dynamic symbols, an expert hand could nonetheless only place those symbols—according to the content—exactly as Beethoven himself has done."⁸

The same view is expressed in more general terms in the *Entwurf einer "Lehre vom Vortrag"*: "Performance directions are fundamentally superfluous, since the composition itself expresses everything that is necessary."⁹ The actual, historical increase in the use of performance directions by composers and editors alike is attributed in *Vom Vortrag* to the general

Plate 1 (ex. 10).

This musical score is for Plate 2, example 14, covering measures 35 to 40. It is written for piano in B-flat major (two flats) and 4/4 time. The score consists of two systems. The first system contains measures 35 and 40. Measure 35 begins with the instruction *dolce*. The second system contains measures 40 and 45. Measure 40 includes the instruction *cresc.*. The score features various fingerings, including triplets and sixteenth-note runs, and dynamic markings such as *dolce* and *cresc.*.

Plate 2 (ex. 14).

Plate 3 (ex. 15).

Plate 4 (ex. 19) shows two systems of musical notation. The first system contains measures 25 and 26, with a *p* dynamic. The second system contains measures 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31, with various fingerings and a *p* dynamic. Measure numbers 25, 30, and 35 are circled. Below the first system, there is a performance instruction in German: "1) Kurzer Vorschlag 2) Der Doppelschlag fällt noch in den vorausgehenden Takt." followed by "U. E. S." and a circled "3".

Plate 4 (ex. 19).

Handwritten musical score for Plate 5 (ex. 25). The score is written for piano on a grand staff (treble and bass clefs). The key signature is one sharp (F#). The tempo is marked 'cresc.' (crescendo). The score is divided into two systems. The first system contains measures 1 through 15, with measure 15 circled. The second system contains measures 16 through 20, with measure 20 circled. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and fingerings. The dynamics are marked 'f' (forte) and 'p' (piano). The score is written in a cursive, handwritten style.

Plate 5 (ex. 25).

Handwritten musical score for Plate 6 (ex. 27). The score is written for piano on a grand staff (treble and bass clefs). The key signature is one sharp (F#). The tempo is marked 'cresc.' (crescendo). The score is divided into two systems. The first system contains measures 1 through 5, with measure 5 circled. The second system contains measures 6 through 10, with measure 10 circled. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and fingerings. The dynamics are marked 'p' (piano) and 'cresc.' (crescendo). The score is written in a cursive, handwritten style.

Plate 6 (ex. 27).

Largo e mesto.

p *lunga*

5

5 4 5

Musical score for "The Rose Tree" in G major, 2/4 time. The score is for piano and voice. The piano part features a bass line with a triplet of eighth notes (5, 6, 3) and a treble line with a triplet of eighth notes (2, 3, 1). The voice part has a melody with a triplet of eighth notes (2, 3, 1) and a triplet of eighth notes (2, 3, 1). The score includes a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a time signature of 2/4. The tempo is marked "moderato". The score is divided into two systems. The first system contains measures 1 through 4. The second system contains measures 5 through 8. The score ends with a double bar line.

decline of musical culture and to the spread of that declining culture to an excessive number of untalented performers and amateurs.¹⁰ At another point in the *Entwurf*, Schenker articulates what is perhaps the most important point: "All performance comes from within, not from without. . . . Performance must come from within the work; the work must breathe from its own lungs—from the linear progressions, neighboring tones, chromatic tones, modulations. . . . About these, naturally, there cannot exist different interpretations."¹¹ And elsewhere in the same work he cries, "No 'interpretation'!"¹²

It would appear, therefore, that in the title of this study I have committed a grave offense against Schenker's entire concept of performance. Schenker did not consider himself an "interpreter" in anything like the usual sense of that word. To his way of thinking, performance is the means of making audible that which is already objectively there in the work. In this view he agrees completely with Brahms, who said: "When I play something of Beethoven, I have absolutely no individuality in relation to it; rather, I try to *reproduce* the piece as well as Beethoven wrote it. Then I have [quite] enough to do."¹³

A little earlier I alluded to the relationship between the composer's notation and performance. Schenker discusses this relationship in *Vom Vortrag* and also in the Introduction to the Ninth Symphony monograph.¹⁴ Briefly stated, the composer's notation (according to Schenker) indicates only the *effects* that the composer desires; it does not specify the *means* by which the performer is to obtain those effects. In many cases the performer must actually use techniques that would appear to contradict the composer's instructions, precisely in order to obtain the effect that the composer intends. It is partly for this reason that the performer may not take the composer's notation at face value and simply play everything exactly as written; neither, on the other hand, may he assume that the structure of the work will express itself adequately without his help.¹⁵ Rather, he must seek those means that will communicate the structure and the affect of the work as clearly as possible. An amusing sentence from the *Entwurf* sums it up admirably, if perhaps

over-optimistically: "The best performance is that in which the amateur finds everything so clear, so self-evident, that he believes that he, too, plays it that way."¹⁶ If only we had such amateurs!

III

We turn finally to the performance annotations themselves. I have divided these into five categories which will be discussed separately. The five categories are: dynamics; rubato (meaning all fluctuations of rhythm and tempo); articulation, especially legato; hand motions; and pedaling.

DYNAMICS

Schenker's conception of dynamics is a complex one. First, he distinguishes between, on the one hand, those instances of *forte* or *piano* that are to be taken literally as indications of the physical quantity of sound desired, and, on the other, those instances that are to be taken less literally, as indications merely of psychological qualities. The same distinction applies to other dynamic markings and to written nuances of all kinds.¹⁷ Needless to say, the performer must be able to decide in each case which reading of a given dynamic symbol is most appropriate.

Second, Schenker asserts that most nuances are unwritten, yet nonetheless mandatory. These unwritten nuances are implied by a musical context, and are therefore very difficult—if not impossible—to codify into general rules.¹⁸ This idea may be traced back to C. P. E. Bach and J. J. Quantz, both of whom did to some extent offer general rules for such nuances in their respective *Essays*.¹⁹

In choosing examples from the Beethoven sonatas to illustrate these and other points, I have tried insofar as possible to determine the objective circumstances which motivated Schenker's dynamic markings. (The same holds true for the remaining four categories of markings.) Since, for Schenker, nuance is often closely connected with a certain rubato, some of the examples inevitably reflect this connection.

Perhaps the oldest and simplest general rule of dynamics is that which requires a diminuendo from a metrically accented dissonance to its resolution. Schenker takes this rule directly from C. P. E. Bach's *Essay*.²⁰ As he points out in the analytical edition of the Sonata in A, op. 101, with respect to ex. 1, this rule must be followed even in the midst of a general crescendo. (In this case the dissonances are accented passing tones in the bass and soprano.) Therefore, this is also a simple example of layered dynamics (see fn. 19): the crescendo takes place at a higher level than the diminuendos, since the latter merely serve the resolutions in m. 7.²¹

Example 1: Op. 101, I.

Example 2: Op. 53, I.

Example 3: Op. 57, III.

Schenker frequently complains that performers who instinctively produce a finely nuanced *piano* generally produce a monotonous and unnuanced *forte*. To put it in his terms, they interpret the *forte* purely in terms of physical quantity of sound. Hence he pays special attention to *forte* and *fortissimo* passages in his copies of the sonatas. A simple example from the "Waldstein" Sonata will serve to illustrate (ex. 2). Schenker often refers in his writings to such "artificially inserted" *pianos*. Notice the care with which he connects the seventh f^3 to f^2 by means of the apparent accent on f^2 , and thence to the resolution e^1 through the expressively written nuance—a diminuendo and crescendo combined in one symbol.²²

Sometimes, particularly in rapid passages, only the main tones within a written *forte* need actually to be played loudly in order to give the psychological effect of a *forte* (ex. 3). In his essay on the Sonata in F Minor, op. 57, in *Der Tonwille*, an essay which includes a lengthy and detailed discussion of performance, Schenker writes:

a.

b.

Example 4: Op. 109, I.

In mm. 96–97, only g^2 in the right hand and g^1 in the left are to be brought out with a *forte*; the immediately adjacent ab^2 and ab^1 are already to be played *piano*. The force of these two *fortes*, the imitation, the high register, the pedal (which, however, is to be lifted on the second beat of m. 96)—all of these together lead of themselves to the *forte* which Beethoven has written. This sum of factors also excludes as superfluous and harmful any physical exertion for the sake of the individual sixteenth-notes or for the general dynamic level.²³

Note how Schenker's printed fingering in mm. 96–97 and 100–01 forces the pianist to lift the hand in order to accent the high G in each entrance of the motive. Note also how the nuance in the left hand in m. 98 restricts the *sforzando* to the right hand and also expresses the brief prolongation of the tone *d*.

Some of Schenker's nuances serve to clarify the voice-leading of a given passage. One such example comes from the Sonata in E, op. 109 (ex. 4a).²⁴ The forward-pointing arrows in ex. 4a indicate tiny accelerations. As ex. 4b helps to show, the small crescendos and accelerations in ex. 4a serve to connect the tones of a descending line divided between the hands: from $d\sharp^3$ to $d\sharp^2$ in m. 58, then to $c\sharp^3$ to $c\sharp^2$ in m. 59, ending with b^2 in m. 60. A descending fourth-progression starting from this b^2 concludes the phrase (the antecedent phrase of the second theme).

Nuances often have motivic significance. In the following example from the Sonata in C, op. 2, no. 3, Schenker shows a motivic link between the first two movements by means of nuance (ex. 5). The motive is a descending second, which Schenker associates here with a diminuendo. The pianist may find it surprising to see the infamous double thirds of the opening in parentheses; he will soon find, however, that Schenker's treatment of these thirds as mere embellishment is psychologically liberating. All too often in performance the emphasis is placed—or rather misplaced—precisely on those difficult thirds.²⁵

WILLIAM
ROTHSTEIN
Beethoven
Interpreted
by Schenker

Example 5A: Op. 1, no. 3, I, 1-4. B: II, 1-2. C: II, 53-54.

Example 6: Op. 81a, I.

A more elaborate example, also in the opening of a movement, comes from the Sonata in E $\flat$, op. 81a, *Das Lebewohl* (ex. 6). Each of the principal motives in this introduction has a specific nuance associated with it. The *Lebewohl* motive (a descending third-progression) always carries a diminuendo, whether it appears in the right hand or the left hand. Beethoven's nuances in mm. 14 and 15, by contrast, serve the introduction of the dissonant chromatic tone $\flat^1$, which points subtly through its twofold resolution to the C $\flat$ -C $\sharp$ conflict which permeates the movement. The descending second, which might be called the "sigh" motive, also carries a diminuendo; the foreground reduction in ex. 6b clarifies the occurrences of this motive. Note how the slash in m. 11, which indicates a separation, sets off the "sigh" $\flat^2$ - $\flat^1$ from the preceding motive. The tiny swell that Beethoven has written at this point is perhaps elucidated by a note of Schenker's on a scrap of paper dated 24 October 1913: "<> in Beethoven not infrequently indicates merely a lingering, without an actual <> in respect of dynamics."²⁶ Another motive in this introduction is associated with the "sigh" motive: this is the ascending and descending third in a characteristic dotted rhythm. This motive always ends with the falling second of the "sigh" motive, of which it is in fact an embellishment (see ex. 6b). The ascending portion of the dotted motive, with the turn, always carries a crescendo in ex. 6a.

The single exception to this scheme of nuances occurs in m. 5, where the repetition of the "sigh" motive is accompanied by Beethoven's written crescendo. This crescendo serves the sudden change of foreground key focus from C minor to E $\flat$ major, a change that expresses the harmonic motion III $\flat$ -V in the middleground. Beethoven explicitly adds emphasis to this motion through his fingering (given in italics in Schenker's edition): the repeated use of the fifth finger in the right hand places unusual weight on the chromatic progression, while the doubling of the chromatic step B $\flat$ -B $\flat$ by the left hand gives an almost orchestral effect, like the addition of a new instrument. The importance of this harmonic and melodic motion supersedes the inherent diminuendo of the "sigh" motive; consequently Schenker reinforces Beethoven's crescendo with crescendi of his own.

In the main portion of this movement the various motives retain their associated nuances (ex. 7). The "sigh" motive is now identified with the neighboring motion $\flat^6$ - $\flat^5$ (G $\flat$ -F) or $\flat^6$ - $\flat^5$ (G-F), the local representative in B $\flat$ major of the C $\flat$ -C $\sharp$ conflict (i.e., $\flat^6$ and $\flat^6$ in E $\flat$ major). Note the diminuendi for the *Lebewohl* motive in mm. 47 and 48. The apparent victory of $\flat^6$ (g^3) is then expressed beautifully by an accent and a lingering on g^3 that is aided by an arpeggiation of the chord on the downbeat of m. 49. (Such arpeggiations are very rare in Schenker's scores.) Any possible ritardando before the *espressivo* of m. 50 is excluded by Schenker's forward arrow, which has the effect of holding together the entire upper-voice descent from g^3 to $\flat^1$, a descent that is echoed subsequently in lower registers.

Example 7: Op. 81a, I.

Example 8: Op. 81a, I.

In mm. 50–52 the *Lebewohl* motive in the upper voice carries its usual diminuendo while the stubbornly returning $\flat\delta$ in the left hand ($g\flat^1$) receives an accent (roughly equivalent to a diminuendo); compare Schenker's slightly different notation of the corresponding measures in the recapitulation (ex. 8). The "correction" of $\flat\delta$ by $\sharp\delta$ in m. 52 (neighboring motion $g^2-f^2=\sharp\delta-\delta$) also carries a diminuendo. Finally, the diabolically insistent $G\flat-F$ receives another diminuendo in m. 58, while the final cadential echo of the *Lebewohl* motive in m. 62 gets one as well, despite the greater length and syncopation of its last note, $b\flat^1$. (Such notes are more commonly accented.)

On the subject of neighboring motions, there is a general principle evident from Schenker's markings that upper neighbors are very often dynamically highlighted; i.e., they are either accented or followed

Example 9: Op. 90, II.

Example 10: Op. 90, II (see plate 1).

Example 11: Op. 10, no. 2, II.

by a diminuendo. This principle is most clearly illustrated in the rondo movement of the Sonata in E Minor, op. 90. The neighboring motion $a^1-g\sharp^1$ ($4-3$) plays an important role in this movement, both within the rondo theme itself and in the retransitions that lead back to it. Example 9 shows the first occurrence of the neighboring motion; ex. 10 is the first retransition. Above the neighboring note a^1 in ex. 9 Schenker writes: " $\{Nb\}$." (The abbreviation *Nb* stands for *Nebennote* ["neighboring note"]; in his published works Schenker generally uses the longer abbreviation *Nbn*.) In ex. 10 he points out the entry of a^1 (m. 64) as graphically as could be desired, and then shows the connection from a^1 to $g\sharp^1$ over the intervening right-hand flourish. Again he takes note of the dynamic circumstances (this time Beethoven's own) in the margin: " $\{Nb\}$." There are similar marginal notations twice more in the course of the movement.

Other annotations confirm this principle. One set comes from the second movement of the Sonata in F, op. 10, no. 2 (ex. 11). The diminished-seventh harmony in mm. 19 and 21 is a neighboring harmony to the tonic; Schenker's diminuendos in mm. 19–22 be-

gin and end precisely at D $\flat$ and C (the upper neighbor and its resolution) in each entrance of the motive. The neighboring notes d $\flat$ ¹ in mm. 23 and 24 are then accented.

Once again, and despite the apparent generalization in exs. 9 and 10 (Nb), it seems that Schenker had only *upper* neighbors in mind for dynamic highlighting. It must be stressed, too, that this principle is nowhere stated in *Vom Vortrag* or in the *Entwurf einer "Lehre vom Vortrag"*—nor, to my knowledge, in any of Schenker's writings. I have, however, observed the phenomenon in Schenker's scores with sufficient frequency to elevate it to the status of an implicit principle.

A similar principle, equally implicit, involves sevenths. Sevenths are very often dynamically highlighted in Schenker's scores, and with particular consistency in certain voice-leading situations. Unprepared sevenths, for instance, are often highlighted as in ex. 12. Schenker's diminuendos clarify the voice-leading analysis represented by the downward eighth-note stems in the right hand. The sevenths b $\flat$ (in m. 72) and e $\flat$ ¹ (m. 73) resolve only at the next downbeats, not before. The performer can only express these delayed resolutions through the extended diminuendos that Schenker has written.

Schenker's practice is most consistent when the seventh of a dominant harmony is approached from the fifth of the same harmony; such a motion, 5–7 or 5–6–7, almost always receives a crescendo. Conversely, when a dominant seventh descends by step to the fifth ($\frac{7-6-5}{5-4-3}$), this motion receives a diminuendo. Examples of each case can be found in the first movement of the *Sonata Pathétique*. Example 13a represents a prolonged dominant harmony of C minor. Schenker's slurs and parentheses show the contrapuntal progression $\frac{5-6-7-6-5}{3-4-5-4-3}$. The motion up to the seventh carries a crescendo specifically for the left hand; the dissolving texture which follows in mm. 29–31 is itself a kind of diminuendo. In ex. 13b, another prolonged dominant, Schenker's stems and beams in mm. 168–71 show the progression 7–6–5 repeated twice, and each time it receives a precisely corresponding diminuendo. The 7–6–5 motion in the upper register in mm. 173–75 also receives a diminuendo. The swell in the left hand in these measures helps to bring out the syncopation in the right hand by accenting the downbeat of m. 174.

One final note on dynamics: Schenker did not believe that the tones of highest structural significance in a composition are to be given any special emphasis as a general rule.²⁷ In fact, sometimes just the opposite is the case, and the structural tones are actually to be underplayed. One such example, according to Schenker (writing in *Der Tonwille*), is the passage from the Sonata, op. 57, shown in ex. 14a. Schenker's foreground reduction of the passage is shown in ex. 14b. He comments: "One ought not to think that in m. 36 the tones of the fundamental line are to be brought out above all the others; just as on the page they seem to be hidden in the weak beats, so in performance, too, they should be left in the shadow."²⁸ It

Example 12: Op. 22, IV.

a.

b.

Example 13A: Op. 13, I, 27–31. B: mm. 167–75.

a.

b.

Example 14A: Op. 57, I (see plate 2). B: Schenker's reduction (from *Die Tonwille* 7).

is for this reason that Schenker places a *p* specifically for c^2 in m. 36 and again for e^b1 in m. 38. (The meaning of the other notations in this passage will become clear as we proceed.)

RUBATO

I have thus far used the term “rubato” with abandon, and I shall continue to do so, but Schenker himself never uses the term in his writings (as far as I know). His conception of rhythmic freedom, nevertheless, is remarkably similar to that rough concept of rubato that many musicians learn as children: if you take time in one place, you must give it back someplace else. As Schenker expresses it in *Vom Vortrag*, “Whatever is to be taken later must be given back first; which certainly applies in reverse as well: whatever would be taken earlier must be given back later.”²⁹ He states that this principle of equilibrium, as we might call it, applies “almost in all cases.”

This is an old idea, and one to which much lip service has been paid over the years, but also one which has rarely been followed in practice. (In practice, most performers take more time than they give back.) A thoughtful musician might well be surprised to find such a widely and, often, thoughtlessly parroted idea expressed by a thinker of Schenker’s sophistication. However, two things become apparent when one compares this statement of Schenker’s with his later writings on performance and with his annotated scores. First, it is clear that he continued to believe the idea. Second, his *application* of the idea was highly flexible and far from simplistic (as we shall see).

Schenker sets down several general principles of rubato in *Vom Vortrag*, of which that concerning equilibrium is one. Another is this: in most cases one should accelerate slightly to any *sforzando* that falls on a weak beat; the compensating retardation (if one may use that term to mean a very slight lingering) should occur somewhere between the *sforzando* and the following downbeat. Rather than go through Schenker’s psychological explanation of this principle (which is also expressed in part in the Ninth Symphony monograph³⁰), I shall quote a relevant sentence from the analytical edition of op. 110: “Since metrical strictness expresses the norm of the rhythmic phenomenon, it cannot . . . simultaneously express an abnormal rhythmic occurrence.”³¹ Since so many rhythmic irregularities exist so much of the time in tonal music, what Schenker is calling for here is an almost constant use of rubato to express those irregularities.

Example 15, a particularly subtle and beautiful example, shows the principle of equilibrium at work. In mm. 15–16 Schenker writes two pairs of arrows; let us examine the second pair first. Schenker wishes to linger over the double suspension on the third beat of m. 16 (a carry-over from the downbeat) and also over the anticipation d^b1 ; neither of these had occurred in the theme or in the first variation. He prepares this retarda-

Example 15: Op. 109, III (see plate 3).

Example 16: Op. 10, no. 3, II (see plate 7).

tion with the acceleration in the first part of the measure; the acceleration simultaneously expresses the sinking of the bass into its “proper” register.

In m. 15 the theme’s simple cadential motion $\frac{6}{4} \frac{5}{3}$ over the dominant is replaced by a chromatic ascent from V to I in the bass. The first and therefore most surprising element of this ascent is the chromatic leading tone $b^{\sharp}1$, which initially gives the effect of a V–VI deceptive cadence through its resolution to $c^{\sharp}2$ (VI). This initial deceptive cadence is expressed by a retardation and an emphasis on $b^{\sharp}1$, from which a diminuendo begins. From the VI the bass motion continues chromatically upward to V^6_5 —which substitutes for the expected resolution of the cadential $\frac{6}{4}$ —and I. In this part of the progression the uncertainty which was aroused by the entrance of $b^{\sharp}1$ is largely dissipated; hence it would be wrong, for example, to give $c^{\sharp}2$ the same emphasis as $b^{\sharp}1$. The increasing feeling of inevitability is expressed both by Schenker’s diminuendo and by the slight acceleration to e^2 on the downbeat of m. 16.

Since Schenker’s rule regarding weak-beat *sforzandi* is relatively simple, I have chosen three examples which show that the rule has somewhat wider applicability than Schenker’s words might suggest. First of all, the rule applies, to some extent, to all accents on weak beats, not only to literal *sforzandi*. Example 16 shows an instance of accents created by melodic contour. As slight as the accents are, Schenker hurries to them in spite of the *Largo* tempo; in fact, the tiny accelerations create the desired *mesto* effect much better than would a metronomic performance. The holding down of f^1 and g^1 —which Schenker has indicated by the word *liegenlassen* and by means of horizontal lines—tends to bring of itself a slight retardation which compensates for the previous acceleration.

WILLIAM
ROTHSTEIN
Beethoven
Interpreted
by Schenker

Example 17: Op. 57, III.

Example 18: Op. 81a, III.

Example 17 shows that what applies to weak beats also applies to weak bars. As Schenker states in *Der Tonwille*:

The *sf* in m. 309 applies to a weak measure, the second of an 8-measure group. Therefore one must proceed from m. 308 to this *sf* in a crescendo and with acceleration, as if f^1 and ab^1 were in legato. After the *sf* has ended, the right hand drops onto the keys from above, so that the following chords can be played in a light and pointed manner.³²

The backward arrow in mm. 309–10 thus indicates a brief added silence between the measures rather than a lengthening of the *sf* chord itself. This interpretation is further confirmed by the indication, above the treble staff, of the proper hand motion, a motion to which Schenker refers in the quotation above.

Finally, ex. 18 shows a case to which the principle applies despite a change of tempo. Note that Beethoven has written *Poco andante* over the middle of m. 176, not at its beginning. In this case the slower tempo itself constitutes the compensating retardation.

Among other general principles concerning rubato which are to be found in Schenker's writings, one stipulates that a slight retardation must be made at the beginning of any new motive that enters on a weak beat.³³ Another, expressed in various sources but in less general terms, suggests that an acceleration of the tempo is desirable whenever the composition itself seems to accelerate in some way. In particular, this latter principle seems to apply to those cases of motivic acceleration that Arnold Schoenberg often termed "liquidation" and which Alfred Brendel calls "foreshortening."³⁴ In the Ninth Symphony monograph, for example, Schenker states in reference to mm. 150ff. of the first movement: "An acceleration of the tempo proceeds along with the contraction, or compression, of the motive from m. 154 onwards; the acceleration is to reflect in the medium of time that which is cumulatively compressed in the medium of the motive."³⁵

a.

b.

Example 19: Op. 14, no. 2, I (see plate 4).

The following examples from the Beethoven sonatas illustrate the use of rubato in connection with certain other categories of tonal or motivic events.

In ex. 19, rubato is used to clarify the voice-leading (see the reduction in ex. 19b). A third-progression is here divided into two steps of a second, and each second is stretched out into a ninth; thus the third-progression takes place in two registers. After establishing the bass tone D in m. 26 by lengthening it slightly, and after pressing ahead to the last statement of a^2 in m. 27 (which Schenker treats as an accent on a weak measure), the sixteenth-notes accelerate to the downbeat of m. 29, where the goal of the first second (or ninth) is embellished with a lower appoggiatura. The same process is repeated for the last step of the progression, $g^2-f\sharp^1$. The accelerations help to bind together each of the two ninths in turn and thus to communicate the third-progression as a whole. They are subtly balanced by the lengthenings in mm. 26 and 30.

In ex. 20 rubato is used for motivic purposes, specifically to express what Schenker calls "linkage technique"—i.e., the linking of one formal section to another through the use of the same motive on either side of the boundary between the two sections.³⁶ The motive here is a simple half-step neighboring motion, which appears repeatedly in mm. 48–57; Schenker brackets the motive in his score. The new theme in mm. 59ff. begins with the same motive—hence the linkage. Schenker brings out the linkage by means of a slight retardation combined with a *le-*

Example 20: Op. 2, no. 2, I.

a.

b.

Example 21: Op. 81a, I.

gatissimo—for which his indication here is the horizontal line over the motive.³⁷ The abbreviated instruction written above the motive (not clearly legible in Schenker's score) probably stands for *tief in der Klaviatur* or something similar, indicating that the pianist is to play deeply into the keyboard with an immobile hand and a low wrist. The acceleration which follows the motive in mm. 59–60 aims toward the weak-beat *sforzando* d^{♯2}, the resolution of which (to d^{♯2}) is affected by the diminuendo required after suspensions and other accented dissonances.

Example 21a is also motivic in nature, if one takes that term in its broadest possible sense. The example comes from the coda of the movement entitled *Das Lebewohl* (cf. exs. 6–8). The *Lebewohl* motive is everywhere in evidence; the C^b-C[♯] conflict referred to

a.

m. 9 12 18 21 25 27 29 31 38 39
(Th. 1. ant. con. Mod. Th. 2 ant. con.)

b.

c.

d.

Example 22A: Op. 10, no. 2, I. b: Schenker's graph in *Meisterwerk II* (*Jahrbuch II*)—*Anhang IV*, fig. 4h. c: Schenker's graph in *Free Composition*, fig. 101, 4. d: reduction of ex. 22A.

earlier may be seen in mm. 183–87. The goal of the acceleration is the *sf* in m. 195, which is the third measure of a four-bar hypermeasure and thus subject to Schenker's rule concerning weak-beat accents. All of this is perfectly logical and in accordance with Schenker's principles, as is the compensating retardation after the *sf*. The deeper meaning of Beethoven's *sf* and of Schenker's rubato, however, is to be seen in ex. 21b. The bass tone b[♯] of m. 195 is enharmonically reinterpreted as c^{b1}. This reinterpretation becomes clear when b[♯] (c^{b1}) resolves to b[♭], and thus we recognize the neighboring motive b[♭]–[♮]5, C^b–B[♭]. Measure 195 marks the last appearance of C^b in the movement.

A final example of rubato, the opening of the Sonata in F, op. 10, no. 2, shows how rhythmic freedom

may be used to guide the listener to the middle-ground and even to the background. Example 22a is Schenker's score, 22b his middleground analysis of the passage from *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*, and 22c his middleground graph from *Der freie Satz*. I have supplemented these with a graph of my own (ex. 22d). Although Schenker's two analyses differ, most notably in their choice of primary tone—it is $\hat{8}$ in *Das Meisterwerk*, $\hat{3}$ in *Der freie Satz*—their differences are not crucial for our immediate purposes. In the performance markings, the initial upbeat pattern is given a forward arrow in m. 1 and m. 3, but a backward arrow in m. 5. (I shall explain the vertical arrows later.) This contrast, combined with Schenker's generous pedaling, clearly connects the descending line $c^2-b^1-a^1$ and makes a a^1 sound like an important, if temporary, goal. (The marks between the staves in mm. 1 and 3—asterisk and cross respectively—both indicate pedal release. One must also assume a change of pedal at the downbeat of m. 3.) Subsequent events confirm that the main upper-voice motion indeed starts from A and not from C; see ex. 22d. The importance of a^1 , at least at a middleground level, is evident even in Schenker's relatively primitive graph in *Das Meisterwerk*. Therefore we can say that his performance markings, which emphasize a^1 , clarify the middleground structure of the passage. If Schenker chose the wrong primary tone in 1926, when volume II of *Das Meisterwerk* was published, it wasn't because he didn't know how to play the opening bars.

LEGATO

As was indicated earlier, both *Vom Vortrag* and the *Entwurf einer "Lehre vom Vortrag"* contain extensive sections on legato playing. The two works complement each other nicely in this area, and together they are nothing short of a revelation to the pianist. Schenker carefully classifies various types of legato playing, explains the effect of each, specifies the physical means of obtaining those effects, and offers examples from the literature to illustrate each type.

Schenker's greatest contribution in this area is his revival of the practice of holding notes beyond their written value in order to secure the effect of a legato or *legatissimo*. This practice has been lost almost entirely among pianists, although it remains well known to harpsichordists, who call it "over-legato." (Perhaps more harpsichordists than pianists have read C.P.E. Bach's *Essay*, where this manner is clearly described [pp. 155–56].) The principal difficulty, of course, is knowing when to use the technique and how. As with most decisions involving playing technique, only knowledge of *compositional* technique can provide the solution, for only such knowledge can enable the performer to determine what effect is desired—and thus which physical means are appropriate—in any given context.

Schenker distinguishes at least three different

Example 23A: Schenker, *Kontrapunkt*, fig. 106 (p. 125). B: *Entwurf einer "Lehre vom Vortrag"*, p. 15.

Example 24: Op. 10, no. 3, III.

types of legato which are to be achieved by holding down the keys: (1) holding the first note of a legato pair may create the effect of a portamento, thus imitating a common vocal or string technique; (2) holding the tones of broken chords or related figurations creates an effect which Schenker calls "*Handpedal*"; (3) holding certain notes in so-called compound melodies may be appropriate to express an underlying polyphonic structure. In practice—i.e., in Schenker's scores—there are also cases which do not fall readily into any of these three categories.

The most extensive discussion of portamento in Schenker's writings is found, oddly enough, in the first volume of his *Kontrapunkt* (1910).³⁸ As a vocal ornament—also known as *porte de voix* or "carrying the voice"—portamento is most often associated with anticipations, especially just before cadences. An example, from op. 57, cited by Schenker both in *Kontrapunkt* and in the *Entwurf einer "Lehre vom*

a.

b.

Example 25A: Op. 14, no. 2, I (see plate 5). v: Schenker's graph in *Free Composition*, figure 47, 2 (mm. 1–26 only).

Vortrag," is particularly close to the typical vocal or violin portamento (ex. 23). Schenker's re-notation in ex. 23b shows precisely how the pianist is to hold c^2 while playing the eighth-note anticipation d^2 . The briefly simultaneous sounding of the two tones outlines the interval between them in a way analogous to the filling-in of the interval characteristic of the true portamento.³⁹

An example from the Menuetto of the Sonata in D, op. 10, no. 3 (ex. 24a) is particularly charming for two reasons. First, the portamento with retardation indicated by Schenker clearly evokes the sound of the cello. Second, the rhythmic effect of this portamento may be described as a deliberate de-accentuation of the melodic high note, $f\sharp$. The conflict here between melodic emphasis and rhythmic de-emphasis is especially affecting because this $f\sharp$ serves as an echo of the primary tone $\hat{3}$ of the fundamental line; the latter has just concluded, in a slightly inconclusive way, with the $\hat{1}$ in an inner voice (see the reduction in ex. 24b). The "cello" melody thus serves to reinforce the final descent of the fundamental line.

A final example of portamento comes from the *Kommentar zu Schindler*. Interestingly, this portamento is not marked in Schenker's score of op. 14, no. 2, although this is one of the more heavily annotated of the sonatas in his collection. Example 25a shows Schenker's markings, which are interesting for their own sake; ex. 25b shows his graph of the same passage in *Der freie Satz*. Schindler had remarked upon the "holding back and the tender carrying-over of individual notes" (*Zurückhalten und*

sanftes Hinübertragen einzelner Noten) in Beethoven's performance of this passage. Schenker comments:

Beethoven expressed the reaching-over of the sixths here by holding the lower tone of each sixth beyond its written value, so that it continued to sound for an instant beneath the higher tone which follows. In this way he obtained an effect similar to the portamento of violinists and singers . . . and it is this that Schindler called "tender carrying-over."⁴⁰

The reachings-over are to be seen in Schenker's graph; they introduce the tones of an arpeggiation, $a^1-c\sharp^2-e^2-a^2$, which expresses an ascending register transfer.⁴¹ Schenker's striking tone of certainty in reporting how Beethoven must have played is characteristic of the *Kommentar zu Schindler*. It is even more striking in those passages in which he disagrees with Schindler's account. Schenker assumes that Beethoven's performance must have followed the content of the piece; since the latter can be objectively determined (in his view), so can the former. Nowhere is Schenker's conviction of the objectivity of correct performance decisions more forcefully demonstrated.

The clearest exposition of the technique which Schenker calls "hand pedal" is given in the *Entwurf einer "Lehre vom Vortrag"*, and I quote it here in full:

Diminution frequently follows the traces of orchestral voices which fill out and thicken a texture. It is the peculiarity of the piano that it gives precedence to diminution and causes the orchestral quality to recede. This surely has the disadvantage that the unimaginative player, who does not grasp the nature of the instrument, is unable to render the concealed filling out of the texture. An example: in Chopin's Nocturne in $F\sharp$ Major, op. 15, no. 2, a literally filled-out texture might look something like this:

played perhaps by horns and bassoons, etc. The pianist must allow the concealed texture to be heard through the figure in mm. 1–2; he can only do this by leaving his fingers on the keys, forming the chords in question. This manner of playing, for which I propose the term "hand pedal"—the creation of a pedal effect by the hand alone—also merges with the concept of *legatissimo*.⁴²

Example 26: Op. 2, no. 3, I.

Example 27: Op. 90, II, (see plate 6).

In ex. 26, from Beethoven's Sonata in C, op. 2 no. 3, Schenker shows precisely how "hand pedal" is to be executed in a specific instance. The ties in the example indicate which tones are to be held and for how long; even the incomplete ties in the latter half of m. 29 have different release points indicated. The third eighth note in the measure, a^2 , is not held, probably in order to secure a portamento effect between $f\sharp^2$ and c^3 . A sustained a^2 would interfere with the delineation of this melodic interval.

Example 27 beautifully contrasts "hand pedal" with actual, or foot pedal. As the voice-leading reduction in ex. 27b indicates, the tones $e^2-d\sharp^2$ and $d\flat^2-c\sharp^2$ form a covering voice; $c\sharp^2$ is taken over by the bass $c\sharp$ in m. 14 and is led through $c\flat$ to B. Thus the structural upper voice doubles the upper notes of the left hand from the second beat of m. 8 to the first beat of m. 12. At the same time, the bass tones $F\sharp$ (m. 9) and E (m. 11) are triadic roots that have been added underneath the structural bass voice.⁴³ In other words, two inner-voice tones have been simultaneously added *outside* of the outer voices in mm. 9 and 11. Schenker expresses this striking situation by marking just those two points with the pedal. In order to save the pedal for

Example 28A: Op. 22, I. B: Schenker's graph in *Free Composition*, figure 113, 3d.

these two points, however, he indicates the use of "hand pedal" at the first beat of m. 9—he presumably intends its use in m. 11 as well. The effect of this pedaling is magical: in conjunction with the diminuendo from the first to the second beat, it creates what is sometimes called a "negative accent"—i.e., an accent created by especial *softness* rather than by added force. Rare indeed is the performer who creates such beautiful effects for such well-grounded reasons.

Example 28a shows "hand pedal" used in the service of middleground structure; it is a passage from the first movement of the Sonata in B $\flat$, op. 22, immediately preceding the extended dominant which concludes the development section. Example 28b is Schenker's middleground analysis of mm. 89–112; it shows an unusual prolongation of V of V. The return of the bass tone C in m. 109 occurs in the middle of a sequential passage, hardly the usual context for an important middleground goal.⁴⁴ The arrival at m. 109 must therefore be marked in some way. Beethoven marks it *pp*. Schenker adds to this a *Luftpause* before the downbeat and a retardation on the downbeat; he also *holds* the C, thereby indicating its greater structural value in relation to the $E\flat$ of m. 105. The abbreviated notation "Hdpd." (*Handpedal*) probably means that all the tones of the C harmony are to be held for the duration of the horizontal line; the passing tones are not to be held. Given the low register, this produces an impressively mysterious sound. The subsequent arrival of the V (F), a fifth lower, is then treated in the same way. It is clear that the foot

Example 29: Op. 57, II.

Example 30: Op. 53, I.

pedal could not be used in this passage—it would muddy the bass melody too much (even on a piano of Beethoven's time). Schenker's solution is surely the best.

As an example of holding the notes of compound melodies, ex. 29 requires little comment. The notes with eighth-note stems are to be held as eighth notes. The two-note slurs seem to indicate desired portamento effects. In contrast, m. 36 is to be played very evenly ("gleichmässig"), without holding any note except d^1 beyond its written value; the slash shows where d^1 is to be released. Schenker's markings in this passage differ slightly from his description of the same passage in *Der Tonwille*.⁴⁵

Holding notes beyond their written value is only one type of legato technique described by Schenker. Since most of the others are more familiar, at least to pianists, I will not discuss them here.⁴⁶ One type, however, forms a natural transition to the subject of hand motions, which we shall take up next, and that is "articulated legato" (*artikulierendes Legato*).

As defined by Schenker in *Vom Vortrag*, articulated legato is a means by which to give individual notes within a legato a certain emphasis. This is achieved by raising the arm and the hand in order to attack the following tone from a greater height, while continuing to form a meticulous legato with the fingers. One effect of this motion, from the point of view of the pianist, is a release of physical tension in the arm. From the point of view of the listener, an articulation is created which sets apart the tone or tones just prior to the raising of the arm.

An example from the "Waldstein" Sonata may serve as an illustration (ex. 30). The raising of the arm is indicated by the symbol above the treble staff in m. 3. This motion releases any physical tension which may have built up through the repeated notes in mm. 1–2; it also sets off the goal tone G (on the downbeat) from the following three-note motive. The line from the note d in m. 3 indicates that this tone is to be shortened to a quarter note. The release of d also helps to throw g into relief.

Example 31: Op. 101, IV.

Example 32: Op. 27, no. 2, III.

USE OF THE HAND

The subject of hand motions on the piano may seem an esoteric one to the non-pianist. It is surely far from the realm of what is generally considered music theory. Yet both *Vom Vortrag* and the *Entwurf* contain important sections on hand motions, fingering, and other aspects of piano technique. Despite appearances to the contrary, there is no contradiction here: indeed, it is fitting that Schenker, who saw his mission as the reuniting of theory and practice, and who often used the lowly piano lesson as the vehicle for his theoretical teaching, should have paid so much attention to such practical matters. A sentence such as the following from the *Entwurf* demonstrates that Schenker recognized no gulf between theory and performance: "The hand may not lie; it must follow the meaning of voice-leading." And again: "Fingering must also be true; the hand—like the mouth—must speak the truth."⁴⁷

These quotations help to explain many of Schenker's unusual fingerings in his edition of the Beethoven sonatas. In the following passage from the Sonata in A, op. 101, for example (ex. 31), the right hand is forced to lift after m. 60. Schenker offers this explanation in his analytical edition of the sonata:

The last sixteenth note of m. 60 should only be played with the fourth finger and not, as is recommended in so many editions, with the first. With the latter fingering the hand is guilty, so to speak, of an untruth, in that it posits a relationship between a^1 and $\text{f}\sharp^2$ which does not in fact exist.⁴⁸

Some of Schenker's instructions regarding hand motions stress the relationship of the piano to other instruments and to the voice. Thus, hand motion on the piano is seen as analogous to bowing on stringed

WILLIAM
ROTHSTEIN
Beethoven
Interpreted
by Schenker

Example 33: Op. 10, no. 2, I [see plate 8].

instruments or to breathing for wind players or for singers. As with bowing or breathing, hand motion (like fingering) is to be determined by the performer in advance, according to the musical content. Each individual musical unit that would receive, say, a single bow on the violin, should receive a single physical impulse of the hand.⁴⁹

A particularly graphic example of an analogy with string playing may be seen in ex. 32. The various-sized curlicues which appear mostly in the left hand indicate release motions. Schenker's notation is so painstaking that, in the actual copy at Riverside, it is evident that the curlicues were all originally of equal size, and that he subsequently erased those in m. 39 and substituted the increasing series found in the example. The pianist is thus directed to lift the left hand higher with each release in m. 39, just as a string player would use progressively greater lengths of the bow in order to make the crescendo. The longer quarter notes in m. 38 receive correspondingly longer "bows" than the first eighth notes in m. 39. That this analogy was what Schenker had in mind is confirmed by a passage from the chapter on staccato in *Vom Vortrag*: "In certain circumstances—particularly when a *cresc.* or *dimin.* is involved—the pianist, just like the violinist, can progress from longer to shorter bow strokes (or vice versa) in a continuous gamut."⁵⁰

Example 33 is notable for its extremely detailed markings, many of which indicate hand motions. Two layers of markings are apparent in Schenker's score: a layer in plain pencil (e.g., in the treble staff in mm. 69–72); and a layer of much heavier markings, originally in purple pencil (e.g., in the bass staff in the same measures). There does not appear to be any consistent functional differentiation between the two layers. (This observation holds true throughout the sonatas, however many colors may be used in the marking of a particular passage.) In a second copy of this sonata (not shown in plate 8), Schenker marks a *f* for the left hand at the second D in m. 74; this may help to clarify the *p* at the beginning of m. 73 in ex. 33.

The hand motions indicated for the three-note descending motive are perhaps most readily understandable at their first appearance, in mm. 65–66. The high c^3 in m. 65 is the upper-voice goal of the closing theme, while the low C in m. 66 is the bass goal. Therefore it is appropriate that the eighth-note c^3 be played particularly sharply, with a strong release; this "releases" some of the momentum of the preceding trill and gives c^3 an individuality beyond that motive of which it forms a part. The octave G is then played as being "on the way" to C, with a gentler release. The arrival at the bass C (a quarter note, not an eighth) is marked *tenuto* by Schenker. This three-note pattern is then maintained in the development section, except that the lowest note, now an eighth, is less important than before; hence the diminuendo which Schenker marks at each appearance of the motive from m. 67 on.

The marking of the ascending motive which first appears in m. 69 seems to depict the haste with which the hand seeks out each off-beat entrance. Schenker's fingering (see mm. 73–74, left hand) ensures that the hand must lift at each beat. It is probable that each entrance is intended to be a little early—i.e., rushed—although this is not specifically marked.

Of the other markings in ex. 33, the stems are analytical, while the small slurs in mm. 70, 72, and 74 seem to indicate *legatissimo* (to be achieved by holding the appropriate notes).

In an earlier example from the same sonata—ex. 22—we saw vertical arrows used, pointing either upward or downward. Schenker explains these symbols in the *Entwurf*: they indicate the two parts of the physical impulse of the hand, the downward weight and the upward reflex.⁵¹ As he explains in *Vom Vortrag*, the downward motion is essentially passive; the arm and the hand are allowed to fall into the keys of their own natural weight. It is the reflex that is the more active motion: "Only the point of weight absorbs the natural weight of the hand; motion to and from this point, by contrast, commands the greatest lightness and agility."⁵²

In ex. 22, the reflex on the downbeats of mm. 2 and (presumably) 4 helps to create the feeling of alternating strong and weak measures. Since c^2 and $b\flat^1$ have already been established on the downbeats of mm. 1 and 3 respectively, and since these are both certainly points of weight, adding another such point to each tone on a downbeat would be redundant and would create an undue feeling of heaviness (see ex. 34).

PEDAL

There are many uses to which the pedal may be put which go beyond its standard function of sustaining individual tones and harmonies. Like dynamics, rubato, and articulation, the pedal may help to bring out details of voice-leading, of motivic structure, or of rhythm. Instances of all these uses are to be found among Schenker's performance markings.

Example 34: Op. 10, no. 2, I (hypothetical).

Example 35: Op. 90, I.

Example 36: Op. 90, I.

Beethoven himself used pedal indications in unconventional ways, of course: one thinks, for example, of the Largo of the C-Minor Concerto, the recitative in the Sonata in D Minor, op. 31, no. 2, and the opening of the Rondo of the "Waldstein" Sonata.

Two examples from the Sonata in E Minor, op. 90, illustrate the versatility of the pedal in uses that are still close to its conventional role (exs. 35 and 36). In ex. 35 the pedal, while sustaining the chords of mm. 2 and 6, helps to articulate the four two-measure motives into two four-measure groups. This grouping corresponds to the two third-progressions of the upper voice, g^1-b^1 in mm. 1–4 and b^1-d^2 in mm. 5–8. The upper-voice tones in mm. 2 and 6 are thus passing tones; by causing these tones to sound through to their continuations and eventual resolutions, Schenker's pedaling helps to clarify their voice-leading function.

Example 36 typifies the careful attention that Schenker pays to the inner articulation of runs and other so-called passagework. This sixteenth-note run does not merely connect two registers in the right hand; it "dissolves" the chord of m. 29 by moving through its chordal spaces, ending with its bass tone g . The chordal spaces— f^3-f^2 , f^2-f^1 , and f^1-g —are beautifully depicted in Schenker's score, as is the connection between the left and right hands. The pedal is released precisely as the right hand reaches f^1 , the uppermost tone of the left hand in m. 29. This release, by dividing the run into two parts at just this

Example 37A: Op. 109, I. v. Schenker, *Meisterwerk II*, p. 51, figure 8.

Example 38: Op. 109, II.

point, helps to make audible the transfer of the chordal space f^1-g from the left hand to the right. Thus, once again, the pedal serves to clarify the voice-leading.

The final two examples, from the Sonata in E Major, op. 109, are more unusual (exs. 37 and 38). Example 37a shows the pedal used in the service of motivic structure; ex. 37b is Schenker's sketch of the transformations throughout the first movement of the third-motive which opens the sonata. The last two sixteenth notes in m. 97 echo the motive in the highest register of Beethoven's piano, the same register in which the motive appeared at the beginning of the recapitulation (m. 48). On the modern piano—Schenker's piano—these two notes fall outside the range of the dampers, which ends (on the Steinway D) at g^3 . Therefore, Schenker's special pedal for these two notes has the effect of a vague halo of sound, caused by the raising of the dampers and by sympathetic vibrations, rather than an actual sustaining effect. This pedaling virtually forces the pianist to take time in playing the motive; holding back here would also compensate for pushing ahead in m. 96 as Schenker indicates. The combination of the retardation and the "halo" effect helps to communicate the motive—which otherwise might easily pass unnoticed—to the listener.

WILLIAM
ROTHSTEIN
Beethoven
Interpreted
by Schenker

In ex. 38 the pedal is used to solve one of the most intractable problems of piano playing—the inability to make a crescendo on a single note. As the reduction (ex. 38b) shows, the bass tone F $\sharp$ in m. 55 undergoes a functional enharmonic change to E $\sharp$. The harmony might be described as V $_2^4$ of C major—the Neapolitan (bII) of B minor—in the first half of the measure, and as an inverted German augmented sixth in the second half; the latter harmony then leads to V. As a chromatically raised tone (a secondary leading tone), E $\sharp$ must be dynamically highlighted; this is an old and familiar rule of performance.⁵³ But since E $\sharp$ is not rearticulated on the second beat of m. 55, this rule can be fulfilled only by a crescendo—a crescendo, that is, on a single, sustained pitch.

There are basically two methods of creating the illusion of a crescendo on a sustained note: either one makes a crescendo in the moving notes of the other voices, or one depresses the pedal midway through the duration of the sustained note itself. In ex. 38a, Beethoven has supplied the first method and Schenker the second. Since depressing the pedal always causes a change of timbre and thus a certain accent, depressing it precisely at the second beat of m. 55 subtly accents the enharmonic change.

IV

After this lengthy exposition of Schenker's performance markings and their meanings, an obvious question suggests itself. Why did Schenker keep this all to himself? Why didn't he publish a "performing" edition of the sonatas, as Bülow, Riemann, Tovey, and Schnabel did?

To anyone familiar with Schenker's writings, to ask this question is to answer it.⁵⁴ We have seen, for example, that Schenker regarded the composer's notation as an indication of desired effects. To realize the composer's intentions—which, Schenker believed, can be objectively determined (witness the *Kommentar zu Schindler*)—the composer's notation must be preserved to the greatest extent possible, for only the authentic text, properly read, can lead to the desired execution. Therefore, additional performance markings by an editor could only be misleading.

Another part of the answer is supplied in *Vom Vortrag*. Speaking of unwritten dynamic nuances, Schenker comments:

While the present generation [i.e., the generation of the turn of the century] is wearing itself out adding such nuances to editions of the older masterworks,

sometimes well and sometimes badly, the written-out instructions stimulate the performer's nerves (simply as a visual reflex) in such a way that, because he has been instructed to execute the nuance, he exaggerates it, though he would surely have been more discreet if left to himself. When all is said and done, the last word must finally be left to the performer himself.⁵⁵

In other words, each performer must find his own way to the composer's intentions, using only the composer's actual notation, his own intuitive ear, and his educated mind. Additional "expression" markings are not a legitimate means to this end, if only because they inevitably cloud the more economical markings of the composer himself.⁵⁶ The common expedient of bracketing editorial markings, incidentally, cannot completely eliminate the visual confusion since, as Schenker says, the performer tends to react to everything he sees. Indeed, any attempt by an editor to specify the smallest nuances, rubato, or pedaling is likely to lead to an overreaction on the part of the performer.

The matter is somewhat different with respect to added fingering, which is more easily ignored by the performer. It must be admitted, however, that even the addition of fingering can be problematical if the performer does not understand the musical or technical idea which motivates it. Schenker's fingerings are intended to point the performer—the performer, that is, who chooses to be so pointed—in the direction of the proper performance. The performer's choice here is crucial, for with the decision to use Schenker's fingering (or, for that matter, Beethoven's, in those infrequent passages in which it appears) comes the obligation to understand it.⁵⁷ If even editorial fingering creates such problems, it is easy—and frightening—to imagine the almost insuperable difficulties that are created by the addition of markings the interpretation of which is less straightforward.

We can conclude from the above that Schenker's annotated scores were intended purely for his own use—as an aid in performance and analysis and perhaps also to help him in his teaching.⁵⁸ He would not have wanted to see them published in the form of a "practical" edition, and there are very good reasons why we should respect his wishes in this. Since he did so much to establish responsible editorial stand-

ards in our century, it would be ironic indeed if his work were to inspire an abrogation of those same standards. The thought of a young pianist struggling to master the choreography of ex. 33—lovingly reproduced in the original purple—should be enough to give any publisher pause.

V

I would like to conclude this study with a brief, general consideration of Schenker's style of performance, and to begin to place that style within an historical perspective.

From the evidence of his scores of the Beethoven sonatas, Schenker's playing was both clear and flexible: clear in conception and articulation, but without dryness; flexible in tempo, in rhythm, and in nuance. It was characterized by great variety of touch and of shading. It was goal-oriented playing: in the Ninth Symphony monograph Schenker calls for "a kind of spiritual bird's-eye view" in performance,⁵⁹ and it is clear that his playing had this. As part of this orientation toward near or distant goals, his playing was characterized much of the time by a surprising *lightness*, a lightness evident from his scores in the many *pianos* inserted within *fortes*, in the frequent accelerations (which are usually longer than their corresponding retardations), and in the careful grouping and shading of tones within figurations.

It is this essential quality of lightness that brings up the historical questions. To what extent, for example, is this quality applicable to music after Beethoven? And how does Schenker fit into the history of performance practice?

Fortunately, Schenker's writings provide some of the answers. First, they show that he was aware of this lightness and that he considered it a necessity: "The ear, too, like the eye, must serve distance. The ability to do this comes from knowledge of the background; there follows a corresponding lightness . . . of performance."⁶⁰ Second, they show that he associated this lightness with the art of instrumental diminution—i.e., with the use of idiomatic figuration as an organic part of the work:

Thus it happens that in spite of employing the most exalted idiom, as is frequently the case, for example, in their Adagios, the works of our masters do not lack

the most purposeful passagework and ornamentation. Even in his very last works, where the expression is surely the most intensified, Beethoven still calls upon the most diverse figuration to bear the most powerful expression.⁶¹

Finally, the writings reveal that Schenker believed a decline in this art of instrumental diminution to have taken place after Beethoven. In *Vom Vortrag* he traces the initial stages of this decline to Schubert, Mendelssohn, and Schumann.⁶² In the later *Entwurf*, however, he lays blame squarely on Wagner:

It was first through Wagner that the foreground was burdened with motives and bits of motives that were, so to speak, too weighty to be able to fly. For synthesis was understood less and less. While a certain heaviness weighted down the motive or its components—that was also to Wagner's taste—the ability of the diminution to soar was destroyed. Then the mistake was made of transferring the manner of performance of this overburdened diminution to the masterworks, of investing them with a pathos inconsistent with the agility and lightness of their diminution. The great crescendos in flight, the long progressions that aim toward individual tones—these are things that do not appear in Wagner's works. Therefore the heavy plodding of Wagnerian performance is not applicable to the masterworks—not the weighting down of series of eighth or sixteenth notes, not the thickening from eighth note to eighth note in crescendo, etc.⁶³

This indictment of Wagner was by no means written thoughtlessly or in a state of temporary peevishness. As far back as 1896, in an article on conducting published in the periodical *Die Zeit*, Schenker accused Wagner (along with Hans von Bülow) of influencing performance practice for the worse. The younger conductors, he says—citing Weingartner, Strauss, and Siegfried Wagner by name—dwell upon details to such an extent that they frequently lose sight of the whole; Wagner and Bülow, he continues, initiated this style of conducting. On the other hand, the generation of conductors that preceded Wagner—Schenker may have had Mendelssohn in mind here—probably paid too little attention to the shaping of details.⁶⁴

Thus the issue comes down, as it so often does, to one of balance: balance between the shaping of detail and the projection of the whole; between "expression" and "lightness";

WILLIAM
ROTHSTEIN
Beethoven
Interpreted
by Schenker

or, to put it in more theoretical terms, between the demands of the foreground and the demands of the middleground. Schenker's sense of this balance changed remarkably little from 1896 to his death in 1935, and indeed it runs through his work like a leitmotiv—oddly reminiscent, in its way, of the similar balance which he sought between harmony and counterpoint.⁶⁵ In a very

real sense, balance is the central message of Schenker's work—balance not only within the realm of theory, but perhaps more fundamentally between theory and practice. In this century of literally disintegrated musical activity, Schenker—as pianist, composer, critic, editor, theorist, and polemicist—not only sought balance but lived it.

NOTES

I am indebted to John W. Tanno, Assistant University Librarian, and Clifford Wurfel, Head of Special Collections, both of the University of California, Riverside, for their permission to use, and assistance in preparing, reproductions of material in the Oswald Jonas Memorial Collection. Professor Philip Brett was also very helpful in preparing the material. Examples from *Free Composition (Der freie Satz)* by Heinrich Schenker, translated and edited by Ernst Oster, are reprinted by permission of Longman, Inc., New York. Copyright © 1979 by Longman, Inc.

¹Schenker's insistence upon the connection between his theoretical and his practical activities is most emphatically stated in the original title of his first major theoretical work, *Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien—von einem Künstler*, published anonymously by Universal Edition in 1906.

²An excellent recent article in this area is Charles Burkhardt's "Schenker's Theory of Levels and Musical Performance," in *Aspects of Schenkerian Theory*, ed. David Beach (New Haven, 1983), pp. 95–112.

³*Erläuterungsausgabe der letzten fünf Sonaten Beethovens*, 2nd edn., rev. Oswald Jonas (Vienna, 1971–72); *Chromatische Phantasie und Fuge: Kritische Ausgabe von Heinrich Schenker*, 2nd edn., rev. Oswald Jonas (Vienna, 1969); "A Contribution to the Study of Ornamentation," trans. Hedi Siegel, *Music Forum* 4 (1976), 1–139; *Beethovens neunte Sinfonie* (Vienna, 1912).

⁴Jonas, *Einleitung* (unpub.), Oswald Jonas Memorial Collection, University of California, Riverside. "Da finden sich Eintragungen, nicht nur solcher, den authentischen Text betreffend, oder solcher analytischer Natur, sondern auch die minutiösesten Eintragungen, um den Vortrag anzuzeigen. Sie werfen ein Licht auf Schenkers umfassende Tätigkeit, und sie machen es verständlich, warum sich viele praktische Musiker—unter ihnen auch Wilhelm Furtwängler—immer wieder bei Schenker Rat und Belehrung geholt haben."

⁵See also the following articles by Jonas: "Die Kunst des Vortrages nach Heinrich Schenker," *Musik Erziehung* (March 1962), 127–29; "Schenker und große Interpreten," *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 19 (1964), 584–89.

⁶Although Door (1833–1919) edited all the sonatas, the Schenker Collection at Riverside contains only the earlier ones, up to and including op. 31.

⁷Schenker's edition was published in two formats. The

thirty-two sonatas appeared individually from 1921 to 1923; a complete edition in four volumes was published in 1923. (This was revised by Erwin Ratz for Universal Edition in 1945.) Schenker owned exemplars of both formats, of course, including multiple copies of many individual sonatas. All of this material is now in the Jonas Collection at Riverside.

⁸*Beethovens neunte Sinfonie*, p. xiv. "Würde beispielsweise die IX. Sinfonie auf uns, ähnlich etwa wie die meisten Werke von Seb. Bach, nicht schon ausdrücklich bezeichnet gekommen sein, so müßte eine kundige Hand die dynamischen Zeichen gemäß dem Inhalt doch wieder nur genau so setzen, als es eben Beethoven selbst getan hat."

⁹"Anweisungen im Grunde überflüssig, da die Komposition alles nötige aussagt," *Entwurf*, p. 3 ("Ergänzungen u. ähnliche Ausführungen zu 'Die Meister'").

¹⁰*Vom Vortrag*, ch. 9, §3.

¹¹*Entwurf*, pp. 1 and 5; this quotation is a combination of two very similar passages in the sections headed "Methodik." "Der Vortrag muß von innen des Werkes kommen, das Werk hat aus eigenen Lungen zu atmen, aus den Zügen, Nebennoten, Chromen, Modulationen—hierüber keine 'Auffassung,' auch unzugänglich jeder Notierung im Werke" (p. 1). "Aller Vortrag kommt von innen, nicht von aussen. Das Stück atmet aus eigenen Lungen, führt das Blut eigener Züge (Nebennoten und Chromen), über die es verschiedene Auffassungen naturgemäß nicht geben kann!" (p. 5).

¹²"Keine 'Auffassung!'" *Entwurf*, p. 2 ("Sich selbst stilisieren").

¹³Quoted in Schenker's *Erläuterungsausgabe* of op. 110, p. 78n.

¹⁴*Vom Vortrag*, ch. 2; see also *Beethovens neunte Sinfonie*, pp. xii–xvi.

¹⁵See *Op. 110*, p. 41 and pp. 78–79.

¹⁶*Entwurf*, p. 2 ("Sich selbst stilisieren"). "Der beste Vortrag, bei dem der Laie alles so selbstverständlich findet, daß er glaubt, so auch selbst zu spielen."

¹⁷See *Chromatische Phantasie und Fuge*, pp. 44–45; also *Vom Vortrag*, ch. 9, §1.

¹⁸*Vom Vortrag*, ch. 9, §3.

¹⁹The concept of layered dynamics—Schenker's most original contribution to the study of dynamics—is not discussed in *Vom Vortrag*, since this manuscript predated his theory of structural levels. It is only mentioned briefly in the *Entwurf* (p. 1). See, however, *Music Forum* 4 (1976), 156–57, for a statement of this concept (from Schenker's essay on Bach's Sonata for Solo Violin, BWV 1005, trans. John

Rothgeb). Burkhart (see fn. 2) comments on this concept is his article (p. 112n.); he believes that Schenker probably discarded the idea at some point.

²⁰See C. P. E. Bach, *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments*, trans. William Mitchell, pp. 87–88 and p. 98. See also Schenker, "A Contribution to the Study of Ornamentation," *Music Forum* 4 (1976), 58–59.

²¹See *Op. 101*, p. 45.

²²A much more elaborate example of shading within a *fortissimo* dynamic is shown and discussed in *Beethovens neunte Sinfonie*, pp. 293–95 (fig. 362).

²³*Der Tonwille* 7, 31. There appears to be a discrepancy between the essay and the score with respect to pedaling. "In T. 96–97 sind mit *forte* nur *g*² bei der rechten Hand und *g*¹ bei der linken hervorzuheben, schon die danebenstehenden *a*² und *a*¹ [sic] im *piano* zu spielen; der Nachdruck dieser beiden *forte* nun, die Nachahmung, hohe Lage, das Pedal (das aber im Aufstreich des T. 96 zu entfernen ist), alles das zusammen führt von selbst zu dem von Beethoven vorgeschriebenen *forte* und schließt jede physische Anstrengung im Dienste einzelner Sechzehntel oder des dynamischen Zustandes als überflüssig und schädlich aus."

²⁴These markings are found in a copy of the *Erläuterungsausgabe* of op. 109 that belonged to Ernst Oster, and apparently later to Jonas. The markings appear to have been copied very neatly from some other source—probably a score belonging to Schenker, since they are clearly in his style. (Compare Burkhart, p. 111, fn. 12.)

²⁵Schenker's characteristic exclamation point in ex. 5c is occasioned by the identity of the descending seconds *e*¹–*d*¹ and *f*¹–*e*¹ with the descending seconds at the beginning of the sonata (ex. 5a).

²⁶The scrap, in Mrs. Schenker's hand, reads as follows: "Vortrag! <> bedeutet bei Beethoven nicht selten bloß ein Verweilen-machen, ohne ein eigentliches <> in dynamischer Hinsicht! 24. X. 13."

²⁷Burkhart develops this point in some detail; see p. 107.

²⁸*Der Tonwille* 7, 23. "Man darf nicht glauben, in T. 36 seien vor allem die Urlinietöne hervorzuheben; so versteckt sie hier in den schwachen Takteilen erscheinen, sind sie auch wirklich im Schatten zu belassen." Burkhart discusses a different aspect of this passage: Schenker's fingering (pp. 97–99).

²⁹*Vom Vortrag*, ch. 10, §6. "Was später genommen werden soll, muß im Vorhinein zurückgegeben werden, was freilich auch in umgekehrter Ordnung gilt: was früher genommen würde, muß später zurückgegeben werden."

³⁰See *Beethovens neunte Sinfonie*, p. 18.

³¹*Op. 110*, pp. 78–79. "Denn wenn die Strenge des Taktes die Norm der rhythmischen Erscheinung ausdrückt, so kann sie . . . nicht auch zugleich Ausdruck eines anormalen rhythmischen Ereignisses sein."

³²*Der Tonwille* 7, 32. "Das *sf* in T. 309 gilt einem schwachen Takt, dem zweiten eines Achttakters, daher muß auf dieses *sf* in einem *cresc.* und mit Beschleunigung von T. 308 zugegangen werden, als wären *f*¹ und *a*¹ im *legato*. Nach Auslauten des *sf* fällt die rechte Hand von oben auf die Tasten und verschafft so die Möglichkeit, die nächsten Akkorde feldernd-spitz zu spielen."

³³See Schenker, "Ein Kommentar zu Schindler, Beethovens Spiel betreffend" in *Der Dreiklang* (March 1938), 190–99; see especially p. 192.

³⁴See, e.g., Schoenberg, *Style and Idea* (New York, 1975), p. 288; and Brendel, *Musical Thoughts and Afterthoughts* (Princeton, 1976), pp. 38–53 and 154–61.

³⁵*Beethovens neunte Sinfonie*, p. 67. "Mit der Verkürzung bzw. Zusammendrängung der Motive von Takt 154 ab gehe eine Beschleunigung des Zeitmaßes einher, die im Medium

der Zeit widerspiegeln soll, was im Medium des Motivischen an Gedrängtheit aufgehäuft ist." See also *Op. 101*, p. 45: this example concerns the acceleration of a linear progression.

³⁶On linkage technique, see Jonas, *Introduction to the Theory of Heinrich Schenker*, trans. and ed. John Rothgeb (New York, 1982), pp. 7–9; also Rothgeb, "Thematic Content: a Schenkerian View," in Beach, *Aspects*, pp. 42–45.

³⁷In general, Schenker's horizontal lines seem to indicate that the tones under (or over) them are to be held at least slightly longer than their written values. Compare exs. 14a and 16.

³⁸See pp. 124–30. See also Burkhart, p. 110 and fn. 11.

³⁹*Kontrapunkt I*, 126–27.

⁴⁰*Kommentar zu Schindler*, p. 196. "Beethoven hat hier die übergreifenden Sextschritte zum Ausdruck gebracht, indem er den tieferen Ton dieser Sextschritte jeweils über den vorgeschriebenen Wert hinaus liegen gelassen, sodaß er unter dem folgenden höheren Tone noch einen Augenblick weiter klang. Hiedurch erreichte er eine dem Portamento der Geiger und Sänger ähnliche Wirkung . . . und das nannte Schindler 'sanftes Hinübertragen'."

⁴¹See Schenker, *Free Composition*, p. 51.

⁴²*Entwurf*, p. 17 ("Klavier-Entwurf [mit Ergänzungen]"). "Die Führung der Diminution folgt öfter den Spuren des von füllenden, bindenden Orchesterstimmen. Das Eigentümlich des Klaviers ist es nun, daß es die Diminution vor- und den orchestralen Beigeschmack zurücktreten läßt. Das hat freilich den Nachteil, daß der fantasielose Spieler, der das Wesen des Instrumentes nicht erfaßt, die geheime Füllung wiederzugeben keine Kraft findet. Ein Beispiel: In Chopins *Fis* dur Nocturne könnte ein wirklich füllender Satz etwa so aussehen: [example] geblasen etwa von Hörnern und Fagotten usw. Der Klavierspieler muß nun den geheimen Satz durch die Figur der Takte 1–2 durchhören lassen; er kann das nun nicht anders als durch ein Liegenlassen der Finger auf den Tasten, wodurch sich die betreffenden Klänge formen. Diese Spielweise, für die ich die Bezeichnung *Handpedal* vorschlage: Erzeugung einer Pedalwirkung nur durch die Hand—fließt auch mit dem *legatissimo* zusammen."

⁴³See *Free Composition*, p. 90.

⁴⁴For a fuller discussion of the relationship between foreground design (i.e., motivic and/or textural pattern) and middleground structure, see John Rothgeb, "Design as a Key to Structure in Tonal Music," *Journal of Music Theory* 15 (1971), 230–53 (rpt. in Yeston, *Readings in Schenker Analysis and Other Approaches* [New Haven, 1977]).

⁴⁵See *Der Tonwille* 7, 28.

⁴⁶Other legato techniques described by Schenker include: changing finger silently on one note in order to facilitate a legato continuation; connecting only one voice of a series of double notes; use of the pedal to simulate legato; use of dynamic shading to aid in creating a legato effect; use of the "gliding elbow" (*Ellbogen gleitend*); use of gesture to suggest an otherwise unfeasible legato. The first two of these techniques are described in *Vom Vortrag* (chap. 6), the others in the *Entwurf* (pp. 11–15).

⁴⁷*Entwurf*, p. 21 ("Klavier Hand"), and p. 23 ("Fingersatz"). "Die Hand darf nicht lügen, sie muß dem Sinn der Stimmführung folgen." "Fingersatz muß auch wahr sein—die Hand muß—wie der Mund—Wahrheit sprechen."

⁴⁸*Op. 101*, p. 77. "Das letzte Sechzehntel des T. 60 soll nur mit dem vierten Finger gespielt werden und nicht, wie in so vielen Ausgaben empfohlen wird, mit dem ersten: macht sich doch im letzten Falle die Hand gleichsam einer Unwahrheit schuldig, da sie einen Zusammenhang zwischen *a*¹ und *fi*² behauptet, der in Wahrheit nicht besteht." For a fuller discussion of Schenker's fingering, see Carl Schach-

ter's Introduction to the Dover edition of the sonatas; also Burkhart, pp. 96–99.

⁴⁹*Entwurf*, pp. 21–22 ("Klavier-Hand").

⁵⁰*Vom Vortrag*, ch. 7, §3. "Unter Umständen, zumal wenn ein cresc. oder dimin. damit verbunden ist, kann der Klavierspieler ebenso wie der Geiger von längeren zu kürzeren Bogenstrichen in verfließender Scala übergeht, (oder auch umgekehrt) . . ."

⁵¹*Entwurf*, pp. 20–21 ("Klavier-Hand").

⁵²*Vom Vortrag*, ch. 4, §5. "Nur die Druckstelle absorbiert das natürliche Gewicht der Hand, zu ihr hin, und von ihr weg dagegen walte leichteste Beweglichkeit."

⁵³See, for example, C. P. E. Bach, *Essay*, p. 163 (of the English edn.).

⁵⁴See especially Schenker's essay "Weg mit dem Phrasierungsbogen," *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik* I.

⁵⁵*Vom Vortrag*, ch. 9, §3. "Wenn nun gerade die heutige Generation sich darin erschöpft, in den Ausgaben der älteren Meisterwerke solche Schattierungen schlecht oder recht zu ergänzen, denn ausgeschrieben reizt die Vorschrift schon als optischer Reflex die Nerven des Vortragenden dergestalt, daß er, weil über Aufforderung und Wunsch, die Nuance übertreibt, wo er doch aus eigenem sicher zurückhaltender wäre. Ein Letztes muß schließlich doch auch dem Vortragenden selbst überlassen bleiben."

⁵⁶Recall that Schenker believed *all* markings to be "fundamentally superfluous" (see above, p. 5)!

⁵⁷For a discussion of Beethoven's fingerings and their implications, see Jeanne Bamberger, "The Musical Significance of Beethoven's Fingerings," *Music Forum* 4 (1976), 237–80.

⁵⁸See Burkhart, p. 111, n. 12.

⁵⁹*Beethovens neunte Sinfonie*, p. 85 ("man hat den Vortrag . . . aus einer Art geistiger Vogelperspektive . . . einzurichten").

⁶⁰*Entwurf*, p. 6 ("Selbststilisierung"). "Auch das Ohr muß uns wie das Auge, mit Ferne bedienen: die Fähigkeit kommt aus der Hintergrund-Erkennntnis—dann entsprechende Leichtigkeit (Beschwingtheit) des Vortrags."

⁶¹*Vom Vortrag*, ch. 11, §6. "So kommt es, daß trotz oft erhabenster Sprache, wie z.B. in den Adagios, die Werke unserer Meister der entschiedensten Passagen und Ornamente durchaus nicht entbehren und selbst noch in seinen allerletzten Werken, wo der Ausdruck sicher am gesteigertsten, zieht Beethoven auch noch die verschiedensten Figuren zu Hilfe heran, um in ihnen noch den stärksten Ausdruck zu deponieren."

⁶²*Ibid.*

⁶³*Entwurf*, pp. 7–8 ("Paralipomena zu II [Selbststilisierung]"). "Durch Wagner erst kam, da das Bewußtsein der Synthese zurücktrat, eine Beschwerde im Vordergrund durch Motivteile und Motivbestandteile, die zu anspruchsvoll waren, um gewissermaßen fliegen zu können, eine gewisse Schwergewicht drückte das Motiv oder seine Bestandteile nieder—das entsprach auch Wagners Sinn—aber die Flugkraft der Diminution war zerbrochen. Nun beging man den Fehler, den Vortrag dieser beschwerten Diminution auf die Meisterwerke zu übertragen, in sie ein Pathos hineinzutragen, das sich mit der Behendigkeit und Luftigkeit der Diminution nicht vertrug. Die < im Fluge, die langen Züge, die auf einzelne Töne zielen, das alles sind Dinge, die in Wagners Werken nicht vorkamen—deshalb ist der schwere Tritt nicht anwendbar auf die Meisterwerke—also nicht das Beschweren der Achtel, Sechszehntel im Fortgang, das Verdicken im cresc. von Achtel zu Achtel usw."

⁶⁴Schenker, "Die jungen Dirigenten," *Die Zeit* (25 January 1896). It is interesting that, in a diary entry from 1919, Schenker rates the young conductor Furtwängler superior to Nikisch, Strauss, and Weingartner. This was several years before Schenker and Furtwängler met.

⁶⁵See Oswald Jonas's Introduction to Schenker's *Harmony* (Chicago, 1954; rpt. Cambridge, Mass. 1973).

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE. The music examples and plates for this essay have been prepared from the following sources in the Oswald Jonas Collection, University of California, Riverside:

Breitkopf edn. of the Beethoven sonatas in **Box 26**, folder 3: vol. 2, p. 125 (ex. 30), p. 131 (ex. 2); folder 4: vol. 3, p. 9 (ex. 6), pp. 10–11 (ex. 7), p. 13 (exs. 8 and 21), pp. 23–24 (ex. 18).

Schenker edns. of the sonatas in **Box 27**, folder 2, copy 2: p. 21 (ex. 20); folder 3, copy 1 [dated 4.X.1921]: p. 43 (ex. 5a), p. 44 (ex. 26), p. 52 (ex. 5b), p. 55 (ex. 5c); folder 6, copy 1: p. 108 (ex. 22); pp. 109–10 (ex. 33, plate 8), p. 115 (ex. 11); folder 7, copy 2 [25.VIII.1922]: p. 11 (ex. 16, plate 4), p. 16 (ex. 24); folder 8 [4.XI.1922]: p. 144 (ex. 13a), p. 148 (ex. 13b); folder 9 [26.I.1923]: pp. 3–4 (exs. 19 and 25, plates 5 and 6); folder 10 [6.IV.1923]: p. 7 (ex. 28), p. 20 (ex. 12); folder 13, copy 2 [10.III.1923]: p. 7 (ex. 32); **Box 28**, folder 3, copy 1 [9 Juni 1923]: p. 4 (ex. 14, plate 2), p. 18 (ex. 29), p. 24 (ex. 3), p. 30 (ex. 17); folder 8, copy 1 [8.X.1923]: p. 2 (exs. 35–36), p. 8 (exs. 9 and 27, plate 7), p. 10 (ex. 10, plate 1).

Erläuterungsausgabe [inscribed "Ernst Oster 1927"]: in **Box 28**, folder 11, item 5: p. 5 (ex. 4), p. 6 (ex. 37), p. 8 (ex. 38), p. 13 (ex. 15, plate 3).