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Abstract

HEINRICH SCHENKER’S EARLY APPROACH TO FORM, 1895–1921: IMPLICATIONS FOR HIS LATE WORK AND ITS RECEPTION

by

JASON A. HOOPER

ADVISOR: Professor William Rothstein

This dissertation constructs Heinrich Schenker’s early approach to form and traces its development as his organic theory of transformational voice leading emerged in the early 1920s. Schenker’s late approach to form is then briefly reconsidered from this newfound perspective.

Chapter 1 defines the nineteenth-century Formenlehre tradition established by A. B. Marx and passed down to Anton Bruckner through his studies in model composition, leading to Schenker himself. Chapter 2 presents Schenker’s early approach to form in a generative fashion, demonstrating how a single motive can grow into a large thematic group unified by a single key area or an economy of Stufen. Chapter 3 introduces the schemas that Schenker developed in the 1910s to analyze full-movement forms, from one-part form to six-part cyclic form. Chapter 4 reappraises Schenker’s later work, including the inherent conflict between the continuity of counterpoint (as in J. S. Bach’s fugues) and the discontinuity of musical form (as in Beethoven’s sonatas). The Formenlehre expressed in Der freie Satz (1935) is viewed as an attempt to unify these two “musical cultures” through a single cause (Halm 1913): the background’s dynamic transformation into the foreground.
Yet this union of voice leading and form is not always convincing. The schematic forms described in the last chapter of *Der freie Satz* (1935) are identical to those encountered in Schenker’s work twenty years earlier. Schenker claims to derive these forms from the background as a matter of generative theory—but as a matter of history, they predate his apprehension of the background altogether. Given this insight, I contend that the relationship between form and content is reciprocal: form is best understood not only as a surface manifestation of tonal forces emanating from the background but also as a co-determining force that shapes deeper levels of voice-leading structure (C. Smith 1996). The latter force is manifest through interruption: Schenker’s last theoretical concept, which enabled him to integrate organic voice leading with a more traditional *Formenlehre* (Rothstein 2001; Samarotto 2005). This dissertation therefore rejects the monism permeating Schenker’s late work and calls for a return to his original conception of *Synthese*, in which independent musical parameters are integrated rather than fully subsumed by the controlling influence of the *Ursatz* (Korsyn 1988; Cohn 1992a, 1992b; Lubben 1993; Cook 2007; Brody 2015).
We fill pre-existing forms and when we fill them we change them and are changed.

—Frank Bidart, “Borges and I”
Despite the prestige Heinrich Schenker’s late work has gained within Anglo-American music theory, recent theories of form—including William Caplin’s *Classical Form* (1998) and James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy’s *Elements of Sonata Theory* (2006)—have largely ignored its implications. By no means are these approaches obligated to take Schenker’s ideas into account, for there are many productive ways to think about music—but given the interest in form at the turn of the twenty-first century and the influence of Schenkerian theory within the field, why was this so? As I discovered, my initial observation was not accurate; work involving Schenker’s late *Formenlehre* was being carried out. Felix Salzer’s *Structural Hearing* (1952, 1:220–54) and Sylvan Kalib’s dissertation (1973, 1:235–306) were important first steps, but more recent scholarship—including Beach (1993), Cadwallader (1990), Petty (1995), Rothstein (1989), Schmalfeldt (1991), C. Smith (1996), and P. Smith (1994)—also began to emerge. These studies pose a fundamental question: What is the relationship between traditional approaches to form (outer form) and the levels of transformational voice leading (inner form) present in Schenker’s late work?¹

In *Der freie Satz*, Schenker ([1935] 1979, 130) claimed that all forms “have their origin in, and derive from, the background.”² Charles Smith (1996) inverted this relationship by suggesting that articulations of the outer form might determine the background and middleground through

---

¹ Rothstein ([1989] 2007, 104) defines outer form as the “thematic aspect of a piece, as well as its layout into periods and phrases,” while inner form is defined as the “tonal dynamic of a work—its large-scale harmonic and linear layout.”

² “Das Neue in der nachfolgenden Darstellung der Formen liegt in der Ableitung aller Formen als eines äußersten Vordergrundes von dem Hinter- und Mittelgrund” (Schenker 1935, 210).
analysis. Janet Schmalfeldt (1991) reconciled levels of Schenkerian voice leading with Caplin’s *Formenlehre* (1998)—along with the work of Schoenberg (1967) and Ratz (1973)—in a more balanced way by emphasizing their correspondences rather than defining one wholly in terms of the other. More recently, Peter Smith (2005) has incorporated Schenker’s late theory into his own conception of form as “dimensional counterpoint,” while Allen Cadwallader (2008) has uncovered correspondences between levels of voice leading and Sonata Theory.³

Despite these efforts, I felt that a truly “Schenkerian” theory of form—a theory faithful to the precepts (and even polemics) in *Der freie Satz*—remained elusive. I also realized that the final chapter of *Der freie Satz* was fragmentary; it did not express a comprehensive theory.⁴ I began to doubt whether a comprehensive *Formenlehre* based on Schenker’s late work was possible (a doubt that I still hold). Schenker went too far when he insisted that form originates in the background (Cohn 1992b); conversely, Charles Smith (1996) went too far when he claimed that form should largely determine the background.⁵ Rather than demonstrate how the background generates form (or *vice versa*), I question whether a causal relationship exists in only one direction or the other.⁶

---

³ Peter Smith (2005, 31) writes, “A movement’s form consists of the total structure that emerges through a *counterpoint of musical dimensions*. These dimensions . . . can be reduced to three main categories: thematic design, key scheme, and tonal structure.”

⁴ For example, Ernst Oster characterizes Schenker’s ([1935] 1979, 139n) conception of sonata form as “sketchy and in a number of ways incomplete.” Allen Cadwallader (1990, 17) claims, “No comprehensive *Formenlehre* is tacitly expressed in [Schenker’s] late writings; only an approach and a few principles are adumbrated.”

⁵ According to Charles Smith’s revisionist theory, “*form and fundamental structure are essentially the same thing*” (1996, 270; emphasis original). The result is a menagerie of unorthodox middlegrounds and backgrounds. For a critique of C. Smith (1996), see P. Smith (2005, 49–54).

⁶ Or, as Peter Smith (2005, 59) argues, “The best course of action . . . is to give up both Schenker’s idea that fundamental structure can form the basis for a new *Formenlehre* and [Charles] Smith’s belief that form provides direct access to fundamental structure.”
One day it might be possible to demonstrate that form is generated from background to foreground based on axioms operating within a formalized system, but I believe that a different approach is required—one that attempts to understand how Schenker’s ideas developed, with the assumption that his late Formenlehre is a vestige of work carried out before he had apprehended the Ur- linie. As Nicholas Cook (2007, 285) observes, Der freie Satz is “rather like the broken watch in a detective story: the trace of an ongoing process, frozen in time by Schenker’s death.” Perhaps the inconsistences in Schenker’s late Formenlehre are best understood as a byproduct of this ongoing process, not generative theory per se. To understand the closed system presented in Der freie Satz, one must first step outside that system and recognize its history.

One must also confront the documents extant in Schenker’s vast Nachlass. In a letter to Allen Forte, Ernst Oster once wrote, “I sometimes really feel that having all those unpublished analyses available would be almost as important as all of Schenker’s published books together” (Forte et al. 1977, 342). I share Oster’s sentiment, although I offer one caveat: Given the sheer volume of archival materials (the Oster Collection alone contains ca. 18,000 items) and Schenker’s handwriting (which is nearly impossible to read), interpreting these documents has proven difficult. Oster recognized this, too. Dismayed at the prospect of preparing Schenker’s unpublished work for publication, he again writes Forte, stating, “absolutely nobody, not even you or Milton [Babbitt] can have the faintest idea of how long it all takes” (342). Despite these difficulties, I hope my engagement with this material has proven worthwhile.
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CHAPTER 1
AGAINST THE FORMENLEHRE TRADITION

§ 1.1. Polemics vs. Practice

In the last chapter of Der freie Satz, Heinrich Schenker ([1935] 1979, 133) expresses his disdain for traditional approaches to sonata form when he claims, “it is necessary to discard the concepts and terminology of conventional theory.”\(^1\) He not only dismisses conventional theory, he openly mocks it, complaining that previous textbooks “present rubrics, which are like a set of children’s building blocks” (1979, 138).\(^2\) In other words, Formenlehre is mere child’s play.

Schenker often dismissed entire theoretical traditions (his attacks on Rameau come to mind), but this tactic was more than empty rhetoric—it influenced how his theories evolved over time. As Nicholas Cook (2007, 256) writes, “Schenker’s theoretical development could be characterized as a progressive denial of the basic categories of conventional theory.” Schenker redefined fundamental concepts such as motive, harmony, melody, and form; but in doing so, he was often prone to making exaggerated or even untenable claims.

I contend that the apparent dismissal of the nineteenth-century Formenlehre tradition in Der freie Satz is one such claim—it is an attempt to redefine “form” after nearly one hundred years of prior theory stemming from the work of A. B. Marx ([1837–47] 1887–90). Yet Schenker was

---

\(^1\) “Wie bei der Darstellung der Liedformen ist auch hier zunächst nötig, die Begriffe und Bezeichnungen der üblichen Theorie abzulehnen” (Schenker 1935, 215–16).

\(^2\) “Statt des in einem Meisterwerk waltenden Organischen einer Sonatenform stellen die Lehrbücher Rubriken auf, eine Art Steinbaukasten zu kindischem Spiel” (Schenker 1935, 223).
influenced by this tradition, appropriating it in ways both subtle and covert.3 The forms described in the last chapter of Der freie Satz—forms purportedly based on the dynamic transformation of the background into the foreground—predate Schenker’s organic theory of voice-leading coherence altogether. In fact, as I show in chapter 3, they began much like the schematic forms of the nineteenth century. While history and generative theory should not be confused, perhaps this discovery draws aspects of Schenker’s late Formenlehre into question.

In contrast, the Anglo-American reception of Schenker’s late work has often taken his apparent dismissal of traditional forms for granted. Schenker is often regarded as “the great antihero of the Formenlehre tradition,” an iconoclast who “did more than anyone else to discredit the enterprise of taxonomic formal analysis as schematic and empty” (Burnham 2002, 901). As a result, “few serious admirers of Schenker’s work could return to the traditional business of formal analysis without feeling as though they were wading in the shallows” (901).4 I shall counter this received view. Schenker’s late approach to form is best understood as a reconciliation of his organic theory of transformational voice leading with a more conventional Formenlehre. In practice, he did not dismiss traditional formal analysis outright—even if his polemics often leave us with that impression. Instead, he sought a new way to continue this tradition.

---

3 As Janet Schmalfeldt (1991, 234) writes, “I should like to believe that Schenker’s scathing critique of traditional formal concepts as expressed in his final, and consummate, work—Der freie Satz—is a deliberate overstatement—a polemic that has been partially misinterpreted.” Charles Smith (1996, 196) also recognizes this discrepancy, writing, “[Schenker] was adamant that form did not arise primarily from the manipulation of themes and motives, and also regarded proportional relationships between sections as superficial and irrelevant (§ 308 and § 302). In both cases, his disparagement was too strong, in that it was misleading to pretend to ignore melodic and proportional relationships altogether—and, of course, in practice he did no such thing.”

4 For example, David Beach (1993, 4) claims, “Schenker, of course, was not much interested in accommodating the traditional notion of form, and understandably so.”
Schenker was engaged with traditional modes of formal analysis throughout his entire career, although this history prior to *Der freie Satz* has largely been ignored. In a brief diary entry dated July 11, 1907, Schenker writes that he is developing “ideas toward a ‘new theory of form.’” Numerous sections of *Harmonielehre* ([1906] 1954), as well as sections of a related, unpublished typescript titled “Über den Niedergang der Kompositions­kunst” ([1905–6] 2005a) are concerned with form (particularly sonata form). In the preface to his monograph on Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, Schenker (1912, vii) promises an *Entwurf einer neuen Formenlehre* predicated on universal laws of human psychology. His first three explanatory editions of the late Beethoven piano sonatas (1913, 1914, 1915) include many diagrams belonging to the *Formenlehre* tradition. Schenker later mentions plans for a new theory of form in the explanatory edition of Beethoven’s op. 101 (1921) and the preface to book II of *Kontrapunkt* (1922). As he developed his organic theory of transformational voice leading in the 1920s, Schenker wrote two important essays in the second volume of *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik* (1926): one on fugue, the other on sonata form. And in volume 3 of *Meisterwerk* (1930), he analyzes the first movement of Beethoven’s *Eroica* Symphony according to what he begrudgingly calls “the customary theory of sonata form.” Even the figures in *Der freie Satz* (1935) are rife with labels that belong to a theorist deeply rooted in the nineteenth century (e.g., $a_1–b–a_2$). Yet, despite these efforts, Schenker’s *neue Formenlehre* remained unfinished by his death in 1935.

---

5 “Ideen zu einer ‘neuen Formenlehre’” (JC 1/6; see Bent 2005, 96).

6 Of course, Schenker might traditionally be expected to write a *Formenlehre* after completing treatises on harmony and counterpoint.

7 “nach der üblichen Lehre der Sonatenform” (Schenker [1930] 1997, 12–13, fig. 3; see example 3.3.3, p. 242).
§ 1.2. “TWILIGHT OF THE MASTERS”

Our story begins in Vienna at the turn of the twentieth century. Schenker characterized this time by its decadent culture. He thought that decline was apparent in music education, performance, criticism, theory, and composition; in response, he sought to restore German musical culture to its past glories. We find these ideas in Schenker’s earliest writings, including an 1894 article from the *Neue Revue*, where he laments the state of musical affairs in general and the exploitation of art for profit in particular. To correct these problems,

A brilliant and inspiring teacher would have to appear, a teacher in the broadest and most beautiful sense of the word, an educator, composer, critic and philosopher, just as were Guido of Arezzo, J. S. Bach, Schumann, and Wagner in their time; a man who would “go into the temple of art, and cast out all them that sell and buy in the temple, and overthrow the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sell doves, And say unto them, It is written, My house shall be called a house of prayer.”

It is not difficult to imagine whom Schenker had in mind for this task, but to understand his project as an overthrowing of the prevailing musical order at the turn of the century, one must identify those responsible for music’s decline—those whom Schenker was writing against (Cook 8 For an intellectual history of Vienna during this time, see Johnston (1972) and Schorske (1981). As this history relates to Schenker, see Cook (2007) and Korsyn (2009). The term “Twilight of the Masters” (Meisterdämmerung)—an allusion to Wagner’s *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg* and *Götterdämmerung*—is taken from the beginning of Schenker’s “Niedergang” typescript discussed below (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 34, 122n1).


11 “Es müßte denn ein hinreißend genialer Pädagog erscheinen, ein Pädagog im weitesten und schönsten Sinne des Wortes, ein Erzieher, Componist, Kritiker, Philosoph, wie es für ihre Zeit’ ein Guido v. Arezzo, J. S. Bach, Schumann oder Wagner gewesen sind, ein Mann, der ,zum Tempel der Kunst hineinginge und heraustriebe alle Verkäufer und Käufer im Tempel und stieße um der Wechsler Tische und die Stühle der Taubenkrämer, und spräche zu ihnen: Es steht geschrieben: Mein Haus soll ein Bethaus heissen’” (Schenker 1894; Federhofer 1990, 64). This passage alludes to the parable of when Jesus expelled the moneychangers from the temple during Passover.
1989, 416–17). (And note that Schenker would later sour on Wagner.) This is the best way to conceptualize his early writings in particular: Schenker’s edition of C. P. E. Bach’s keyboard sonatas (1902) and *Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik* ([1903] rev. 1908) against Hans von Bülow, Anton Bruckner, and Hugo Riemann; his *Harmonielehre* (1906) against E. F. Richter (among many others, including Bruckner, Tchaikovsky, Riemann, and Rimsky-Korsakov); his monograph on Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony (1912), like Nietzsche, against (or contra) Richard Wagner. It was not enough to offer new ideas; Schenker felt compelled to annihilate the old.

He led his fiercest attacks in the “Niedergang” typescript (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a). According to this polemic, composers were responsible for music’s decline after the death of Beethoven. Schenker indicts the likes of Berlioz, Liszt, and Wagner on two related charges: First, they were unable to compose in a variety of different genres. Schenker writes, “It used to be the custom of great composers to have a comprehensive mastery of all the forms of the art [of music] and all the stylistic genres, complete command of musical technique, which enabled them to conceive ever new creative tasks” (35). Earlier composers such as J. S. Bach, Haydn, Mozart,

---


14 Schenker’s views on music’s decline around the turn of the century are part of a larger cultural matrix, which, as William Drabkin (2005, 22) notes, includes Max Nordau’s *Entartung* (1896) and Oswald Spengler’s *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* (1918/1922).

15 “So gehörte ehemals zum Habitus eines Meisters umfassende Beherrschung aller Kunstformen und Stilgattungen, eine vollendete Handhabung der musikalischen Technik[.]
and Beethoven wrote sonatas, oratorios, string quartets, concertos, symphonies, and operas, whereas “today’s artists . . . write too little; they are insufficiently productive, whether in relation to what we now know of the accomplishments of true geniuses or truly great talents, or simply considered in absolute terms” (38). He cautions that he is not “disposed to measuring the work of the human intellect by the yard,” and promises to base this “objection on yet other, more organic grounds” (38).

Schenker writes,

The real reason, however, why the great masters were so productive and at the same time created such consummate works of art lies, as I have said, simply in their secure command of the technical means, just as, conversely, the decline may be sought in the lack of any technique today. . . . It is, however, this very misunderstanding of cyclic form [i.e., sonata form], as the highest representation of absolute music, that I hold principally responsible for the decline of the art of music in the nineteenth century. (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 40, 43)

Mendelssohn and Brahms are regarded as the only masters of sonata form after Beethoven (66–67). Schenker even deems Schubert, Schumann, and Chopin deficient. Their themes are considered too lyrical and too regular, their forms too schematic (65–66). In Schubert’s case,
“however beautiful the themes (too beautiful, in fact, for the purpose of cyclic form), however striking and original the harmony, and however novel the mood, these things are incapable of achieving the effect of a true synthesis and a deeply founded irregularity” (65). And Schenker claims that in Chopin’s case, “hardly does he think about writing a sonata than his spirit is broken; and what he offers as a sonata is little more than merely the most regular course of a schematic pattern” (66). A work becomes dull if it is too regular, yet risks incomprehensibility if it is too irregular. This Hauptprinzip belongs to the same Formenlehre tradition that Schenker rebelled against; or, as J. C. Lobe (1844, 2) describes it, “Unity in variety, or variety in unity.”

Schenker’s second charge claims that composers after Beethoven based their music on extrinsic associations rather than intrinsic musical laws. This was especially true of Wagner:

His music follows the logic of thoughts and events incomparably more than the laws that reside in music itself. Since he devotes himself entirely to drama, he does not bind himself to the needs of a purely constructive nature. He does not put together ideas from various elements, he builds no groups, he takes no care of the succession of keys, since he never has in mind a higher unity that is equivalent to any form. (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 99)

---

20 “kaum denkt er aber[,] eine Sonate zu schreiben, schon ist sein Mut gebrochen, und was er als Sonate bietet, ist nur wenig mehr als blos der regelmässigste Ablauf eines vorgefaßten Schemas” (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 166).
21 “Einheit in der Mannichfältigkeit, oder Mannichfältigkeit in der Einheit” (Lobe 1844, 2; emphasis original).
22 “Seine Musik folgt der Logik der Gedanken und der Ereignisse ungleich mehr als den in ihr selbst deponierten Gesetzen. Da er sich ganz dem Drama ergibt, so bindet er sich nicht an die Bedürfnisse rein konstruktiver Natur, er setzt den Gedanken nicht aus verschiedenen Elementen zusammen, bildet keine Gruppen, nimmt keine Rücksicht auf den Tonartenverlauf, da ihm keine höhere Einheit, die irgend einer Form gleichkäme, vorschwebt” (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 196).
According to Schenker, Wagner lacked the compositional technique required to compose finely crafted absolute music. But even composers who wrote absolute music fell victim to extrinsic sources by relying on abstract forms. These forms had become pre-determined, reified schemas lacking any sense of causality or necessary connection (Cook 2007, 54–55). In the case of sonata form, “The [derivative] work has indeed not become an organic structure, but rather a potpourri comprising three melodies that seem to have been locked up in cages” (69). And in an even earlier source, we encounter “caged themes” when Schenker likens composers to birdcatchers:

they lie in wait for their own fantasy; pursue—like birdcatchers—the necessary “motives” and “themes”; force the themes, when they have found some, into any old beautiful form; and glue and paste, according to old, well-tried and half-understood rules, until at last there is a beginning, middle, and end. (Schenker [1897] 1988, 137; emphasis original; quoted in Cook 2007, 54–55)

This compositional “method” lacks the organic, improvisatory qualities that distinguish music by previous masters—music inspired by genius. Compositions after Beethoven—whether they were based on extrinsic text, narrative, or abstract form—represent not only the decline of compositional technique but also the decline of German musical culture writ large (Cook 1989, 420–22). Schenker’s melodies locked up in cages were canaries in a coalmine.

---

23 In “Der Geist der musikalischen Technik,” Schenker ([1895] 2007, 331) describes “formalism” as when a composer relies on a model, such as a Beethoven sonata, for inspiration.


25 “Die meisten unserer Classikaner componiren so: sie lauern auf ihre eigene Phantasie, stellen, wie Vogelfänger, den nöthigen ‘Motiven’ und ‘Themen’ nach, zwingen die Themen, wenn sie welche gefunden, zu irgend einer Schönheit und leimen und kleistern bis es endlich einen Anfang, Mitte und Ende gibt, nach alten bewährten, halb verstandenen Gesetzen” (Schenker 1897; Federhofer 1990, 220).
§ 1.3. FORM’S REIFICATION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

“In the beginning was content!”26 Thus speaks Schenker in the preface to his monograph on Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony ([1912] 1992, 4).27 He describes the Ninth’s opening measures as “the birthplace of the Ur-motif,” where a descending fifth (or fourth) is introduced and developed.28 There is no better example of music born into existence (see example 1.3.1).

Having asserted content’s primacy over form—and, contra Wagner, purely musical content over words and narrative—Schenker finds a new coalition to attack: theorists. He claims, “while for the genius a specific content could produce only this specific shape and none other, the theorists grasp the content a posteriori only through a form arbitrarily abstracted by them, but one in which no manner of necessity rules” (5).29 Content is cause; form is effect. Content is real; form is a mere abstraction. In “Der Geist der musikalischen Technik,” Schenker even claims, “In complex constructs . . . one hears only the content, never the form” ([1895] 2007, 331; emphasis original).30 According to this view, to reify form is to commit a grave mistake.

Form’s reification was symptomatic of larger changes in the way time was conceptualized at the turn of the nineteenth century. Karol Berger (2007) describes this change using the

---

26 “Am Anfang war der Inhalt!” (Schenker 1912, vii).
27 See Snarrenberg (1997, 2–3). Snarrenberg writes, “By replacing ‘das Wort’ of St. John’s proclamation with ‘das Inhalt,’ a term that signified the work’s configuration of tones as notated by the composer and authentically rendered in performance, Schenker staked his interpretive practice on the claim that there is a genuine art whose medium is tone alone.”
28 “Noch überragender indessen die Bedeutung der Einleitung in thematischer Hinsicht; ist sie doch die Geburtsstätte des Urmotivs, das dem ersten Satz sein Gepräge gibt!” (Schenker 1912, 3–4). See Treitler (1980) for a critique of Schenker’s analysis.
29 “Während also beim Genie ein bestimmter Inhalt nur diese bestimmte und keine andere Gestaltung hervorbringen konnte, begreifen die Theoretiker den Inhalt a posteriori erst durch eine von ihnen willkürlich abstrahierte Form, in der aber keinerlei Notwendigkeit waltet” (Schenker 1912, viii).
30 “Bei zusammengesetzten Gebilden aber hört man immer nur den Inhalt, nie ihre Form” (Schenker 1895, 326).
metaphors of “Bach’s cycle” and “Mozart’s arrow.” This dichotomy juxtaposes a cyclic conception of time with a teleological conception (e.g., the changing seasons versus Enlightenment notions of social and scientific progress).\footnote{The metaphors of time’s cycle and time’s arrow were originally used in Gould (1987).} Berger writes, “By Mozart’s time, the form of a musical work is temporal; that is, it consists of a number of phases or parts that succeed one another in a determined order” (179). This idea is illustrated by comparing two genres: fugue and sonata (8–9). A Bach fugue is embodied by the continuous permutation of its subject, whereas a Mozart sonata is embodied by the sequential disposition of its themes—a dichotomy that is reminiscent of August Halm’s \textit{Von zwei Kulturen der Musik} (1913).\footnote{Summarizing Halm (1913), Carl Dahlhaus (1989, 124) writes, “the form in a fugue is a function of the theme; in the sonata the theme is, inversely, a function of form.”} Berger therefore declares the “primacy of invention over disposition” in the fugue (99).\footnote{See Dreyfus (1996).}

Invention is a process whereby a musical idea is imagined and transformed; disposition is the arrangement of those ideas into an overall plan.\footnote{These terms are closely associated with J. S. Bach’s contemporary, Johann Mattheson (McCreless 2002, 869–70); see part 2, chapter 14 of Mattheson’s \textit{Der vollkommene Capellmeister}}
might well be transposed to an eighteenth-century sensibility that values invention.

And with these terms we return to the theorists, for the evolution from subject to theme, fugue to sonata, invention to disposition, and time’s cycle to time’s arrow also coincides with a change in the way musical form was conceived in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. As Mark Evan Bonds (1991, 132) observes, “the metaphor of the musical work as an oration gradually gave way to a new image, that of the biological organism.” Berger (2007, 182) describes this as a move away from Koch’s *interpunctische Form* (punctuation form)—an approach that relies on cadential goals for closure—toward “the notion of thematically and tonally driven musical logic,” where themes themselves become the source of “compositional originality and individuality.”


35 This is apparent in Schenker’s praise of the masterworks for their improvisational qualities. The *locus classicus* is his commentary on improvisation, form, and the music of C. P. E. Bach in *Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik* ([1903, rev. 1908] 1976, 33–36); also see Rink (1993), Petty (1995), and Koslovsky (2010).

36 Along with these changes comes a shift from solar to polar tonality. Leonard Ratner (1980, 51) writes, “Solar arrangement promotes unity of key by subordinating related degrees to the tonic and by occasional returns to the primary key. This layout lends itself to discursive, exploratory treatment of a theme, as in fugues and concertos . . . . Polar arrangement sets the dominant against the tonic (in minor key movements, the relative major is the opposing key).” Polar tonality is the basis for sonata form’s “large-scale dissonance,” which creates an expectation of resolution in the recapitulation—like an arrow shot into the future (Rosen 1988, 229, 287).

37 Bonds (1991, 132–41) emphasizes that some degree of continuity exists between the emerging nineteenth-century conception of form-as-organism and the eighteenth-century conception of form-as-rhetoric. For example, Koch (1811) describes form using both organic and spatial metaphors more closely associated with later theorists, while Lobe’s (1844) *thematische Arbeit* is related to rhetoric’s concepts of invention and elaboration (Bonds 1991, 145, 143). The above dichotomies—while useful heuristics—are also oversimplifications (Gould 1987, 8–10).

Koch describes punctuation form in his *Versuch* (1782–93, vol. 3). See Berger (1996) for more on this topic, especially as it relates to the analysis of Mozart’s music.
the early and mid-eighteenth century becomes the primacy of disposition over invention by the early nineteenth century. It is this inversion that Schenker laments in the “Niedergang” essay.

With musical events occurring in a predictable (or even prescribed) order, emphasis on part-whole relationships consonant with organicist thought becomes possible, all while enabling form’s diagrammatic representation. From this newfound perspective, the “paradox of musical form” emerges (Bonds 1991, 13–16). This paradox entails two conceptions of form. Bonds characterizes the first as organic-generative:

According to this outlook, the component elements of every successful work of art must articulate in a manner analogous to the constituent parts of a living organism. The process of growth within a work, moreover, must be internally motivated. The shape of an organic whole is often held to be inherent in its germinal unit, with the whole existing in the part just as the part exists in the whole. . . . Elements imposed externally upon a work do not threaten its organic unity: they destroy it. (Bonds 1991, 142)

Schenker’s critique of composers who rely on external sources for inspiration—whether word, narrative, or reified form—is a logical extension of this idea. Bonds (1991, 146) characterizes the second conception of form as mechanistic-conformational—namely, a conception that favors taxonomies abstracted from a large number of individual works. Unlike eighteenth-century approaches based on rhetoric, the conformational approach results in schemas that are inherently synchronic (147). By the end of the nineteenth century, music’s temporal flow risks becoming frozen form. Schenker’s polemics against nineteenth-century composers and theorists rely on this projection of time into space: composers fill up pre-determined spaces with themes, while

---

39 Bonds (2010, 267) writes that while form was represented spatially in the early nineteenth century—e.g., Anton Reicha’s (1824–26) diagram of the grande coupe binaire—it was only in the early twentieth century that such representations became commonplace.
40 The work of Schenker and other early-twentieth-century energeticists, such as August Halm and Ernst Kurth, is perhaps a reaction against this trend; see Rothfarb (2002).
Theorists derive fixed, generic architectural plans from the masterworks.41 The organic-generative approach, on the other hand, is diachronic, but potentially in two dimensions: (1) the progressive flow of a composition from beginning to end as a motive is developed; and (2) the generative growth of a composition from background to foreground.42

The conflict between the organic-generative and mechanistic-conformational conceptions of form in the first half of the nineteenth century helps to explain the contradictions that exist between Schenker’s early polemical writings, which identify with the organic-generative approach, and his early analytical practice, which relies on conventional schemas characteristic of the mechanistic-conformational approach. Schenker did not dismiss the nineteenth-century *Formenlehre* tradition in its entirety; instead, through synecdoche, he represented this tradition using only its mechanistic-conformational aspects. Having dismissed previous *Formenlehren* on conformational grounds—perhaps even willfully ignoring their generative features—he grabs the organic-generative mantle for himself.

In the following subsections, I do not provide a comprehensive overview of the nineteenth-century *Formenlehre* tradition. Rather, I am concerned with influential theories and aesthetic beliefs that Schenker either incorporated into his early approach to form or rejected vociferously. This narrative is just one of many threads that lead through the long nineteenth century: from the work of A. B. Marx to midcentury theorists E. F. Richter and J. C. Lobe,

41 These arguments rely on a network of conceptual metaphors, including TIME IS SPACE (Lakoff and Johnson 1980; Zbikowski 2002). In addition to form’s increasingly diagrammatic representations (Bonds 2010), most nineteenth-century *Formenlehren* rely on the container image schema and its related orientational metaphors (e.g., Schenker’s “melodies . . . locked up in cages”). Also see Saslaw (1996, 1997–98).

42 Cook (2007, 70–1) describes the latter dimension as “axial causality.”
Eduard Hanslick’s formalist aesthetics, Anton Bruckner’s studies in model composition and the reception of his symphonies, and Hugo Riemann’s motives (and forms). Together these vignettes show how “form” had become increasingly reified by the late 1850s (both in theory and compositional practice), which tipped the balance in favor of the conformational over the generative. Schenker sought to correct this imbalance. He took Marx (1824a, 1824b, [1859] 1884) to task in all four explanatory editions of the late Beethoven piano sonatas (Schenker 1913, 1914, 1915, 1921). Schenker was often critical of Bruckner’s compositions in the press (Federhofer 1990). And he went to great lengths to refute Riemann’s (1889, 1:140–60) analysis of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony (Schenker 1912). By the end of chapter 1, we will have returned to where our story began: Schenker’s polemics levied against these figures at the turn of the twentieth century.

§ 1.3.1. A. B. Marx’s “Textbook” Approach to Form

A. B. Marx’s Formenlehre had a profound influence on Schenker’s early thought. Both theorists regarded sonata form—the paragon of absolute music—as the most dynamic schema in a series of increasingly complex structures.43 Schenker’s early Formenlehre also betrays Marx’s influence in other ways, including emphasis on: (1) the motive as a seed from which a composition grows;44 (2) a variety of Perioden articulated by cadences; (3) two- and three-part Liedformen; and (4) three-part Sonatenform rather than the two-part conception that endured in

43 I thank Wayne Petty for bringing this similarity to my attention.
44 For instance, Schenker’s unpublished manuscript “Der Weg zum Gleichnis” uses examples taken directly from Marx’s works. See the footnotes enclosed by square brackets in § A1.2 for these correspondences.
other nineteenth-century treatises. But Schenker also misunderstood Marx by viewing his \textit{Formenlehre} as rigid in its conception. Scott Burnham (1989, 247–48) writes, “what many now regard as a formulaic recipe was, in its original statement, a dynamic understanding of sonata form.” Although Marx was best known for his “textbook” approach to the genre—his \textit{Kompositionslehre} was written for students at the University of Berlin (then the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität)—like Schenker, he was skeptical of formalism if taken to an extreme.

Marx expresses his aesthetic views most succinctly in “Die Form in der Musik” (1856). He claims that music is unique compared to the other arts because its content does not represent an external source: “For music stands the farthest from the appearances and language of worldly life” (Burnham 1997, 61–62). Marx also thought that by relying on schematic forms, composers risk creating dull compositions. He asks, “Do we not regularly observe around us those wretched mediocrities . . . carrying around forms that they picked up here or there, like so many cocoons from which the butterfly, Spirit, has flown?” (58). Marx may employ models, but they are not the lifeless schemas characteristic of later theorists; they are dynamic in their conception, whether it is the tension created by the latent problem in each rondo (first, second, etc.) solved by the next, the dynamic \textit{Gang}, or the \textit{Ruhe–Bewegung–Ruhe} paradigm underlying his theory. (It is for

\begin{enumerate}
\item For examples of two-part sonata form in the nineteenth century, see Reicha (1824–26), Czerny (1849?), Lobe (1844; 1850–67), and Richter (1852).
\item “Denn sie [Musik] steht den Erscheinungen und der Sprache des Weltlebens am fernsten, und darum bietet das Leben für sie und ihre tiefere Verständniß den schwächsten Anhalt” (Marx 1856, 26).
\item “Sehn wir nicht täglich um uns her jene unseligen Mittelmäßigkeiten, die nirgend über daran sind als in der Kunst, sich mit Formen herumtragen, die sie da oder dort ausgelesen, aus denen, wie aus seiner Verpuppung der Schmetterling, der Geist ihnen entflohn ist?” (Marx 1856, 23).
\item Burnham (1989, 248) writes, “In a sadly typical historical metamorphosis, the schema Marx considered as an underlying construct [of sonata form] later became a textbook recipe for
\end{enumerate}
this reason that sonata form has three parts.) Like Marx, Schenker also admits that schematic forms may have some value if they do not become too rigid. Toward the end of “Geist,” Schenker writes,

The only fruitful significance of “form” seems, in my opinion, to be this: that the mere notion of a “form” can influence the creative imagination, and that from the perspective of a model—let us say, for instance, any of Beethoven’s sonatas—the imagination can do its work. . . . Despite the fact that the majority of unoriginal composers (and even the masters themselves, often enough) take this creative path, I nevertheless consider it pointless and unproductive always to account for and identify the form before the content.49 (Schenker [1895] 2007, 331)

This is not an endorsement of Marx’s compositional method per se, but even acknowledging that the masters composed in this manner “often enough” is quite a concession. Schenker’s example is also telling, for Marx’s Formenlehre is most closely associated with Beethoven’s sonatas (Burnham 1995, 69–81). Might this particular example allude to Marx’s work? If so, then Schenker is far more sympathetic toward Marx in this passage than in his later writings.50

Nonetheless, a point of disagreement between Marx and Schenker does exist. According to Marx’s pedagogical method, form is a framework used to help the student develop and shape content; or, as Burnham (1989, 251) writes, “musical content is . . . intelligible only though the agency of form.” While Schenker might tolerate this view, he would surely disagree as a matter of constructing form: the prototypical is mistaken for the literal [i.e., form’s reification]. . . . Marx’s model was not intended as a mold but rather as a dynamic pattern.”

49 “Der einzige productive Werth der ‘Form’ scheint nämlich meiner Ansicht nach der zu sein, dass die blosse Vorstellung einer ‘Form’ die schaffende Phantasie beeinflussen kann, und dass unter dem Gesichtspunct eines Musters, sagen wir z.B. irgend eines Sonatenmusters von Beethoven, die Phantasie ihre Arbeit liefern kann. . . . Trotzdem die Mehrzahl der nichtoriginalen Componisten und oft genug auch die Meister selbst solchen Schaffensweg gehen, finde ich es dennoch für müßig und unproductiv, immer wieder die Form vor dem Inhalt anzusehen und zu benennen” (Schenker 1895, 326).

50 It is also possible that this sentiment betrays Brahms’s influence, with whom Schenker was acquainted. See Gustav Jenner’s ([1905] 2009, 411) account of how Brahms encouraged him to carefully study and emulate Beethoven’s sonatas in particular.
generative theory (or even metaphysics). Content has its own agency. Thus, Marx’s position can be inverted to formulate Schenker’s own: *form is intelligible only through the agency of content.* This is true of Schenker’s early polemics—and a better summation of his late *Formenlehre* is hard to imagine—but whether he is able to substantiate this view through a generative mechanism that accounts for content’s agency remains to be seen. Having reached this impasse, I introduce important theoretical concepts in Marx’s *Formenlehre* and foreshadow their influence on Schenker.

In his most famous treatise, Marx (1837–47) distinguishes between two fundamental forms (*Grundformen*): *Satz* and *Gang*.51 The *Satz* is harmonically closed and self-sufficient, whereas the *Gang* is associated with the continuous development of a motive (or motives).52 Although motivic development plays an important role in Schenker’s early *Formenlehre*, he does not have a *Gang*-like equivalent; all sections that compose full-movement forms are *Satz*-like in their conception.53 Thus, Schenker’s full-movement forms introduced in chapter 3 (see example 3.1.1, p. 158) conflate Marx’s rondo and song forms: like Marx’s rondo forms, they are increasingly complex, culminating in sonata form; but like Marx’s song forms, they comprise only *Satz*-like units.

Example 1.3.2 shows a *Satz* as a self-sufficient, ascending melodic idea labeled *a*. A descending *Satz* labeled *b* answers this idea. Together these *Sätze* compose a higher-order structure, which Marx calls a *Periode*. They are interdependent due to their balanced contours (ascending then descending), creating *Satz* and *Gegensatz* (or *Vordersatz* and *Nachsatz*). However,

51 Marx regards the *Periode* as equal in rank to the *Satz* and the *Gang*, although the *Periode* is already a compound form comprising two *Sätze*.

52 The *Gang* is often considered harmonically open, but it can end with a perfect authentic cadence. This is often the case with the *Gang* located between the *Seitensatz* (SS) and the *Schlußsatz* (SZ) in sonata-form expositions and recapitulations; see example 1.3.8(d), p. 24.

53 Perhaps the only exception to this claim is the development section in Schenker’s early conception of sonata form.
**EXAMPLE 1.3.2** A *Periode* with *Vordersatz* (a) and *Nachsatz* (b) (Marx [1837] 1846, 1:29, fig. 7)

![Example 1.3.2](image1.png)

**EXAMPLE 1.3.3** A *Periode* divided into three levels: *Satz* (A, B), *Abschnitt* (a, b), and *Glied* (c–i) (Marx [1837] 1846, 1:52, fig. 56)

![Example 1.3.3](image2.png)

As example 1.3.3 shows, *Perioden* can embed more than two levels of form (or grouping). In this case, a *Periode* comprises *Vordersatz* (A) and *Nachsatz* (B), the *Vordersatz* comprises two *Abschnitte* (a and b), and each *Abschnitt* comprises two *Glieder* (c and d, and e and f respectively). The *Nachsatz* comprises three *Glieder* (g, h, and i), with g and h together balancing the length of i.54 Meanwhile, Schenker’s motivic-formal analyses in *Harmonielehre* (1906) and other early writings never clearly articulate interacting levels of form in quite this way.

The two *Sätze* making up a *Periode* are also related harmonically. In example 1.3.4, a *Vordersatz* ends with a half cadence (*Halbschluss*); a *Nachsatz* ends with an authentic cadence (*Ganzschluss*). Although prototypical, the *Periode* is not limited to this cadential ordering (e.g., a

---

54 Regarding example 1.3.3, Marx ([1837] 1846, 1:52) writes, “1. in Vorder- und Nachsatz (A, B) theilen, der Vordersatz 2. in zwei Abschnitte (a, b), jeder Abschnitt 3. in zwei, so wie der Nachsatz ebenfalls in drei Glieder (c und d, e und f, g, h und i),—welche letztere übrigens dadurch ebenmässig vertheilt werden, dass das letzte (i) so lang ist, als die beiden vorhergehenden (g und h) zusammengenommen.”
EXAMPLE 1.3.4 A *Periode* schema: *Vordersatz* ending with a half cadence; *Nachsatz* ending with a perfect authentic cadence (Marx [1837] 1846, 1:62, fig. 72)

*Ganzschluss* can be followed by another *Ganzschluss*). Marx also writes that *Sätze* may be chained together in a variety of other ways:

The period is the first compound form and the second song form after the *Satz*. It consists primarily of two internally unified *Sätze*, which are called antecedent [*Vordersatz*] and consequent [*Nachsatz*]—or it can consist of more: two antecedents and a consequent, an antecedent and two consequents, two antecedents and two consequents, etc.55 (Burnham 1997, 73)

Schenker’s conception of the *Periode* is equally flexible: the relationship between *Vordersatz* and *Nachsatz* is based on a proposition-response paradigm rather than any prescribed cadential or thematic relationships.

Marx demonstrates how a two-part form (*zweiteilige Form*) emerges from the *Periode* in example 1.3.5. In the first *Theil* (mm. 1–8), the *Vordersatz* ends with an imperfect authentic cadence (m. 4), while the *Nachsatz* ends with a half cadence (m. 8). In the second *Theil*, the *Vordersatz* ends with a half cadence (m. 12), while the *Nachsatz* ends with a perfect authentic cadence (m. 16). The half cadence in m. 8 leaves the first *Theil* harmonically open, making it dependent on the second *Theil*, although this reverses the typical cadential ordering in a *Periode*. In this situation, the imperfect authentic cadence in m. 4 is used to create variety without providing

55 “Die Periode ist die erste zusammengesetzte Kunstform, und nach dem Satze die zweite Liedform. Sie besteht aus zwei oder mehr innerlich einheitvollen Sätzen,—zunächst aus zweien, die Vordersatz und Nachsatz heißen, dann aus zwei Vordersätzen und einem Nachsatz, einem Vorder- und zwei Nachsätzen, zwei Vorder- und zwei Nachsätzen etc.” (Marx 1856, 35).
**Example 1.3.5** A schema for *zweieilige Form* (Marx [1837] 1846, 1:68, fig. 85)

![Schema for Zweieilige Form](image)

**Example 1.3.6** A derivation of *dreieilige Form* from *zweieilige Form* (Marx [1837] 1846, 1:72)

![Derivation of Dreieilige Form](image)

Complete closure, since three half cadences in succession would become monotonous.

Example 1.3.6 shows how Marx derives three-part form from two-part form through the *Ruhe–Bewegung–Ruhe* paradigm. The first part’s *Vordersatz* is doubled in length (8 Takte) to create a new *Periode*. The first part’s *Nachsatz* and the second part’s *Vordersatz* are fused together, while the second part’s *Nachsatz* is also doubled in length. As a result, the first and third parts share similar thematic elements (\(a_1–b–a_2\)). Schenker’s conception of three-part form and its derivation from two-part form is quite similar to Marx’s, although Schenker relies more on a contrasting key to distinguish the *b* section from the two *a* sections that bookend it (see § 3.2.3).

Two- and three-part forms are the basic building blocks for Schenker’s full-movement forms. Combining two two-part forms creates a four-part form, combining two three-part forms with an elision creates a five-part form, and combining two three-part forms creates a six-part form. But in contrast to Schenker’s process of creating larger structures from relatively tight-knit
EXAMPLE 1.3.7 A Satznette: W. A. Mozart’s Piano Sonata in F Major, K. 332/i, mm. 1–22
(Marx [1845] 1848, 265, exx. 310, 311; trans. Burnham 1997, 113–14, exx. 4.19, 4.20)

Sätze, Marx includes looser constructions in his Formenlehre.56 These occur as more diffuse groups, which Marx describes as Satzketten (Satz-chains) rather than Perioden or Theile:

The Satz-chain is a succession of Sätze that indeed belong to each other by dint of mood, the ordering of harmonic progressions, linking and mediating members, and common motives, but are not fused into a necessary unity through the firmly uniting periodic form.57 (Burnham 1997, 112)

56 The terms tight knit and loose knit are taken from Caplin (1998, 84–86).
57 “die Satzkette, eine Folge von Sätzen, die zwar durch Stimmung, durch Modulationsordnung, durch verbindende Mittelglieder, durch gemeinsame Motiv zu einander gehören, nicht aber durch die fest einende Periodenform zu einer nothwendigen Einheit verschmolzen sind” (Marx [1845] 1848, 3:263–64).
This is remarkably similar to Schenker’s concept of *Gruppenbildung*; as I show in § 2.5, both theorists recognized that a single key (*Tonart*) can unify a variety of melodic ideas. 58

To illustrate this idea, example 1.3.7 (shown above) reconstructs an analysis of Mozart’s K. 332/i. 59 Marx suggests that two interpretations of mm. 1–12 are possible: either a single *Satz* or a *Periode*. According to the latter analysis (which he seems to favor), mm. 1–4 compose a *Vordersatz* that ends with a half cadence (despite the tonic pedal), while mm. 5–12 compose a *Nachsatz* that ends with a perfect authentic cadence. A new *Satz* begins in m. 12 and concludes with an authentic cadence in m. 16. A varied repetition of this idea follows (mm. 16–20), with confirmation of the authentic cadence in mm. 20–22. Marx writes,

That the last *Satz* [m. 13ff.] belongs to the main *Satz*, regardless of the full close that precedes it [m. 12], is shown at first by the identity of key and still more decisively by the further course of the composition, which we will consider later. Yet the designation main *Satz* seems neither reasonable nor applicable here; the designation main group [Hauptpartie] would more appropriately epitomize everything up to the subsidiary *Satz*, or the subsidiary group [Seitenpartie].60

(Burnham 1997, 114; emphasis original)

In his early work, Schenker also relies on key areas to unify sections rather than themes (i.e., melodic ideas) or motives *per se*. Even in his work from the mid-1920s, he relies primarily on keys as a determinant of form rather than spans of transformational voice leading and the composing-

---

58 See *Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik* (Schenker [1903, rev. 1908] 1976, 27–31) and § 2.4.
60 “Dass aber der letzte Satz [m. 13ff.] ungeachtet des vorhergehenden vollkommnen Abschlusses zum Hauptsatze gehört, zeigt zunächst die Gleichheit der Tonart, dann noch entschiedener der weitere Verlauf der Komposition, den wir später zu betrachten haben werden. Nur erscheint hier die Benennung Hauptsatz nicht füglich noch anwendbar; man würde passender die Benennung Hauptpartie für den Inbegriff alles bis zum SeitenSATZ oder zur Seitenpartie Gegebenen brauchen” (Marx [1845] 1848, 3:265).
out of deep-level *Stufen*.\(^{61}\) For example, Schenker’s diverse groups unified by a single key function as the main components of a sonata-form exposition in particular—an observation that leads us to the disposition of themes in this complex schema.

Example 1.3.8 outlines Marx’s rondo forms, including the derivation of two-part sonatina form (sonata form without development) and three-part sonata form from the fifth rondo.\(^{62}\) In Example 1.3.8(a), the first rondo’s *Hauptsatz* (*HS*)–*Gang* (*G*)–*HS* layout corresponds to Marx’s *Ruhig–Bewegung–Ruhig* paradigm. The second rondo becomes more differentiated with the added *Seitensatz* (*SS*). While Marx states that the *HS* and *SS* can occur in the same key, he prefers a change in key (or mode) to distinguish these sections. The third rondo brings yet another *Seitensatz* (*SS*.2), and along with it, another iteration of the *HS*–*SS*–*G* pattern. Marx describes *SS*.1 as an attempt to depart from the main *HS*, while *SS*.2 is an even more dramatic attempt. The extra rhetorical weight of *SS*.2 and its recency in the listener’s mind requires a return of *SS*.1 so that the listener does not forget it, resulting in the fourth rondo.

Yet the fourth rondo presents a new problem: *SS*.1, which was lighter in character than *SS*.2, concludes the entire movement. Marx introduces the fifth rondo to correct this imperfection. This rondo’s three-part layout (again a manifestation of the *Ruhig–Bewegung–Ruhig* paradigm) is shown in example 1.3.8(b). A *Schlußsatz* (*SZ*) is added at the end of the *HS*–*SS*–*G* pattern to create a greater sense of rhetorical closure at the end of part III (this *SZ* also provides closure at the end of part I). In the fourth rondo, the *HS* is repeated three times, which risks monotony. However, since part I ends with a *SZ*, the *HS* in part II may be deleted. As a result,

---

\(^{61}\) In particular, see the correspondences between the parts of the form and the key areas in Schenker’s analysis of Haydn’s Piano Sonata in G Minor, Hob. XVI: 44/i, from “Vom organischen der Sonatenform” (Schenker [1926] 1996, 24, fig. 1b; see example 4.3.4, p. 338).

\(^{62}\) The following discussion is based on Marx (1856, 39–43; trans. Burnham 1997, 78–83).
EXAMPLE 1.3.8 Rondo forms, sonatina form, and sonata form (Marx 1856, 39–43; trans. Burnham 1997, 78–83; see Burnham 2002, 888)

(A) Rondo forms

First rondo: \( HS - G - HS \)
Second rondo: \( HS - SS - G \sim HS \)
Third rondo: \( HS - SS.1 - G \sim HS - SS.2 - G \sim HS \)
Fourth rondo: \( HS - SS.1 - G \sim HS - SS.2 - G \sim HS - SS.1 \)
Fifth rondo: \( HS - SS.1 - G - SZ \sim SS.2 - G \sim HS - SS.1 - G - SZ \)

(B) The fifth rondo (three-part layout with expected keys)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{I.} & \text{II.} & \text{III.} \\
\text{HS} & \text{SS.1} & \text{G} & \text{SZ} \\
C \text{ dur} & G \text{ dur} & G \text{ dur} \\
A \text{ moll} & C \text{ dur} & C \text{ dur} \\
\text{C moll} & \text{E moll} & \text{As dur} \\
\text{E moll} & \text{F dur} & \text{F moll} \\
\text{F dur} & \text{As dur} & \\
\end{array}
\]

(C) Sonatina form (two-part layout)

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{I.} & \text{II.} \\
\text{HS} - \text{SS.1} - \text{G} - \text{SZ} & \text{HS} - \text{SS.1} - \text{G} - \text{SZ} \\
\end{array}
\]

(D) Sonata form (three-part layout)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{I.} & \text{II.} & \text{III.} \\
\text{HS} - \text{SS.1} - \text{G} - \text{SZ} & \text{Durcharbeitung} & \text{HS} - \text{SS.1} - \text{G} - \text{SZ} \\
\end{array}
\]
the first SZ rushes headlong into SS.2. (Without this first SZ, the form would have a SS.1–G pattern leading awkwardly to yet another SS.) Finally, Marx derives sonatina form and sonata form from the fifth rondo. Sonatina form, shown in example 1.3.8(c), is the product of deletion: part II in the fifth rondo is deleted, which leaves only two iterations of HS–SS.1–G–SZ. On the other hand, sonata form restores a three-part layout in example 1.3.8(d), with the Durcharbeitung replacing the fifth rondo’s second large part. (This section develops material from the first part of the form while also working through different keys.)

Like Marx, Schenker couched his early Formenlehre in language that mixes energetics with psychology: as content proliferates, each form urges for further development; repetitions compensate for some imperfection in a previous form or are necessitated by the psychological principles that underlie our ability to remember music and make associations. With a similar combination of energetics and psychology as their basis, many concepts in Schenker’s early Formenlehre can ultimately be traced back to Marx. These include the organic development of motives to generate Sätze articulated by cadences (usually authentic or half); the combination of Sätze into tight-knit structures of a higher order (e.g., the Periode, zweiteilige Form, and dreiteilige Form); the reliance on key areas to unify a more diverse group of ideas (as in Marx’s Satzkette); and the progression of full-movement forms from simple to complex, culminating in sonata form. Both theorists thought that pre-existing forms could stimulate a composer’s imagination, although Schenker did so with far more trepidation.
§ 1.3.2. Classicists from Anton Reicha to J. C. Lobe and E. F. Richter

Not long before Marx had completed his *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition* (1837–47) while in Berlin, Johann Christian Lobe had published his *Compositions-Lehre* (1844) in Weimar.63 Lobe understood form as melody punctuated by cadences and adhered to a two-part conception of sonata form rather than Marx’s three.64 These “classical” features ally Lobe—and Ernst Friedrich Richter to some extent—with theorists from the second half of the eighteenth century. However, Lobe’s greatest influence was Anton Reicha—a longtime friend of Beethoven and the composition teacher of Berlioz and Liszt (among others). Carl Czerny (1832–34?) compiled Reicha’s first three treatises—including the *Traité de mélodie* (1814), the *Cours de composition musicale* (1818), and the *Traité de haute composition musicale* (1824–26)—into a dual-language edition that included the original French and a parallel German translation, making these works available to Lobe in his native language.65

Reicha’s *Traité de mélodie* was particularly influential on Lobe’s *Formenlehre*.66 Reicha ([1814] 2000, 13) writes, “melody requires a *theory of rhythm; a theory of resting points, or cadences; the art of connecting and developing ideas so as to create a whole; and a knowledge of periods and their inter-relationships.*”67 Although he focused on melody, Reicha’s approach was intimately connected with a theory of form (melody punctuated by cadences at various hierarchical levels). He also emphasized symmetry and proportion: a *période*, which must conclude with either an authentic

---

63 For an introduction to Lobe’s *Formenlehre*, see Moyer (1969, 145–57).
64 Lobe and Richter did not use Marx’s term *Sonatenform*; instead, they described it as *die erste Form des Quartetts* or *der erste Satz einer Sonate* respectively.
65 There is no evidence that Schenker knew Reicha’s works, even in translation.
66 See Baker (1992) for an introduction to Reicha’s *Traité de mélodie*.
67 “la Mélodie exige la théorie du rythme; celle des points de repos ou cadences; l’art d’enchaîner et de développer des idées pour en faire un tout; la science des périodes et de leurs réunions entre’elles” (Reicha 1814, 9; emphasis original).
EXAMPLE 1.3.9 A période comprising three membres (Czerny 1832–34?, 2:368, ex. J; see Reicha 1814, 2, ex. J)

In example 1.3.10(a), Reicha analyzes the Thème ou Motif, subdividing it into thirteen dessins. (A motif should not be confused with a traditional motive, which is equivalent to Reicha’s dessin.) From one or two of these dessins, Reicha generates the ten périodes shown in example 1.3.10(b). He then combines these périodes to create a composition (not shown).

68 See Reicha ([1814] 2000, 80; emphasis added to match the original). “Qui a pour but de développer un motif . . . et de faire avec la matière qui en résulte des phrases et des périodes melodiques bien rythmés” (Reicha 1814, 81).
EXAMPLE 1.3.10 Reicha’s *thème* and ten related *périodes*

(A) Reicha’s *thème* divided into *dessins* (Czerny 1832–34?, 2:523; see Reicha 1814, 53, ex. J5, no. 7)

(B) Related *périodes* derived from the *dessins* identified above (Czerny 1832–34?, 2:523–24, ex. K5, nos. 1–10; see Reicha 1814, 53–54, ex. K5, nos. 1–10)
Lobe describes a similar method of melodic composition as *thematische Arbeit*. In this case, he finds the instrumental music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven particularly instructive. Indeed, Lobe and Schenker were kindred spirits—even if Schenker would never dare admit it. For example, in the “Niedergang” typescript Schenker ([1905–6] 2005a) concluded that the instrumental music of the First Viennese School represented an apex in music history because this repertoire was based on motivic development originating from an improvisational impulse inspired by genius. (And, as we saw earlier, he claimed that this apex was soon followed by a precipitous decline.) Schenker also used many of Lobe’s terms related to form, adopted Lobe’s terms and definitions for what constitutes a cadence (although Schenker’s innovative concept of the *Stufe* complicates this matter), and copied the layout of Lobe’s form diagrams. Moreover, while Schenker surely knew Marx’s *Kompositionslehre*, it is also possible that Schenker encountered Lobe’s work through his studies with Bruckner (see § 1.3.4 below).

Example 1.3.11 demonstrates *thematische Arbeit* and its relationship to the *Periode*. Here a theme from Haydn’s *London* Symphony is generated, which Lobe (1844, 3–5) then divides into its constituent parts. He begins with an *Urgestalt*: an eight-measure *Gedanke* (idea) composed entirely of whole notes on A₄. Yet this idea lacks tonal and rhythmic interest. Rhythmic interest is added at stage 2, although a unified whole is not achieved because each measure contains a different rhythmic figure. (Although Lobe often restricted his motives to the space between two bar lines,

---

69 Reicha, on the other hand, claimed that his work applied equally to instrumental or vocal music.

70 Bruckner’s own training included studying *Formenlehren* by Lobe (1850–67, vols. 1 and 2) and Richter (1852).

71 For more on Lobe’s approach to melodic composition, see Trippett (2013, 117–29).

72 “Es ist zu grosse Mannichfaltigkeit darin, jeder Takt hat eine andere rhythmische Figur, und der Gedanke ist nicht als ein Ganzes zu erfassen” (Lobe 1844, 3).
EXAMPLE 1.3.11 Haydn, Symphony no. 104 in D Major, Hob. I:104/iv, mm. 3–10 (Lobe 1844, 3–5, exx. 1–9; see Trippett 2013, 122, ex. 2.5)
he also allowed motives to cross the bar line; see example 1.3.12.) Stage 3 provides a synthesis of unity (Einheit) and variety (Mannichfaltigkeit) created through similarity (Aehnlichkeit) and repetition (Wiederholung). Measures 1–2 are parallel to mm. 5–6 (labeled a), while mm. 3–4 are parallel to mm. 7–8 (labeled b). As a result, mm. 1–4 are parallel to mm. 5–8 (labeled c). Stage 4 offers one attempt to achieve tonal variety, which stage 3 lacked. However, Lobe describes stage 4 as “an asymmetrical rambling-about of tones.” The appropriate balance between unity and variety is finally achieved at stage 5—the theme as Haydn composed it. Lobe divides this theme into its constituent parts: the eight-measure Periode divides into two four-measure Sätze (see analysis 1); each Satz divides into two two-measure Abschnitte (see analysis 2); and each Abschnitt divides into two one-measure Motive (see analysis 3). These terms are identical to those used by Marx (cf. example 1.3.3, p. 18), although this may be due to their use in Czerny’s translation of Reicha.

The entire Periode is shown in example 1.3.11 as analysis 4.

---

73 “Der erste, zweite, fünfte und sechste Takt gleichen sich; eben so der dritte und siebente; eben so der vierte und achte. Oder vergleicht man zwei und zwei Takte miteinander, so zeigen sich 5 und 6 als Wiederholungen von 1 und 2; 7 und 8 als Wiederholung von 3 und 4. Auch vier zu vier betrachtet, erscheint die zweite Abtheilung als eine Wiederholung der ersten” (Lobe 1844, 4).

74 “Hier [stage 4] finden wir jedoch denselben Fehler im tonischen Element, wie oben im rhythmischen, nämlich ein unsymmetrisches Herumschweifen der Töne, weshalb uns der Gedanke auch so nicht anspricht” (Lobe 1844, 4).
Yet *thematische* (or *motivische*) Arbeit goes far beyond what we find in this relatively simple theme. Example 1.3.13 shows many transformations of Haydn’s initial motive categorized according to whether they affect the pitch or the rhythm. For example, *Vorsetzung* transposes a motive to other *Stufen* (see pitch 1). *Verengerung* contracts an interval (or intervals) within a motive (see pitch 2). *Erweiterung* expands an interval (or intervals) within a motive (see pitch 3). *Verkehrung* inverts an interval (see pitch 4). *Vergrösserung* enlarges a motive’s rhythm proportionally (see rhythm 1), while *Verkleinerung* reduces a motive’s rhythm proportionally (see rhythm 2). These transformations can be combined (e.g., a motive might undergo *Vorsetzung* and *Vergrösserung*). Other mutations (*Umbildungen*) are also possible: a motive might be broken off (*Abreissen*) or broken off and repeated (see *Umbildung* 1); a new submotive (*Glied*) might be added to an existing submotive (see *Umbildung* 2); or a motive might undergo further variation (see *Umbildung* 3).

These transformations are all based on a model undergoing some varied repetition. This is made explicit in Lobe’s *Lehrbuch der musikalischen Komposition* ([1850–67, vol. 1] 1858). Example 1.3.14 illustrates how the opening theme from a Beethoven string quartet contains four individual motives. Lobe then composes four new themes by sequencing each of them. He also creates themes that incorporate two of the original motives (e.g., *Motive* 1 and 2) or one original motive plus a new idea. This sequencing can either be strict (*strenge Sequenz*) or free (*freie Sequenz*), and it can operate at higher formal levels. For instance, example 1.3.15(a) shows how an

---

75 Schenker describes a model-copy paradigm in § 4 of *Harmonielehre* and in his earlier manuscript “Der Weg zum Gleichnis” (see appendix 1). In part IV of the latter, he describes this paradigm in the terms of *Vorbild* and *Gegenbild*.

76 These motives create a single *Satz* (mm. 1–4) subject to varied repetition (not shown).
EXAMPLE 1.3.13 Transformations of a motive (Lobe 1844, 15–19, exx. 56–59, 62, 64, 66–68, 70, 74, 76, 78)

Haydn's Motiv
[ex. 56]

Pitch 1
[ex. 57]

Pitch 2
[exx. 58, 59]

Pitch 3
[ex. 62]

Pitch 4
[ex. 64]

Rhythm 1
[exx. 66, 67]

Rhythm 2
[ex. 68]

Umbildung 1
[exx. 70, 74]

Umbildung 2
[ex. 76]

Umbildung 3
[ex. 78]
**EXAMPLE 1.3.15** Model and sequence (Lobe [1850–67, vol. 1] 1858, 20–21, exx. 56a, 57a, 58)

(A) *Abschnitt als Modell*

(B) *Satz als Modell*

Although eight measures is the prototypical length, the *Periode* can be shortened or lengthened from anywhere between six and thirteen measures (Lobe 1844, 78–81).

---

77 Here Lobe indicates *Stufen* with Arabic numerals.

78 Lobe ([1850–67, vol. 1] 1858, 292–95, 325) describes *Perioden* that are six to twelve measures long (although one *Periode* is fifteen measures; see example 1.3.18, p. 43). Richter (1852, 22, ex. 36) also analyzes a *Periode* from Mendelssohn’s *Hebrides* Overture that is twenty measures.
be accomplished in one of four ways (see example 1.3.16). Example 1.3.16(a) shows Verengerung (constriction): the eighth measure of a Periode overlaps with the first measure of a new Periode. Because Lobe privileges the beginning of each Periode, the first Periode is seven measures long rather than eight. This grouping is unusual because—assuming that Lobe would hear an authentic cadence, as I have indicated using Roman numerals below the ossia staff—it severs the tonic chord concluding the first Periode from its preceding dominant. In other words, the grouping cuts across the syntax of the authentic cadence.79 Perioden can also be truncated through Wegnehmen (deletion). In example 1.3.16(b), mm. 7 and 8 of an eight-measure Periode are deleted; this shows how Lobe hears Haydn’s six-measure Periode in relation to an eight-measure prototype (see the ossia staff). On the other hand, example 1.3.16(c) shows how a Periode can undergo Erweiterung (expansion). In this case, the Periode is nine measures long, perhaps due to the repetition of the initial motive. Finally, example 1.3.16(d) shows how Wiederholung (repetition) and Einschaltung (insertion) together result in a twelve-measure Periode. Repeating the opening Abschnitt (although not exactly) creates two additional measures, while inserting this Abschnitt in mm. 7–8 has the same effect.

By 1846 both J. C. Lobe and E. F. Richter were living in Leipzig: Lobe had begun working on his Lehrbuch (1850–67), while Richter taught at the Conservatory and later published Die Grundzüge zur musikalischen Setzkunst und ihre Analyse (1852).80 As its title suggests, Richter’s treatise was far more concise. Initially forgoing a description of thematische Arbeit, Richter focused more on the relationship between form and cadence instead.

---

79 This is a feature of Schenker’s early Formenlehre as well; see § 2.4.2.
80 For an introduction to Richter’s Grundzüge, see Moyer (1969, 158–66).
**EXAMPLE 1.3.16** Modifying the *Periode* (Lobe 1844, 78–80, exx. 233–34, 236–38, 241)

(A) *Verengerung* (constriction): Haydn’s Symphony no. 104 in D Major, Hob. I:104/iv, mm. 323–30 (winds)

(B) *Wegnehmen* (deletion): Haydn’s Symphony no. 104 in D Major, Hob. I:104/iv, mm. 291–98 (violins)

(C) *Erweiterung* (expansion): Haydn’s Symphony no. 104 in D Major, Hob. I:104/iv, mm. 330–38 (winds)
EXAMPLE 1.3.16 CONTINUED

(D) Wiederholung and Einschaltung (repetition and insertion): Haydn’s Symphony no. 104 in D Major, Hob. I:104/iv, mm. 108–21 (flutes and violins)

Table 1.3.1 outlines Richter’s (1852) cadence types and compares them to the descriptions found in Lobe (1844).81 Both theorists describe a cadence as an event that comprises two chords (usually ending a Satz or a Periode).82 The Ganzschluss (authentic cadence) occurs when a V or V7 chord resolves to I. A vollkommenen Ganzschluss (perfect authentic cadence) occurs when both chords are in root position and the tonic chord ends with I in the melody.83 An unvollkommenen Ganzschluss occurs when at least one chord is inverted (although both can be inverted), when the melody ends with 3 or 5 over the tonic, or when there is some combination of chord inversion and melodic incompleteness.84 A plagalische Schluss (plagal cadence) occurs when IV resolves to I (both in root position), while Lobe specifies that I should occur over the final tonic. A Halbschluss

---

81 The Roman numerals in table 1.3.1 and the following discussion represent chords in either the major or minor mode (in the minor mode, the dominant has a major quality).

82 Richer (1852, 4, ex. 7) distinguishes between two-chord Cadenzen and erweiterte Cadenzen (enlarged cadences). The latter are better suited to close large sections of a composition; enlarged cadences can involve at least seven individual chords.

83 Lobe’s Lehrbuch ([1850–67, vol. 1] 1858, 175) gives additional instructions: to sound most conclusive, the second chord in a Ganzschluss should fall on the strong part of the measure (more specifically, the tonic should fall on the downbeat of a measure).

84 Likewise, Schenker does not require that a Ganzschluss involve root-position chords; see §2.4.3 and table 2.4.1, p. 126.
TABLE 1.3.1 Lobe and Richter’s cadence types (Lobe 1844, 75–76; Richter 1852, 2–4; cf. table 2.4.1, p. 126)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schluss</th>
<th>Lobe (1844)</th>
<th>Richter (1852)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) vollkommener Ganzschluss: V(^7)–I, melody ends with (\bar{1}) over I</td>
<td>(A) vollkommener Ganzschluss: V(^7)–I, melody ends with (\bar{1}) over I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) unvollkommener Ganzschluss: V(^7)–I, melody ends with (\bar{3}) or (\bar{5}) over I, or at least one chord is inverted (or some combination of both)</td>
<td>(B) unvollkommener Ganzschluss: V(^7)–I, melody ends with (\bar{3}) or (\bar{5}) over I, or at least one chord is inverted (or some combination of both)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plagalische Schluss</td>
<td>IV–I, melody ends with (\bar{1}) over I</td>
<td>IV–I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halbschluss</td>
<td>X–V, where X is some other chord</td>
<td>X–V, where X is some other chord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trugschluss</td>
<td>V(^7)–X, where X is some chord other than the tonic</td>
<td>V(^7)–X, where X is some chord other than the tonic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(half cadence) occurs when some chord (indicated here using the variable X) leads to a root-position V triad. (Neither Lobe nor Richter show an example of a half cadence ending with a V\(^7\) chord.) A Trugschluss (deceptive cadence) occurs when a V or V\(^7\) chord resolves to a chord other than the tonic, making it a broader category than V resolving to VI. Richter (1852, 6) specifies that the first Abschnitt (equivalent to Marx’s Satz) in a Periode should usually end with an imperfect authentic cadence, plagal cadence, or a half cadence, whereas the second Abschnitt should end with a perfect authentic cadence.

At the next hierarchical level, Perioden articulated by cadences combine into a larger complex that Richter (1852, 17–26) calls a Periodengruppe, while multiple Periodengruppen combine to create a Theil (a large part of the overall form). In Lobe’s Lehrbuch ([1850–67, vol. 1] 1858, 344), Perioden also combine to create various Gruppen (e.g., a Themagruppe or a Gesanggruppe). In example 1.3.17(a), Lobe shows how, in the first movement of a Beethoven string quartet, the opening Themagruppe comprises two Perioden: the first is an eight-measure Modellperiode; the second is a twelve-measure Sequenzperiode. Example 1.3.17(b) shows the first movement of

(A) Themagruppe with two Perioden: Beethoven’s String Quartet in G Major, op. 18, no. 2/i, mm. 1–20 (violin I)

(B) Themagruppe with three Perioden: Beethoven’s String Quartet in F Major, op. 18, no. 1/i, mm. 1–29 (violins I and II)
another Beethoven quartet. Here the opening Themagruppe comprises three Perioden: the first is an eight-measure Modellperiode, the second is a twelve-measure Sequenzperiode, and the third is an eight-measure Sequenzperiode. While Lobe indicates that all three Perioden are in F major, the third one does not include its final tonic—perhaps he hears a Verengerung (constriction) in mm. 28–29.

Table 1.3.2 compares the disposition of Periodengruppen in what Lobe and Richter both describe as “first-movement form” (sonata form). First-movement form comprises two Theile. The first Theil comprises four Gruppen. Although Lobe and Richter label them differently, these Gruppen have equivalent functions. Adopting Lobe’s ([1850–67, vol. 1] 1858, 315–16) descriptions, the Themagruppe (theme group) establishes the primary key and the primary melodic material. For first movements in the major mode, an Übergangsgruppe (transition group) begins in the primary key, modulates to the key of the dominant, and ends with a half cadence. A Gesanggruppe (song group) and a Schlussgruppe (closing group) follow in the key of the dominant. For first movements in the minor mode, the Gesang- and Schlussgruppe are set in the relative major (the Übergangsgruppe would presumably end with a half cadence in the same key). Lobe states that while the Übergangs-, Gesang-, and Schlussgruppe can all introduce neue Gedanken (new ideas), the Gruppen in the second Theil cannot. Instead, the Mittelsatzgruppe (the beginning of the second Theil) develops the themes heard previously. Here thematische Arbeit comes to the fore. The

---

85 However, Richter (1852, 33) characteristically places more emphasis on the cadence that ends each group.

86 Lobe (1844, 134–35) uses the same terminology to describe first-movement form in his earlier treatise.

87 Compared to Lobe, Richter (1852, 35, ex. 46) includes one additional section in the second Theil: the Verbindungssatz that follows the Durchführungsperioden proper. This section prepares for the Repetition. According to Richter’s example, taken from Mozart’s K. 533, this preparation is achieved by securing the dominant of the primary key.
Repetition section, which returns to the primary key, recapitulates the first Theil with the necessary tonal adjustments. For movements in the major mode, the Gesanggruppe and Schlussgruppe are set in the primary key; for movements in the minor mode, the Gesanggruppe is usually set in the parallel major, while the Schlussgruppe can be set in either mode. Unlike Richter, Lobe also includes an Anhang (coda).

Example 1.3.18 shows Lobe’s form diagram for the first movement of Beethoven’s String Quartet in G Major, op. 18, no. 2. Each Periode is listed according to its length (in measures) and the keys through which it moves (upper case indicates major keys; lower case indicates minor keys). The braces indicate that two or more Perioden have been yoked together to create a Gruppe. For example, in the first Theil, the Thema- and Gesanggruppe each comprise two Perioden, the Überganggruppe comprises one Periode and one freestanding Satz, and the Schlussgruppe comprises three Perioden and one Satz. The Mittelsatzgruppe moves through ten different keys and comprises
EXAMPLE 1.3.18 Lobe’s erste Form des Quartetts: Beethoven, String Quartet in G Major, op. 18, no. 2/i (Lobe [1850–67, vol. 1] 1858, 325)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Allegro, G dur, } & \frac{3}{4}. \\
\text{Erster Theil.} & \\
1. \text{Themagruppe.} & \\
\{ & \\
8 & G. \\
12 & G. \\
4 & d. \\
\} & \\
2. \text{Uebergangsgruppe.} & \\
\{ & \\
11 & G - e - D - d. \\
4 & d. \\
8 & D - e - D. \\
7 & D - e - h. \\
10 & h - e - D - h - e - D. \\
7 & D. \\
\} & \\
3. \text{Gesanggruppe.} & \\
\{ & \\
10 & D, mit kleinen eingeschalteten Ausweichungen. \\
\} & \\
4. \text{Schlussgruppe.} & \\
\{ & \\
\} & \\
5. \text{Mittelsatzgruppe.} & \\
\{ & \\
15 & d - B - c - Es. \\
4 & Es. \\
7 & Es - As - B. \\
10 & B - b - f - b - g. \\
8 & g - c - a - d. \\
11 & d - G. \\
\} & \\
\{ & \\
\} & \\
[Repetition.] & \\
6. \text{Themagruppe.} & \\
\{ & \\
12 & G. \\
4 & G. \\
9 & G - d - a - e. \\
\} & \\
7. \text{Uebergangsgruppe.} & \\
\{ & \\
9 & E - e - G - D. \\
8 & G - D - e - D. \\
\} & \\
8. \text{Gesanggruppe.} & \\
\{ & \\
8 & G - a - G. \\
7 & G - a - e. \\
10 & e - a - G - e - a - G. \\
7 & G. \\
\} & \\
9. \text{Schlussgruppe.} & \\
\{ & \\
10 & G, mit kleinen eingeschalteten Ausweichungen. \\
\} & \\
4 & G. \\
10. \text{Anhang.} & \\
\{ & \\
8 & G - C - e - G. \\
8 & G. \\
\} &
\end{align*}
\]
five *Perioden* ranging from seven to fifteen measures long (plus thee *Sätze*). Although Lobe emphasizes the importance of the eight-measure *Periode*, it is clear that he uses this prototype flexibly in analysis.

Example 1.3.19 shows an example of Lobe’s rondo form. This form begins with the same initial *Theil* (comprising four *Gruppen*) found in table 1.3.2 and example 1.3.18, although there are two *Repetition* sections rather than one. (It is in this context that we might better understand why “sonata form” has two *Theile* rather than three.) The first *Repetition* includes the *Themagruppe* and an expansive *Mittelsatzgruppe*. The second *Repetition* is based on the first *Theil*, with the *Gesanggruppe* and *Schlussgruppe* set in the primary key followed by an *Anhang*.

Lobe’s concept of *thematische Arbeit*, which perhaps derives from Reicha, had a profound influence on Schenker, whose early *Formenlehre* was animated by the instrumental motive and its development. Schenker also adopted Lobe and Richter’s terminology and definitions for what constitutes a cadence. But unlike these theorists, Schenker did not regard the eight-measure *Periode* as prototypical—at least he never stated this directly. He was, however, deeply concerned with the length of *Perioden*, not only counting the measures in each, but using these numbers to represent weak and strong measures similar to the modern concept of hypermeter. The *Gruppe* and its formation through *Gruppenbildung*—a hallmark of sonata form in particular—was also integral to his early conception of form.88 Although Schenker did not divide sonata form into two large *Theile*, nor did he divide the first *Theile* into four *Gruppen*, the layout of his form diagrams in the explanatory editions of the late Beethoven piano sonatas is quite similar to that of Lobe’s

---

88 *Gruppenbildung*, which Schenker considered sonata form’s defining feature, is described in § 2.5. This concept was introduced in *Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik* ([1903, rev. 1908] 1976).
EXAMPLE 1.3.19 Lobe’s rondo form: Beethoven, String Quartet in F Major, op. 18, no. 1/iv (Lobe [1850–67, vol. 1] 1858, 332)
EXAMPLE 1.3.20 Schenker’s diagram of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E Major, op. 109/ii (Schenker 1913, 36)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Themengruppe:} & \quad (\text{drei Teil-} & \text{gedanken}) \\
\text{Modulation:} & \quad (\text{V. S.:} & \text{T.} \quad 25-28) \\
\text{II. Gedanke:} & \quad \text{T.} \quad 33-56 \\
\text{III. Gedanke:} & \quad \text{T.} \quad 57-69 \\
\text{Durchführung:} & \quad \text{T.} \quad 70-104 \\
\text{Reprise:} & \quad \text{T.} \quad 105-177
\end{align*}
\]

*Themengruppe* comprises the small *a*, *b*, and *c* sections, while the *c* section comprises a *Vorder*- and *Nachsatz* (this *Nachsatz* also functions as the *Modulationspartie*, or transition).

§ 1.3.3. Interlude: Hanslick, Wagner, and the “Lost Art of Hearing”

Eduard Hanslick and Heinrich Schenker shared much in common. Both studied law: Hanslick in Prague, Schenker in Vienna. Both were pianists who later became music critics: Hanslick writing for Vienna’s *Neue Freie Presse*, Schenker writing for a variety of German-language periodicals (Federhofer 1990). And both were connected to Brahms’s circle, often defending Brahms against his critics. At first Brahms was unreceptive to Hanslick’s *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen*—even describing its contents as “stupid” in an 1856 letter to Clara Schumann (Litzmann 1927, 1:168)—although after making Hanslick’s acquaintance, Brahms wrote a warm letter that praised the pamphlet (Avins 1997, 284). Brahms even dedicated his op. 39 waltzes to

---

90 For more on Schenker’s legal training, see Alpern (1999, 2012).
Hanslick a few years later. Schenker, on the other hand, had met Brahms on numerous occasions between 1894 and 1896. His influence on Schenker cannot be overstated.\footnote{See Schenker (1933) and Karnes (2005).}

Given these mutual connections to Brahms’s circle, Schenker corresponded with Hanslick regarding plans to write a “Geschichte der Melodie.” Hanslick replied with a postcard that expressed his enthusiasm for the project (Federhofer 1985, 12–13).\footnote{What follows is based on Cook (2007, 48–62).} The following year, Schenker published his first major theoretical statement, “Der Geist der musikalischen Technik,” accompanied by an editor’s note stating that it was part of a larger manuscript in progress. “Geist” was likely intended as an introduction to the “Geschichte der Melodie” (Federhofer 1895, 12): it begins with melody’s origins, traces music’s evolution from local repetitions (i.e., motives) to the rise of polyphony, describes how harmony is derived from melody, and ends with a discussion of large forms. The “Geist” essay’s conclusion is indeed a fitting point of departure for the more detailed history that would follow:\footnote{Schenker’s unpublished essay, “Der Weg zum Gleichnis,” was also likely intended to be part of the “Geschichte” project (see appendix 1).}

\begin{quote}
the intrinsic nature of music is to create melodies which live together peaceably, like folksongs, like familial relations, and which, like the first humans in paradise, can frolic naked and unclothed in the paradise of music. But, of course, when music donned fig leaves and became Art, people began to keep track of how large a structure one can actually weld together; one melody established a homestead, as it were, and then whole families came along, and a dense population that, unfortunately, is not subject to the law of Malthus!—It is only because of this, I think, that people today, as in the past, turn their awareness of externals toward the artificial proliferation of melodies in a single movement, and yet feel themselves drawn above all and most intensely to the melodies themselves, which seem to be the intrinsic nature of music.\footnote{“die eigentliche Natur der Musik ist Melodien zu schaffen, die, wie die Volkslieder, frei und unabhängig mit einander leben, familienähnlich und versöhnlich, und die, wie die ersten Menschen im Paradies, nackt und unbekleidet im Paradies der Musik sich herumtummeln können. Ja, da die Musik Feigenblätter anlegte und zur Kunst geworden, begann...} (Schenker [1895] 2007, 332; emphasis original)\end{quote}
Hanslick ([1854] 1986, 69) likewise claimed, “melody is the jumping-off point, the life, the
original artistic manifestation of the realm of sound; all additional determinations, all inclusion of
content, are tied to it” in *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen*.95 Regarding Schenker’s “Geschichte” project,
“it makes sense that Hanslick would have been interested in the idea,” observes Nicholas Cook

Hanslick ([1854] 1986, 80), like Schenker, also denied form’s independent status, writing,
“In music there is no content as opposed to form, because music has no form other than the
content.”96 Hanslick even thought that forms—although he uses this term in a broad sense—risk
becoming tired clichés:

> There is no art which wears out so many forms so quickly as music. Modulations,
cadences, intervallic and harmonic progressions all in this manner go stale in fifty,
nay, thirty years, so that the gifted composer can no longer make use of them and
will be forever making his way to the discovery of new, purely musical directions.
Without inaccuracy we may say, of many compositions which were outstanding in
their own day, that once upon a time they were beautiful.97 (Hanslick [1854] 1986,
35; quoted in Cook 2007, 48)

---

springende Punkt,’ das Leben, die erste Kunstgestalt des Tonreichs, an sie ist jede weitere
Bestimmtheit, alle Erfassung des Inhalts geknüpft” (Hanslick 1854, 84).

96 “Bei der Tonkunst giebt es keinen Inhalt gegenüber der Form, weil sie keine Form hat
außerhalb dem Inhalt” (Hanslick 1854, 99).

97 “Es gibt keine Kunst, welche so bald und so viele Formen verbraucht, wie die Musik.
Modulationen, Cadenzen, Intervallenfortschreitungen, Harmonienfolgen nützen sich in 50, ja 30
Jahren dergestalt ab, daß der geistvolle Componist sich deren nicht mehr bedienen kann und
fortwährend zur Erfindung neuer, rein musikalischer Züge gedrängt wird. Man kann von einer
Menge Compositionen, die hoch über den Alltagstand ihrer Zeit stehen, ohne Unrichtigkeit
sagen, daß sie einmal schön waren” (Hanslick 1854, 41).
This sentiment—expressed just as the *Formenlehren* of Marx, Lobe, and Richter were emerging—is a further sign of form’s reification at midcentury. Hanslick’s claim is notable, however, because it represents a *conscious awareness* of this trend. The result was a self-perpetuating cycle: as forms became increasingly standardized, theorists were able to codify them with greater precision; but as these schemas were widely disseminated, this led to an even more standardized compositional practice. And while Schenker accepted Hanslick’s premise, he rejected Hanslick’s conclusion:

> Each and every content that was fresh at one time was also endowed, self-evidently, with its own distinctive expressiveness. After this content has passed through the heads of many subsequent imitators and auditors, it degenerates into a familiar idiom, because one no longer needs to concentrate on its novelty or attend to it carefully. . . . In conjunction with these idioms, which seem to bring about a depreciation of expressive value, the precondition arises that content routinely loses expressiveness over time, and people become accustomed to saying, metaphorically, that contents expire and pass away. But I think differently. Each and every content retains the power which it had originally, and it is up to us to perceive this vitality anew.98 (Schenker [1895] 2007, 330; cited in Cook 2007, 48)

By valuing form over content, (derivative) compositions become lifeless, but by valuing content over form, compositions can never lose their expressive power. Yet there were good reasons why listeners could not recapture the vitality of the masterworks anew. Schenker faults Wagner for “the inexorable destruction of the musical ear”.99

---

98 “Ein jeder Inhalt, der in einer gewissen Zeit neu gewesen, war selbstverständlich mit einem eigenen Ausdruck begabt. Nachdem dieser Inhalt durch die Köpfe vieler Nacherfindenden und Nachempfndenden gegangen, verblasste er zu einer bekannten Redensart, weil man ihm weder eine neue Aufmerksamkeit, noch ein dauerndes Interesse mehr zu widmen brauchte. . . . Gegenüber solchen Redensarten nun, die scheinbar ein Sinken des Ausdruckswertes verursachen, regt sich das Vorurtheil, es gehe dem Inhalt mit der Zeit der Ausdruck von selbst ganz verloren, und man pflegt poetisch zu sagen, es sterben und vergehen die Inhalte. Ich aber denke anders. Es behält ein jeder Inhalt die Kraft, die er einst hatte, und es ist nur an uns, diese Kraft wieder neu zu fühlen” (Schenker 1895, 326).

Custom has done its part in making the offense almost indiscernible. We have learned to come to terms with the individual parts, and to give up the demands of tonality and unity; we have become so demoralized that, for the undoubtedly great enjoyment that this or that passage elicits on account of its indisputable beauty, we confer gratitude upon the whole work of art, despite the fact that our great masters were so generous as to give us works whose value resides not in an individual passage but in the whole. We have repeatedly grown accustomed to following the individual motives with the same instinct with which we would otherwise follow a banal operatic melody, while at the same time we show little interest in the less significant connective materials. Even in the Wagnerian sense it was always just the melody that captivated the ear of the layman; the rest fell victim to inattentiveness. There arose in this way an unhealthy, almost intermittent attentiveness, i.e. the opposite to that artistic listening that always took—and still takes—as given that our masterworks are complete organisms in themselves. In other words, in conceding Wagner his principle, we have lost the art of hearing continuously and artistically.\(^{100}\) (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 114; emphasis mine)

At the turn of the twentieth century, Schenker contends that the masterworks themselves have not diminished; rather, pace Hanslick, what has diminished is the ability of listeners to perceive the masterworks as organic wholes. Only by rejecting the formalist compositions of Berlioz, Liszt, Wagner, and their imitators can the musical ear—and musical culture—be restored.

It is in this context that Schenker launches his attacks against Anton Bruckner—one so-called imitator who combined Wagner’s style with symphonic conventions. Schenker thought that the consequences were severe: “Blinded by the success of Wagner’s music and driven to imitate him in the means with which he was able to conjure such a success, [composers] took so much trouble to get inside the sound of his music that, unfortunately, they thereby lost their powers of listening” (114). But there would be no compromise. “Niedergang” ends with an ultimatum: “Beethoven oder Wagner?”

§ 1.3.4. Bruckner and the Consequences

Two strains of intellectual vulgarity: defenselessness against content and defenselessness against form. . . . In which hell would the artist prefer to fry?

—Karl Kraus, *Heine und die Folgen* (1910)

As the nineteenth century drew to a close, an aesthetic debate raged: How should Bruckner’s symphonies be received? The Brahms partisans thought that Bruckner’s music was based on an errant Wagnerian style that aped symphonic conventions. For example, Hanslick writes the following in his review of the Eighth Symphony:

101 “Geblendet vom Erfolg der Wagnerischen Musik und bestrebt[,] die Mittel ihm nachzumachen, mit denen er einen solchen Erfolg hervorzukaubern gewusst hat, haben sie in seine Werke so hineinzuohren sich bemuht, dass sie leider auch ihre Ohren dariiber verloren haben” (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 212).

102 See Schenker ([1905–6] 2005a, 220). As Drabkin notes, this question was the original title of the “Niedergang” essay (129n100). Also, compare this title with “Rameau oder Beethoven,” in the third volume of *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik* (Schenker [1930] 1997, 1–9).

103 See Korstvedt (2004, 170–72) for a summary of this reception history.
I found this newest one, as I have found the other Bruckner symphonies, interesting in detail but strange as a whole and even repugnant. The nature of the work consists—to put it briefly—in applying Wagner’s dramatic style to the symphony. . . . [Thus, everything flows, without clarity and without order, willy-nilly into dismal longwindedness. . . . It is not out of the question that the future belongs to this muddled hangover style [traumverwirrten Katzenjammerstil]—which is no reason to regard the future with envy.104 (Hanslick [1896] 1950, 303–4)

Critics sympathetic to these views described Bruckner’s music as formless (formlos), a term which, as Benjamin Korstvedt (2004, 170) writes, “referred in part to matters—including novelties of harmony, syntax, and motivic work—that are not aspects of ‘form’ in the modern sense, as well as to Bruckner’s divergence from conventional *Formenlehre* paradigms.” By the turn of the century this sentiment had become so pervasive that Bruckner’s ardent supporters, such as Karl Grunsky (1908) and Max Kiel (1902), began to mount a defense. Kiel addressed the issue directly in “Ist Bruckner Formlos?” His answer was no: if Bruckner’s music seems formless, it is the listener’s fault. Meanwhile, some Wagnerians “felt that Bruckner’s symphonies were all too formal in their reliance on traditional symphonic models, both in their four-movement schemes and in the sonata form of individual movements” (Korstvedt 2004, 171). Rudolf Louis thought Bruckner was a “slave” to conventional form.105 Regarded as both incoherent and schematic, Bruckner’s synthesis of Wagnerian content with conventional forms appeased neither side—an artist’s hell indeed.

Schenker attacked Bruckner on both fronts, although he championed Hanslick’s cause in

---


105 “Bruckner oft geradezu sklavisch sich unter die konventionelle Form beugt” (Louis 1893, 103; quoted in Korstvedt 2004, 171).
particular, even reviewing many of the same works. Schenker, of course, had also studied
harmony and counterpoint with Bruckner at the Vienna Conservatory from 1887 to 1889
(Federhofer 1985, 5–6). Although critical of Bruckner’s music, Schenker remained fond of his
former teacher, as we learn in a letter written to Karl Grunsky in 1908:

For, you see, when I had Bruckner as a teacher at the Conservatory, I loved him
tremendously because of his genuine piety. It reminded me of the piety of my
own father who . . . was filled with genuine religiosity. I enjoyed nothing as much
about him as the strength of faith. Transplanted from the province into the horrid
big city, it was a relief for me to find such faith again in Bruckner—particularly in
a composer—full of wonderful effects. I felt it, gratefully, in light of the fate
granted me to see what strength of faith that follows the path of art, and thought of
the genuinely God-fearing Haydns, Bachs, Beethovens, etc.

And in an earlier letter, we learn that Schenker even admired aspects of Bruckner’s compositions:

I have always evaluated Bruckner’s themes more highly than all invention of all
other composers (that of a Brahms, Dvořák, Wolf excepted, of course), and so it
remains still today. The gap from Bruckner to the others is so great that they don’t
even deserve to be mentioned alongside of him.

---

106 Schenker’s reviews are reprinted in Federhofer (1990, 41–42, 57–61, 197–205).
107 “Denn, sehen Sie, als ich Bruckner am Conservatorium zum Lehrer hatte, liebte ich
ihn maßlos wegen seiner—echten Frömmigkeit, diese erinnerte mich an die Frömmigkeit meines
eigenen Vaters, der, trotzdem er Arzt war . . . u. nichts genoß ich an ihm so sehr, als die Kraft des
Glaubens. In die entsetzliche Großstadt aus der Provinz verpflanzt, war es mir eine Wohltat, bei
Bruckner—zumal einem Komponisten—den Glauben, voller wunderbarer Wirkungen, wieder
anzutreffen. Ich empfand es dankbar gegen das Schicksal, das mir vergönnt hat, zu sehen, welche
Kraft im Glauben steckt, die den Weg der Kunst geht, u. dachte an die echt gottesfürchtigen
Haydn’s, Bach’s, Beethoven’s, etc.” (incomplete letter draft from Schenker to Grunsky, undated,
ca. September 23–December 31, 1908; see Schenker Documents Online; transcr. Ian Bent and
correspondence/letter/oj_515_4_septdec_190.html; Internet; accessed December 12, 2015).
Schenker’s letter is located in the Jonas Collection (5/15).
108 “Bruckners Thematisches habe ich stets höher bewertet, als alle Erfindung aller übrigen
Komp. (natürlich die eines Brahms, Dvořák, Wolf ausgenommen), u. dabei bleibt es noch heute.
Die Distanz von Bruckner zu den anderen ist so groß, daß diese gar nicht erwähnt zu werden
verdienen neben ihm” (incomplete letter draft from Schenker to Grunsky, undated, ca. June 1,
1908; see Schenker Documents Online; transcr. Ian Bent and Lee Rothfarb, transl. Lee Rothfarb;
But in the same letter to Grunsky, Schenker criticizes Bruckner’s compositional practice:

Nevertheless, I still cannot call Bruckner a master, let alone see in him an advancement in any regard whatsoever. The reasons are of a purely technical nature and will find their place extensively in the third volume.¹⁰⁹

This third volume likely refers to the “Niedergang” typescript, where Bruckner’s technical deficiencies are blamed on his imitation of Wagner and his inability to synthesize the parts of a composition into an organic whole.¹¹⁰

Schenker ([1905–6] 2005a, 115) examines the opening of Bruckner’s Fifth Symphony to support these claims. This analysis is reconstructed in example 1.3.21. The first Gruppe comprises three Teile “without any connecting material between them” (115).¹¹¹ Measures 1–14 function as a prelude beginning on the tonic and ending on the dominant in the primary key of B-flat major. Measures 15–54 begin with a fanfare motive on a [k]VI Stufe in the primary key, modulate to the key of D minor with the entrance of new ideas in m. 31ff., and arrive on the dominant of D minor in m. 43. Measures 55–100 compose a two-part Gedanke (Vorder- and Nachsatz). This section effects another modulation, this time through E-flat major’s dominant in m. 91 (although the key of E-flat minor colors this dominant).

¹⁰⁹ “Gleichwohl muß ich Bruck. aus der Gruppe wirklicher Meister ausschließen, [illegible] nennen, bin also noch weniger in der Lage in ihm gar einen Fortschritt in irgendeiner Hinsicht erblicken. Die Gründe sind rein technischer Natur, u. werden ausführlich im III[.]” For the citation, see note 108 above.

¹¹⁰ As described on Schenker Documents Online regarding the three volumes of Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien, “Schenker envisioned II/1, II/2, and III all as a single volume entitled Kontrapunkt. Around 1907–9, Schenker planned a volume entitled Niedergang der Kompositionskunst . . . as vol. III, but that work was not published in Schenker's lifetime (Schenker Documents Online; available from http://www.schenkerdocumentsonline.org/profiles/work/entity-001723.html; Internet; accessed January 30, 2016).

**Example 1.3.21** Bruckner, Symphony no. 5 in B-flat Major, WAB 105/i, mm. 1–101ff. (based on the arrangement by August Stradal)

**Gruppe 1 (mm. 1–100)**

*Teil 1: Prelude*

B-flat major: I

*Teil 2: New motives*

Toward the key of D minor:

*Teil 3: Two-part Gedanke*

Return to the key of B-flat major/minor

*Modulationsparte*

E-flat major: V

*Gruppe 2 (m. 101ff.)*

In the key of F major/minor
Schenker is puzzled why the second group begins in F major/minor (m. 101ff.), especially given the preceding dominant of E-flat major. He is also puzzled why the first \textit{Gruppe} is structured in such a diffuse manner. He feels that the decisive modulation should have occurred in the third part’s consequent phrase (m. 79ff.), and that the second part should have better established the primary key. Given this recomposition, mm. 1–54 would function as a prelude leading to the theme proper in m. 55ff., with this theme’s \textit{Nachsatz} functioning as a \textit{Modulationspartie}. But in the symphony as Bruckner had composed it, Schenker claims there is no sense of progression through the first group, only succession:

[Bruckner’s] musical brain consisted, as it were, merely of peaks; and what he conceives as moves into valleys in order to give the listener the illusion of trekking over hill and dale is artistically so improbable that the only impression which remains is that of leaping from peak to peak. He lacks all technique for gaining a highpoint and leading down from it; the gradients have all been incorrectly measured, and nearly all of them are so steep that one is truly at a loss to comprehend how, short of a miracle, one can possibly reach the next peak.\footnote{“Sein musikalisches Gehirn bestand gleichsam nur aus Höhepunkten und was er an Thalzügen ersinnt, um dem Hörer eine Wanderung durch Gebrig und Thal vorzutäuschen, ist künstlerisch so unwahrscheinlich, dass der Eindruck doch nur der bleiben muss, als springe man von Gipfel zu Gipfel. Es fehlt ihm an jeglicher Technik zum Höhepunkt hinan und von ihm hinabzuführen, die Mensur der Abhänge ist allemal verfehlt, fast alle scheinen sie steil, so dass man förmlich verurteilt ist[,] wie durch Wunder zum nächsten gegenüberliegenden Gipfel zu gelangen” (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 215).}

Therefore, Bruckner’s music is formless: one idea follows the other without necessity, just as one key leads haphazardly to the next. Yet Schenker also argues that Bruckner’s music was too periodic, too regular—and this he ties directly to form’s reification in the nineteenth century.

\footnote{Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 117}
In a series of letters, Schenker leads Grunsky from Bruckner back to C. P. E. Bach through Riemann, Marx, Beethoven, Mozart, and Haydn.  

Although I gladly conceded . . . that isolated moments in Bruckner are grand and sublime, I am nonetheless not guilty of any contradiction if, despite all of that, I assert that Bruckner possessed only very minimal powers of invention. . . . First of all, the fact that Bruckner’s invention expressed itself purely in periodic stretches between which emptiness lay is linked to that deficiency in inventive talent. The moment of ecstasy granted him measures 8 through 12. Then our ecstasy began: what next?

Ecstasy upon ecstasy means—as in life, so too in the symphony—fragment upon fragment! . . . Accordingly[,] you see with him such as result, for example, the helplessness in momentum since individual impulses, and almost exclusively, and almost all proceed beginning on the ton[ic] . . . and almost all [begin] on the strong beat (see Harmonielehre and Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik, p. . . .). When Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven were creative there were no texts by Marx, Riemann, etc., on the market. If ever anyone had to follow only instinct, it was they. However, Bruckner stumbled on form, and tried in fullest consciousness—how often did he speak of it himself to the students!—to acquire and develop form, as he viewed it, of course (and he viewed it poorly, that is just

---

113 The following passage condenses Schenker’s argument spanning four letters sent to Grunsky beginning in June of 1908 and likely carrying into the fall (the date of the last letter has not been determined). Each new paragraph indicates an excerpt from a different letter, while each letter is cited with a separate footnote. All four letters are located in the Jonas Collection (5/15).

114 “Gab ich oben gerne zu, daß die einzelne Momente bei Br. groß, u. erhaben sind, so mache ich mich gleichwohl noch keines Widerspruches schuldig, wenn ich behaupte, daß Br. Trotz alledem nur eine sehr geringe Erfindungskraft besaß. . . . Mit diesem Mangel an Erfindungsgabe hängt er fürs Erste zusammen, daß sich Br.’s Erfindung bloß in periodischen Anfällen von Extase äußerte, zwischen denen ein Nichts lag. Der Moment der Extase bescherte ihm die Takte 8 bis 12; nun begann die Unsere: was weiter?” (incomplete letter draft from Schenker to Grunsky, undated, ca. June 1, 1908; see Schenker Documents Online; transcr. Ian Bent and Lee Rothfarb; available from http://mt.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/schenker/correspondence/letter/oj_515_y_72208.html; Internet; accessed December 13, 2015).

the thing!). With Bruckner, I think less instinct for form prevailed than with the aforementioned masters. . . .

[. . .] with him, art only serves the end of providing content laboriously and artificially instead of art being brought about, conversely, with the requirement of content, as with the masters. Expressed differently: with the latter, the flow of content brings with it all artificialities of the compositional technique (understood in the good and necessary sense), while with Bruckner the artificialities are there to produce content, and display this purpose just as naively [and] as radically as ecstasy displays its end in itself. . . . Take any work of Beethoven or Brahms. How difficult is it, often, to figure out the thematic relationships, even for the most musical ear! So concealed, so subconscious, so easy that we can often hear the main narrative without disturbance, without sensing whence it derives its material? With Bruckner, all tendencies lie too much on the surface. . . . Hopefully, you will see from these very fleeting hints that I have much to reproach Bruckner for with regard to technical backwardness, such as we certainly could by far no longer reproach C. P. E. Bach, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, etc. for similar backwardness.

116 “Als Haydn, Mozart u. Beeth. schufen, waren keine Lehrbücher von Marx, Riemann, etc. auf dem Markte; wenn je ein Mensch, so waren es sie, die blos dem Instinkt folgen hatten. Bruckner aber fand die Form vor, u. hatte mit vollstem Bewußtsein, wie oft sprach er doch selbst davon zu den Schülern! — die Form, freilich wie er sie sah (u. er sah sie schlecht, das ist es eben!) sich anzueignen u. fortzusetzen gesucht. Ich denke, bei Bruckner waltete weniger Instinkt zur Form, als bei den erstgenannten Meistern” (incomplete letter draft from Schenker to Grunsky, undated, ca. September 23–December 31, 1908; see Schenker Documents Online; transcr. Ian Bent and Lee Rothfarb, transl. Lee Rothfarb; available from http://mt.ccnmtl.columbia.edu/schenker/correspondence/letter/oj_515_4_septdec_190.html; Internet; accessed December 13, 2015).

To summarize: Schenker thought that Bruckner lacked sufficient powers of invention—namely, his forms were based on pre-existing molds instead of an improvisational impulse. These molds had become rigid, with each phrase (or section) beginning on both the tonic harmony and the strong (hyper)beat. Bruckner had reified form at the expense of organic content and necessary connection. And as for Grunsky, he agreed with Schenker’s assessment but reached very different conclusions. Bruckner’s approach to form provides “a clear logic . . . to orient us to the entry of new themes,” he composes just the right amount of transitional material, and his strong-beat entrances are necessary, for “[w]hoever is rich in harmony prefers strong beats in general.”118

What Schenker saw as Bruckner’s deficiencies, Grunsky saw as his strengths.

Yet Schenker’s critique is perhaps supported by Bruckner’s studies in model composition with Otto Kitzler, director of the Linz theater orchestra, from December 1861 to July 1863. Paul Hawkshaw (1998, 338–39, table 1) summarizes the contents of the Kitzler-Studienbuch, which includes over 300 pages of exercises scored for keyboard or string quartet.119 These exercises were largely based on Formenlehren by Lobe (1850–67, vols. 1–2) and Richter (1852), while Marx (1837–47, vol. 4) was used for studies in orchestration (353). Bruckner’s lessons began with cadences, modulations to closely related keys, and the composition of eight-measure Perioden

118 “1) inbezug auf die Form. Wenn die Setzung der bekannten Folge im Sonatensatz einen klaren Sinn hat, so kann es nur der sein: über den Eintritt neuer Themen, über den Ort der durchgeführten Themen, über die Wiederkehr + Rückkehr, zu orientieren. . . . Übergänge u. alles was das Gerippe als Fleisch gleichsam umkleidet—das ist ja, soweit notwendig da. . . . 2) Einsatz auf gute Takteile (wenigstens mit Vorliebe; Ausnahmen immerhin zahlreich!): ist ebenso ein gutes Zeichen für mich!” (letter from Grunsky to Schenker, dated September 10, 1908; see Schenker Documents Online; transcr. and transl. Lee Rothfarb; available from http://mt.ccmtl.columbia.edu/schenker_33/correspondence/letter/oj_1129_3_91008.html; Internet; accessed December 13, 2015). Grunsky’s letter is located in the Jonas Collection (11/29).
119 For another summary of Bruckner’s Kitzler-Studienbuch, see Grandjean (2001, 61–75).
(337–39)—all are characteristic of Richter’s (1852) treatise in particular. Two- and three-part song forms, irregular periods (periods of lengths other than eight measures), and periods expanded through repetition followed. But as Hawkshaw writes, “creating melodic relationships between periods [was not] . . . an object of the exercises.” Instead, the exercises were primarily concerned with each period’s length. (This accords with Schenker’s own conception of the period as a simple proposition-response paradigm that does not require any particular thematic relationship.)

Bruckner’s lessons with Kitzler eventually addressed larger forms, including scherzo-trio form, rondo form, and sonata form. The rondos were classified as either small, middle, or large (see table 1.3.3). These schemas do not easily map onto Marx’s classifications, although Hawkshaw finds parallels between the small rondo and Marx’s second rondo (cf. example 1.3.8, p. 24): Bruckner’s Themagruppe has the same function as Marx’s Hauptsatz, and Bruckner’s trio section has the same function as Marx’s Seitensatz. The middle and large rondos are perhaps more characteristic of Lobe (certainly Bruckner uses Lobe’s terminology).120 For example, Hawkshaw finds parallels between Bruckner’s large rondo and Lobe’s analysis of Beethoven’s String Quartet in F Major, op. 18, no. 1/iv (cf. example 1.3.19, p. 45). As the first Roman numeral under “large rondo form” in table 1.3.3 shows, Bruckner combines Lobe’s four opening Gruppen with Lobe’s erste Repetition. This includes a repetition of the Themagruppe, the Mittelsatzgruppe (which introduces new motives), and a Durchführungsgruppe (which develops original motives). The II. Repetition is similar to Lobe’s zweite Repetition; the III. Repetition is similar to Lobe’s Anhang.

Bruckner’s exercises in sonata form also betray Lobe’s influence. In this case, sonata form is divided into two large parts rather than Marx’s three. Moreover, in Bruckner’s exercises the

120 In 1863 Bruckner commented in a letter to Rudolf Weinwurm that he owned the first two volumes of Lobe’s Lehrbuch (1850–67); see Hawkshaw (1998, 353, n44).
**TABLE 1.3.3** Rondo forms in Bruckner’s *Studienbuch* (Hawkshaw 1998, 349–50, nn27–28, n32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Rondo Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[I.] <em>Themagruppe</em> (three-part song form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[II.] <em>Trio</em> (two- or three-part song form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[III.] <em>Repetition</em> (<em>Themagruppe</em> with variants), followed by an <em>Anhang</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle Rondo Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| [I.] *Themagruppe* (two- or three-part song form; one or two *Perioden*, etc.)
*Übergangsgruppe* (or *Periode*)
*Gesangsperiode* (or *Gruppe*; in the dominant key) |
| [II.] *Repetition* (*Themagruppe* in the tonic key)
*Übergangsgruppe* (*Zwischen-Periode* that remains in the tonic key)
*Gesangsgruppe* (in the tonic key) |
| [III.] *Themagruppe* (abbreviated), followed by an *Anhang* |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Rondo Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. *Themagruppe* (two- or three-part song form)
*Übergangsgruppe*
*Gesangsgruppe* (*Anhang*?)
*Schlußgruppe*
*Repetition* (*Themagruppe*)
*Neue Mittelsatzgruppe* (new motives)
*Durchführungsgruppe* (original motives) |
| 2. *Repetition* (*Themagruppe*, *Übergangsgruppe*, *Gesangsgruppe*, *Schlußgruppe*) |
| 3. *Repetition* (*Themagruppe*, *Anhang*) |

Expositions are usually divided into four sections, each labeled using Lobe’s terminology: *Themagruppe*–*Übergangsgruppe*–*Gesangsgruppe*–*Schlußgruppe* (351).\(^{121}\) Bruckner composed these sections in pairs: *Thema*– and *Übergangsgruppe* together with *Gesang*– and *Schlußgruppe* (338, table 1). He would later divide expositions into three sections (*Eingangsperiode*–*Gesangsperiode*–*Schlußperiode*), with little connecting material between them (Grandjean 2001, 75, ex. 13;)

---

\(^{121}\) For a comparison of sonata-form terminology in mid-nineteenth-century *Formenlehren*, see Grandjean (2001, 75, ex. 13).
Korstvedt 2004, 175–79). This change is reflected by Schenker’s own conception of the sonata-form exposition. We saw this in example 1.3.20 (p. 46), where he divides the exposition of Beethoven’s op. 109/ii into three parts (I. Themengruppe, II. Gedanke, and III. Gedanke).

“Bruckner was one of the first significant composers to learn classical forms from a textbook (or at least to admit it),” writes John Parkany (1989, 151). As Schenker would have it, Bruckner composed using dry schemas rather than the flight of an improvisatory imagination.\textsuperscript{122} Schenker likely based this conclusion on personal experience, describing how “Bruckner [had] stumbled on form, and tried in fullest consciousness—how often did he speak of it himself to the students!—to acquire and develop form.”\textsuperscript{123} Seen in this light, Schenker’s 1902 edition of keyboard sonatas by C. P. E. Bach is the single most damning critique of Bruckner’s music in existence—far more damning than Hanslick’s description of the Eighth Symphony as embodying a “muddled hangover style” (\textit{traumverwirrten Katzenjammerstil}). Schenker explains this covert attack a year later in \textit{Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik} (1903, rev. 1908): C. P. E. Bach’s free use of motives, his music’s improvisatory qualities, and the lack of any prescribed formal models all stand in tacit opposition to Bruckner and his contemporaries. By returning to Bach’s music—which, in Schenker’s view, lay at the origins of a sonata style later perfected by Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven (Petty 1995)—the errors of the nineteenth century might one day be corrected:

\textsuperscript{122} Of course, not everyone agreed with Schenker’s assessment. Other critics—especially Ernst Kurth (1925) and August Halm (1914)—saw Bruckner’s music as the paragon of dynamic form in motion. Kurth ([1920] 1968, 330–33) thought that the classicists (e.g., Brahms) were too schematic (\textit{Form als Umriss}), while he thought that the romantics (e.g., Wagner and Bruckner) embodied form as properly understood (\textit{Form als Kraft}, or \textit{Entwicklung, Steigerung, Übergang, Spannungsausladung}). Halm, on the other hand, saw in Bruckner’s music the emergence of a new musical culture that synthesized (and even transcended) Bach’s fugues and Beethoven’s sonatas (Halm 1913, 1914; Rothfarb 2009, 108–12).

\textsuperscript{123} See note 116 (p. 58) above for the original German.
For [in C. P. E. Bach’s music] we are dealing with an art and a technique that are hardly described or discussed at all, either in textbooks on composition or in the schools. I refer here to the way in which Bach’s themes and motives follow one another; when, how, and where they enter; how they are connected and separated, etc.; how Bach effects a synthesis of ideas. This synthesis may rightly be considered the deepest, indeed the ultimate mystery of musical composition.\(^{124}\) (Schenker [1903, rev. 1908] 1976, 15–16)

Yet Schenker’s emphasis on Bach’s free use of motives and forms in *Ornamentik* was also a covert attack on another leading musical figure at the turn of the twentieth century: Hugo Riemann.

§ 1.3.5. Riemann’s Motives (and Forms)

Schenker’s commentary in *Ornamentik* on C. P. E. Bach’s approach to form is concerned primarily with *Gruppenbildung* (group formation). *Gruppen* are large sections of a composition, much like a *Thema-* or *Gesangsgruppe* in Lobe’s first-movement form (example 1.3.18, p. 43) or Bruckner’s large rondo (table 1.3.3, p. 61). Tonality, rhythm, and dynamics all contribute to this technique. Regarding Bach’s treatment of rhythm, Schenker writes:

> The individual segments [*Teile*] of a group enter on different parts of the measure, sometimes on weak, sometimes on strong beats. . . . Thus, for *Bach*, each beat of a measure is equally suited for an entrance. . . . He pays no anxious theoretical respect to the strong beat of the measure, nor does he attempt to begin every idea on a strong beat. . . . Therefore he never suffers the embarrassment of having to fabricate rests because the succeeding phrase [*Gedanke*] could begin only about two or three eighth-notes later.\(^{125}\) (Schenker [1903, rev. 1908] 1976, 29; emphasis added to match the original)

\(^{124}\) “Äußern sie sich doch hauptsächlich in einer Kunst, in einer Technik, die auch in den offiziellen Lehrbüchern der Komposition, oder in den Schulen leider nur allzuwenig beschrieben oder besprochen wird; ich meine, in der Kunst, mit der Bach seine Themen und Motive aufeinander folgen, d.i. in der Art, wann wie und wo er sie eintreten läßt, wie er sie bindet und trennt u. dgl., kurz in der Kunst der Gedankensynthese, die füglich als das letzte und wohl auch das tiefste Geheimnis der musikalischen Komposition überhaupt bezeichnet werden darf” (Schenker [1903] rev. 1908, 3).

\(^{125}\) “Es besteht darin, daß die einzelnen Teile der Gruppe bald in den starken, bald in den schwachen, also in verschiedenen Takteilen einsetzen. . . . So sind bei Bach . . . alle
Bach’s fluid metrical placement of a group’s constituent parts is meant as a counterexample to Bruckner’s compositional practice. As Schenker wrote to Grunsky in a letter already quoted above, in Bruckner’s music, “almost all [impulses] proceed beginning on the ton[ic] . . . and almost all [begin] on the strong beat.”\textsuperscript{126} But this critique of rhythmic rigidity can also be applied to Riemann’s \textit{Formenlehre}, which is based on end-accented segments rather than Bruckner’s beginning-accented segments.

Schenker owned several of Riemann’s works that were published before \textit{Ornamentik} (1903), although it is difficult to determine precisely when they were obtained.\textsuperscript{127} Among the ca. 400 books listed in an auction catalog compiled after Schenker’s death were Riemann’s \textit{Katechismus der Kompositionslehre} (1889) and \textit{Große Kompositionslehre} (1902–3a).\textsuperscript{128} Curiously, two terms characteristic of Schenker’s early \textit{Formenlehre} appear in the \textit{Katechismus: Gruppenbildung}, which Riemann (1889, 1:11) used to describe the combination of \textit{Takt-Motive} into \textit{Gruppen}, and \textit{cyklische Form}, which Riemann (1889, 2:126) used to describe a multi-movement work, such as a Baroque dance suite or modern sonata. Schenker often used the latter term to describe sonata form in particular.

\textsuperscript{126} See note 115 (p. 57) above for the original German.
\textsuperscript{127} The date of publication for \textit{Ornamentik} is often given as 1904. This is an error; it was published in 1903 (Bent 2005, 75–81).
\textsuperscript{128} This catalog is reproduced in Eybl (1995, 161–92). We know that Schenker had read Riemann (1889) because he reacts against its analysis of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony in his own monograph on the symphony (Schenker 1912).
Today Riemann is known for his harmonic and metrical theories; his *Formenlehre* is less well known. In the *Katechismus der Kompositionslehre* (1889), Riemann begins with motives and their combination into higher-order structures. These motives have a prescribed rhythmic position in relation to the bar line, contrary to what Schenker finds in Bach’s works. In example 1.3.22(a), Riemann uses motives found in Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E-flat Major, op. 7/iv, to illustrate growth toward the bar line (see the crescendo markings), a point of emphasis (Schwerpunkt) immediately after the bar line, followed by the dissipation of energy (see the decrescendo markings). In example 1.3.22(b), Riemann describes this gesture as the *Urtypus aller Form* (12). And as example 1.3.22(c) shows, this motion from upbeat to downbeat extends beyond the measure to the *Gruppe* (which comprises two *Takt-Motive*), the *Halbsatz* (which comprises two *Gruppen*), and the *Satz* (which comprises two *Halbsätze*). (The asterisks in this example indicate the *Schwerpunkten* at the end of each unit.) Example 1.3.23, which appears in Riemann’s *Musikalische Dynamik und Agogik* (1884), suggests that *Gruppenbildung* extends beyond the two-measure unit—or even the eight-measure *Satz*—to units with as many as 32, 36, or 48 measures.

In the *Katechismus der Kompositionslehre*, Riemann is also concerned with motivic (or thematic) resemblances at each hierarchical level. For example, table 1.3.4 shows resemblances at the *Gruppe* level. Each *Gruppe* comprises two *Motive* (one light, the other heavy), which can

---

129 Riemann’s *Formenlehre*—which influenced later works such as Prout (1893), d’Indy (1912), Krehl (1902–3), and Leichtentritt (1911)—is summarized in Moyer (1969, 192–216). Also see Burnham (1995, 81–88) for a comparison of Marx’s work with Riemann’s. Burnham’s thesis claims, “If Marx’s work offers a temporal and dynamic representation of Beethoven’s music, the focus at the end of the nineteenth century was to shift to the idea of the work as a totality that could be conceptualized more profitably as a spatial entity. This emphasis is nowhere so apparent as in the theoretical and analytical work of Hugo Riemann” (81).

130 As in the *Formenlehren* of Lobe and Richter, Riemann considers the eight-measure *Satz* (or *Periode*) to be prototypical, although *Perioden* of other lengths are possible as well.
**EXAMPLE 1.3.22** Dynamic shading of the *Takt-Motiv* (Riemann 1889, 1:8, 12, 50)

(A) *Takt-Motive* in Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E-flat Major, op. 7/iv

(B) *Der Urtypus aller Form*

(C) The *Urtypus* at higher levels
**Example 1.3.23** Gruppenbildung (Riemann 1884, 8)

**Table 1.3.4** A taxonomy of Gruppentypen (Riemann 1889, 1:11, 14, 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gruppentypus</th>
<th>Schema</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A            | \(\begin{array}{c}
\text{a} \\
\text{(leicht)}
\end{array}\) | ![Example A](image) |
| B            | \(\begin{array}{c}
\text{a} \\
\text{b}
\end{array}\) | ![Example B](image) |
| C            | \(\begin{array}{c}
\text{a} \\
\text{b}
\end{array}\) | ![Example C](image) |

either be similar (\(a\sim a\); type A) or dissimilar (\(a\sim b\); type B).\(^{131}\) (Gruppentypus C is a version of type B, although the position of the first Motiv is shifted so that its Schwerpunkt occurs after the second bar line.) This approach is extended to the Halbsatz level in table 1.3.5. Halbsätze are classified according to their component Gruppentypen (e.g., AB, BB, or BA), while the numbered subtypes

\(^{131}\) Schenker rarely labels motives with lowercase letters, but instances can be found in his manuscript “Der Weg zum Gleichnis.” See appendix 1, examples A1.2.10 and A1.2.11, p. 381.
### Table 1.3.5: A taxonomy of Halbsatz-Typen (Riemann 1889, 1:17–22, 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Halbsatz-Typus</th>
<th>Schema</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB1</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="example1.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="example2.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB3</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="example3.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB1</td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="example4.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB2</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="example5.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB3</td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="example6.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB4</td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="example7.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB5</td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="example8.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA1</td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="example9.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA2</td>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="example10.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA3</td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="example11.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="example12.png" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 1.3.6** A taxonomy of *Satz-Typen* (Riemann 1889, 1:25–30, 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Satz-Typus</em></th>
<th>Schema</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ia</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Schema Ia" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Example Ia" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ib</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Schema Ib" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Example Ib" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ic</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Schema Ic" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Example Ic" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Id</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Schema Id" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Example Id" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ie</td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Schema Ie" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Example Ie" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Schema IIa" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Example IIa" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Schema IIb" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Example IIb" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.3.6 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satz-Typus</th>
<th>Schema</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIIa</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Schema IIIa" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Example IIIa" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIb</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Schema IIIb" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Example IIIb" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>No schema given; see example</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Example IV" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

help identify lower-level motivic resemblances (e.g., Halbsatz-Typus BB5 indicates that each motive is unique). Table 1.3.6 provides Riemann’s extensive taxonomy at the Satz level, where types are again divided into subtypes based on motivic resemblances.

Riemann also applied his metrical concepts to harmonic progression and its interaction with form. One such harmonic progression is shown in example 1.3.24(a): a development from tonic to dominant followed by a return. Example 1.3.24(b) suggests that this paradigm also models how key areas interact with form. The first Periode effects a motion from the tonic key (Haupttonart) to the dominant key; the second Periode answers this with a motion from the dominant key (colored as mixolydisch) to the tonic key.
EXAMPLE 1.3.24 Interaction between harmony and form (Riemann 1889, 71)

(A) Harmonic development and return

(B) Harmonic development (as key areas) across two *Perioden*

Given this penchant for creating taxonomies, Riemann provides additional examples of how harmony (or key) interacts with form, although these need not concern us here. Yet, as Schenker would have it, all of these exhaustive (and exhausting) taxonomies clearly indicate form’s reification by the end of the nineteenth century. Themes produced through *thematische Arbeit*—a term that Riemann uses in the last chapter of his *Große Kompositionslehre*, where he describes “the modern theme-concept, with its combination of a large number of different motives into a larger unified structure”¹³²—are like Nabokov’s butterflies: no longer living things, they have become dry specimens classified and labeled accordingly. The unique contents of each *Motiv, Gruppe, Halbsatz*, and *Satz* is reduced to an abstract label indicating mere similarity or difference. As a result, Riemann risks the same fate as Marx’s theory, whereby a dynamic process

¹³² “der moderne Themabegriff mit seiner Vereinigung einer größeren Anzahl verschiedener Motive zu einem größeren Einheitsgebilde” (Riemann 1902–3a, 2:414).
becomes a stock pattern. On the other hand, in Schenker’s conception of *Gruppenbildung*, motives coalesce into larger units through a unifying key (or a few *Stufen*), although he resisted abstract schemas in analyses of C. P. E. Bach’s keyboard sonatas in *Ora namentik* and Beethoven’s op. 95 string quartet in *Harmonielehre* (see § 2.5). Through these examples he meant to convey that fixed schemas were no match for the creativity and variety found in the masterworks.

Of course, Riemann was also familiar with Marx’s work, having edited Marx’s *Kompositionslehre* ([1837–47] 1887–90). Like Marx, Riemann (1889, 95) based his full-movement forms on a ternary design, which he described as *Hauptgedanke–Nebengedanke–Hauptgedanke* (A–B–A). (Riemann also maps a *schwer–leicht–schwer* metric scheme onto this schema, although one must assume an initial *leicht* to maintain a sense of *Auftaktigkeit.*) Table 1.3.7 summarizes these forms in the order of increasing complexity. Riemann usually referred to them only by their ordinal numbers, indicated here by Roman numerals. The first form is in three parts (A–B–A), in which each A section is an eight-measure *Hauptgedanke* (or *Periode*). The B section is of a relatively small scope (either four or eight measures) and does not count as an independent section. It is for this reason that Riemann likens the first form to the “so-called two-part [form].” With the second form (three-part song form) comes a more developed and independent B section that might embed a two-part form. The third form demonstrates how the ternary principle is fully recursive. Each large section in the A–B–A form embeds its own three-

---

133 See note 48 above (pp. 15–16).
134 In *Harmonielehre*, Schenker ([1906] 1954, 241) writes that a passage from Beethoven’s op. 95 will “reveal to us the connection between harmony and form on a higher level” (“der Zusammenhang von Harmonie und Form uns Resultate höherer Ordnung offenbaren”; Schenker 1906, 319). The phrase *höherer Ordnung—Sperdruck* and all—is another characteristic expression found throughout Riemann (1884, 1889).
135 This is the same edition of Marx’s *Formenlehre* that Schenker owned (Eybl 1995, 173).
136 “I. ist die sogenannte zweiteilige [Form]” (Riemann 1889, 97).
TABLE 1.3.7 A taxonomy of große Formen (Riemann 1889, 1:96–97, 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grote Form</th>
<th>Alternate Description</th>
<th>Schema</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>zweiteilige Form</td>
<td>A. Hauptgedanke (8 Takte)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>dreiteilige Liedform (oder kleine Rondoform)</td>
<td>A. Hauptabteil der Form I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>große Rondoform</td>
<td>A. Zwischenglied zur selbständigen Themengruppe ausgewachsen: III. Thema, eventuell mit ebenfalls ausgewachsenem Zwischenglied:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Sonatenform</td>
<td>A. Themengruppe:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) erstes Thema,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variationen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g., Beethoven’s op. 109/iι)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

part form (a–b–a). The fourth form, which Riemann likens to Sonatenform, has a three-part layout—although the Themengruppe has four parts similar to Lobe (cf. example 1.3.19, p. 45). Finally, while not a large form per se, Riemann demonstrates how a variation set based on a two-part Thema maintains the ternary principle by overlapping the theme with the beginning of the first variation (and so on for the variations that follow). This is also how Schenker describes rondo form; for example, the five-part rondo is derived by combining two three-part forms with an elision.

137 Notice that Schenker uses Riemann’s term Themengruppe in example 1.3.20 (p. 46) rather than Lobe’s term Themagruppe.
Ornamentik betrayed Schenker’s unease with Riemann’s theories (to put it mildly); and later, Schenker would directly challenge Riemann in print, including in his monograph on Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony (1912) and the explanatory editions of Beethoven’s late piano sonatas, op. 110 (1914) and op. 101 (1921). Despite its dynamic metrical qualities, Schenker found Riemann’s *Formenlehre* too rigid and schematic. It did not help that Riemann dedicated his *Kompositionslehre* to Brahms, either. In the midst of a tirade against Riemann, Schenker writes,

> I will, even before I refute Riemann’s theories more precisely in Book II of my *Counterpoint*, and only to the extent necessary for elucidation of the foregoing remarks, still more clearly illustrate Riemann’s relationship to our masters with reference to the essay published by Riemann himself in the program-book of the first German Brahms Festival in September 1909 under the title “Brahms and the Theory of Music.” The very title shows a thoroughly conceited Riemann: “the theory” here is naturally supposed to mean—Riemann. What Riemann relates, however, proves just the opposite, namely that Brahms wants absolutely nothing to do with the theory that means “Riemann,” and that it is thus only Riemann himself who sees everywhere in the theory again only Riemann.¹³８

Schenker charges that Riemann’s motives for the dedication were only self-serving; at first Brahms had refused it, although later he accepted.¹³⁹ But when Schenker launches a fierce attack such as this one, might he also be suffering from some anxiety of influence?

---


¹³⁹ Riemann later encountered Brahms in Hamburg. According to Schenker, Brahms was quite angry because Riemann “had made the attempt to explain and justify certain ‘unusual notes in Brahms’s music’ in regard to their nature and effect” (quoted in Schenker [1914] 2015, 2:13; “weil ich sowohl in dem Buche als auch um dieselbe Zeit in Zeitungsartikeln den Versuch
We return now to where our story began: Vienna at the turn of the century, including Schenker’s attempts to overthrow the prevailing musical order and restore German culture by returning to the masterworks and their inner laws given by Nature. Not Marx, but Beethoven. Not Riemann, but Brahms. Not form, but content. Yet Schenker was deeply indebted to the *Formenlehre* tradition that he had inherited—perhaps he protests too much.

§ 1.4. SCHENKER’S IMPASSE

Many philosophical traditions collide in Schenker’s early essay “Der Geist der musikalischen Technik” ([1895] 2007).140 William Pastille (1984) identifies anti-organicist tendencies. Allan Keiler (1989, 291) rejects Pastille’s interpretation and argues that the idea “Schenker moved gradually from anti-organicist to arch-organicist throughout the course of his writings” is an “utter absurdity.” Keiler locates Schenker’s early thought within the German idealist tradition—including Goethe, Kant, Hegel, and Schiller—and in opposition to Hanslick’s formalist aesthetics expressed in *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen* ([1854] 1986). But as Kevin Korsyn (1993, 86–87) observes, “German idealism in particular was resisted in Austria.” Korsyn (1993, 109–16) identifies the influence of other philosophers in 1890s Austria, including Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Wagner, and scientist and philosopher Ernst Mach (with whom Schenker corresponded). But in whatever context(s) we read “Geist,” its final section makes it clear that

---

140 For more on “Geist,” see Cook (2007, 63–88) and Morgan (2014, 41–59).
Schenker is wrestling with a question that would occupy him for decades to come: By what causal mechanism does music operate?

The “Geist” essay proposes an answer to this question by denying music has any internal logic or necessary connection, leading Schenker to conclude that music is inherently not organic:

As a matter of fact, no musical content is organic. It lacks any principle of causation, and a contrived melody never has a determination so resolute that it can say, “Only that particular melody, and none other, may follow me.” Indeed, it is part of the work of shaping content for the composer to obtain from his imagination a variety of similarities and contrasts, in order ultimately to select his best option. Because he has selected only one option, we cannot know what other materials were available for him to choose from (the rejected options can often be elicited from his studies and sketches), but only the one that was most agreeable to him personally.141 (Schenker [1895] 2007, 328; emphasis mine)

Music’s organic qualities are only “an illusory halo of rational logic” consciously created by a composer (328).142 As William Pastille (1984, 32) writes, this “guarantees the inorganic nature of music, since the musical artwork is shaped by the subjective will of an outside intelligence, and not by some natural, internal power.” Genuine organicism, according to Schenker, can exist only in exceptional cases; for example, when “a particular similarity has actually arisen organically in the imagination only inasmuch as the composer has not intended it” (330).143 Throughout “Geist,” Schenker draws on such marked oppositions: natural versus artificial, unconscious versus

---

141 “In der That ist kein musikalischer Inhalt organisch. Es fehlt ihm ein jeglicher Causalnexus, und niemals hat eine erfundene Melodie einen so bestimmten Willen, dass sie sagen kann, nur jene bestimmte Melodie darf mir folgen, eine andere nicht. Gehört es doch zu den Schmerzen des Inhaltsaufbaues, dass der Componist von seiner Phantasie sich mehrere Aehnlichkeiten und Contraste verschafft, um schliesslich die beste Wahl zu treffen. Durch die Wahl, die er so getroffen, erfährt man zwar nicht, was er sonst noch zur Auswahl vorräthig hatte (das Unterdrückte kann man oft aus seinen Studien und Skizzen erfahren), wohl aber, was ihm persönlich am besten gefiel” (Schenker 1895, 309).

142 “trügerisch der Schein einer gedanklichen Logik” (Schenker 1895, 297).

143 “vorausgesetzt, dass der Componist jene Aehnlichkeit nicht gewollt hat, ist sie in der Phantasie wirklich organisch entstanden” (Schenker 1895, 310).
conscious, content versus form, organic versus inorganic, and cause versus effect.\textsuperscript{144} For music to be an organic subject, it must have a logic all its own.

Perhaps it was due to the lack of a causal mechanism that Schenker found nineteenth-century Formenlehren so inadequate (notwithstanding, for example, Marx’s Ruhig–Bewegung–Ruhig paradigm, Lobe’s thematische Arbeit, or Riemann’s Auftaktigkeit). As Cook (2007, 65) writes, “Schenker’s problem is not then with music’s organic quality as such, but in seeing how it can be translated into terms of theory. In this sense, the impasse of the Geist essay is a specifically theoretical one.” Schenker’s Harmonielehre (1906) was a first attempt to solve this problem through the dual logic of motivic development and step-progression (Pastille 1984, 32)—although it is difficult to imagine how an entire sonata-form movement might be generated in this way.

Schenker had indeed reached an impasse: his early Formenlehre was a conformational approach still in search of a generative mechanism.\textsuperscript{145}

By the late 1910s Schenker had discovered a causal mechanism in the form of a melodically fluent line (Urlinie) propelled by the dynamics of consonance and dissonance realized via passing tones (or what he describes as “little causal motors” in an early draft of Der freie Satz; see appendix 3).\textsuperscript{146} Nicholas Cook writes:

\textsuperscript{144} See Korsyn (1993, 94, fig. 1) for a list of oppositions taken “[f]rom Schopenhauer’s account of genius . . . that structure[s] organicist discourse.”

\textsuperscript{145} Mark Evan Bonds (1991, 13-16) distinguishes between conformational and generative approaches to form. A conformational approach demonstrates how compositions exemplify an abstract schema. A generative approach demonstrates how an individual composition evolves as an ongoing process.

\textsuperscript{146} “Von elementarster Gewalt äußert sich in der horizontalen Richtung die Kausalität der fließenden Linie; sie ist es, die längst bei sich weiß [illegible], was da kommen wird, die Knotenpunkte der Linie verteilt, [illegible] die kleinen kausalen Motore der Durchgänge u. Vorhälte zu Leben u. Wirkung aufruft. Zu ihr, von der alles kommt, gehen schließlich auch alle Wirkungen ein” (OC 51/1382; see § A3.2). The term Vorhälte is best understood to mean
It is Schenker’s insistence on the strict matching of cause and effect, on demonstrating why things are—even must be—as they are and not otherwise, that is responsible for the impasse in the *Geist* essay. . . . His solution—what I see as the fundamental insight of his theory and the key conceptual leap in its development—was to turn musical causality through ninety degrees, so to speak, so that cause-effect relations flow not from one note to the next but rather from the background to the foreground. (Cook 2007, 70)

Cook calls the motion from background to foreground “axial causality.” This idea began to emerge in Schenker’s thought ca. 1917 in an early draft of *Der freie Satz*—namely, in a section titled “Von der musikalischen Kausalität—Rückblick u. Epilog” (appendix 3). A theory of musical causality was eventually realized through the *Urlinie* concept, which Schenker first described in his explanatory edition of Beethoven’s op. 101 (1921). Perhaps this explains why the “ideas toward a ‘new theory of form’” mentioned in a 1907 diary entry and the “Entwurf einer neuen Formenlehre,” promised in 1912, were never completed.147 For Schenker, any *Formenlehre* that does not reify form at the expense of organic content requires a theory of musical causality—and, until ca. 1917–21, he apparently lacked the prospects for such a theory. As Schenker would later write in *Der freie Satz*:

> All forms appear in the ultimate foreground; but all of them have their origin in, and derive from, the background. This is the innovational aspect of my explanation of forms, which is to follow in the next sections. Previously in this book I have repeatedly referred to form as the ultimate manifestation of that structural coherence which grows out of background, middleground, and foreground; but I here reiterate in order to stress the difference between this new theory and all previous theories of form. . . . It is precisely because I derive the forms from the background and middleground that I have the advantage of brevity in presentation. However briefly I express myself, I am happy to offer, at least in accented dissonances in general rather than suspensions alone (Schenker 1976, 54n4). See Siegel (1999) for the early history of *Der freie Satz*.

147 “Ideen zu einer ‘neuen Formenlehre’” (JC 1/6; see Bent 2005, 96).
this manner, the “Essay on a New Theory of Form” . . . which I have promised for decades.148 (Schenker [1935] 1979, 130)

Nonetheless, Schenker’s early Formenlehre, which had existed long before his conceptions of the Urlinie, the Ursatz, and the dynamic transformation of the background into the foreground (axial causality) were developed, would provide a foundation for this later approach.

CHAPTER 2
A GENERATIVE APPROACH TO FORM

§ 2.1. THE LAWS OF ART AND MUSIC’S ORIGINS

Schenker never offered a detailed exposition of his early *Formenlehre*; we must piece together ideas scattered throughout his early writings on our own instead. These writings include “Der Geist der musikalischen Technik” ([1895] 2007), an unpublished manuscript titled “Der Weg zum Gleichnis” (OC 83/2–43), *Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik* ([1903, rev. 1908] 1976), *Harmonielehre* ([1906] 1954), and an unpublished typescript titled “Über den Niedergang der Kompositions kunst” ([1905–6] 2005a). Although some of Schenker’s ideas may have changed during this time—e.g., his position on organicism (Pastille 1984)—a coherent approach to form still unites these writings: motivic development’s importance in “Geist” foreshadows the opening pages of *Harmonielehre*; sections of *Harmonielehre* and *Ornamentik* are allied through the concept of *Gruppenbildung*; sparse comments on two of Beethoven’s piano sonatas in *Ornamentik* likely derive from earlier analyses in “Gleichnis,” and so on. Given these echoes and allusions, Schenker’s early writings ca. 1895–1906 should be read together as a group, for a more unified *Formenlehre* existed during this time than has previously been acknowledged.

Schenker sought the basis for his early *Formenlehre* in music’s origins. For example, in the “Geist” essay, he describes how music developed from the simple, outward expression of humans’

---

1 See appendix 1 for a transcription of “Der Weg zum Gleichnis,” Petty (1995, 52–58) and Koslovsky (2010) for an introduction to *Ornamentik*, Wason (2008) for a history of *Harmonielehre* and its translation into English, and Drabkin (2005) for more on “Niedergang,” which was intended to supplement *Harmonielehre*. 
inner urges to the complexities of modern harmony and counterpoint. Schenker did not intend to write a history of music *per se*; instead, he identified music’s first principles manifest through melody, polyphony, harmony, and form. This reflects a larger trend in the second half of the nineteenth century: the search for origins in diverse disciplines such as music, language, and biology. As Alexander Rehding (2000, 346) writes, “What historical and systematic musicologists were looking for . . . was the origin of music identified as a first principle, the initial cause that made the historical progress of music possible in the first place.” However, Schenker sought more than a few generative principles; he promised to explain in future writings “the nature of harmonic and contrapuntal prescriptions almost solely in terms of their *psychological origins* and impulses” (324; emphasis mine). Music’s evolution is more than a history of technique; it is a history of human cognitive development—a history of mind (*Geist*).

Schenker later claimed that by tracing music’s historical development we become sensitive to laws (Gesetze): *Kunstgesetze*, *Urgesetze*, and *Gesetze der Tonkunst*. Schenker’s penchant for stipulating such laws may have owed something to his legal training at the University of Vienna (Alpern 2012, 9–15). In this context, Eduard Hanslick’s *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen* ([1854] 1986) was also influential (Cook 2007, 48–60). Hanslick suggested that the “philosophical foundations

---


3 “Dadurch, dass ich die Natur der harmonischen und contrapunctischen Gebote fast rein psychologisch aus ihrer Ursache und ihrem Bedürfniss erläutern werde” (Schenker 1895, 259). These future writings became the first two parts of Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien (Harmonielehre and Kontrapunkt respectively).

of music” should be found in “general laws” (1986, 34).

Kevin Korsyn (1988, 10) attributes Schenker’s laws to Kant’s influence, writing, “The most obvious affinity between Schenker and Kant was their pursuit of rules or laws through which perceptions can be understood.” To this we should also add Schenker’s faith in God, who guarantees the coherence of the cosmos (Cook 2007, 199–217; Alpern 2014; Reiter 2015). Schenker claimed that music’s laws, which are eternal and unchanging, constrain both artist and listener. Discovered by a few artistic geniuses, these laws are objective rather than subjective in nature. It is through these laws that Schenker sought the basis for his *Formenlehre*.

§ 2.2. THE MOTIVE’S AUTONOMY

In the opening paragraphs of “Geist,” Schenker ([1895] 2007) reveals music’s origins through a creation myth. This myth’s first four stages are shown in table 2.2.1 below. At stage 1,

---

5 “Die Erforschung der Natur jedes einzelnen musikalischen Elementes, seines Zusammenhanges mit einem bestimmten Eindruck [nur der Thatsache, nicht des letzten Grundes] endlich die Zurückführung dieser speziellen Beobachtungen auf allgemeine Gesetze: das wäre jene ‘philosophische Begründung der Musik,’ welche so viele Autoren ersehnen, ohne uns nebenbei mitzuteilen, was sie darunter eigentlich verstehen” (Hanslick 1854, 39; quoted in Cook 2007, 61).

6 Korsyn (1988, 11–12) also recognizes Goethe’s thought as an important source for Schenker’s “faith in the rule-governed nature of phenomena.” Also see Pastille (1990a).

7 In fact, Schenker thought of himself as a musical Moses, heralding the true laws of music for the first time (Snarrenberg 1997, 154).


humans vocalize in response to stimuli and, much like songbirds, to fulfill innate drives. These outbursts are likened to those “one sees nowadays in children and shepherds when they convert instinctive joy into instinctive exultation” (319). At stage 2, “the joy of singing must have become an end in itself, dissociating singing from its immediate stimuli and establishing it as an independent, specialized field”—or what Schenker calls “song for song’s sake” (319). At stage 3, the “formal principle of creation” is introduced: music evolves from the aimlessness of shepherd songs to a coherent expression of ideas (320). This coherence is illusory, however, since music imitates language for its coherence. In other words, music is able to “suggest convincingly the impression of self-contained thought” and “mimic accurately all of thought’s vicissitudes—its striving, its self-organization, its closure” (320). This self-contained thought is *texted vocal melody*.

---

10 “Wohl war das erste Singen ein plötzlicher spontaner Ausbruch einer aufgehäuften seelischen oder körperlichen Lust, ähnlich wie man heute Kinder oder Hirten ziellose Freude in zielloses Jauchzen tauchen hört” (Schenker 1895, 245).

11 “Doch bald musste die Freude am Sang selbst schon zur Triebfeder werden, den Sang von unmittelbar erregenden Ursachen loszulösen und ihn auf einen geläuterten, absoluten Cultus zu stellen. Das war der Sang um des Sanges willen” (Schenker 1895, 245).

12 “Es suchte da der Ton ein Abbild des Wortes und seines Tonfalls zu werden und vor Allem musste er lernen, analog nachzubilden, was dem Wort am eigentümlichsten ist, nämlich die Schaffung des Gedankens, der befriedigend abgeschlossen in sich ruht. Durch die Verbindung mit dem Wort lernte der Ton, auch alle Wechselfälle des Gedankens treu zu begleiten, das Aufstreben, das Sich-Gliedern und Schliessen, und durch die Gewohnheit von vielleicht vielen Jahrhunderten bildete sich endlich die musikalische Kunst ein, eine ähnliche Logik wie die Sprache von Haus aus zu besitzen” (Schenker 1895, 246).
Table 2.2.1 Four stages of development in the “Geist” essay (Schenker [1895] 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentience</td>
<td>Naïveté</td>
<td>Imitation of language</td>
<td>Freedom from language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocalizations in response to stimuli (e.g., the instinctive singing of children and shepherds)</td>
<td>Singing dissociated from its stimuli (“song for song’s sake”)</td>
<td>Imitation of language’s coherence ↓ Melody ↓ A false sense of musical coherence</td>
<td>Repetition and association ↓ Motive ↓ Form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 2.2.1. First Principles I: Repetition

At the fourth stage of development, music breaks free from language through repetition. Repetition is intrinsically musical and contrary to the teleological trajectories of language and narrative, but unlike language, “the musical motive is only a sign for itself” (Schenker 2007, 321). Kevin Korsyn (1993, 108) detects Hanslick’s influence here, citing a passage from Vom Musikalisch-Schönen:

The essential difference [between language and music] is that in speech the sound is only a sign, that is, a means to an end, which is entirely distinct from the means, while in music the sound is an object, i.e., it appears to us as an end in itself.14

(Hanslick [1854] 1986, 42; emphasis added to match the original)

---

13 “Ist das Wort eben nur ein Zeichen für Etwas . . . so ist das musikalische Motiv nur ein Zeichen für sich selbst oder, besser gesagt, Nichts mehr und Nichts weniger, als es selbst” (Schenker 1895, 257).

14 “Der wesentliche Grundunterscheid besteht aber darin, daß in der Sprache der Ton nur Mittel zum Zweck eines diesem Mittel ganz fremden Auszudrückenden ist, während in der Musik der Ton als Selbstzweck auftritt” (Hanslick 1854, 49). This passage brings to mind Hanslick’s famous dictum: “The content of music is tonally moving forms” (1986, 29; “Tönend bewegte Formen sind einzig und allein Inhalt und Gegenstand der Musik” [1854, 32]).
In the “Niedergang” typescript, Schenker concludes that “it is precisely the emancipation from the word, the cultivation of those formal-technical elements and the cultivation of the instrumental motive that underlie the historical development that culminates in those peaks that are represented by a Bach, a Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and so on” (2005a, 121; emphasis added). Yet these masters sometimes imitated music’s early reliance on language. For example, Schenker (1897) describes how, when listening to the music of J. S. Bach, we are still so replete with the plasticity of his motives and the speech-like quality of his musical diction that we are involuntarily reminded of everything in plastic form which our senses have ever perceived or which has impressed us in elevated human speech. Behind his plasticity we can see an entire world; in his musical diction we hear again the everyday language of people—question, answer, plea, importuning, persistence, moodiness, laughter, etc. (Schenker [1897] 1988, 135)

Or consider comments in Harmonielehre, where Schenker describes a passage from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A-flat Major, op. 110/iii (example 2.2.1). He argues that Beethoven’s arioso re-evokes, if only fleetingly, the memory of that primordial or natural phase of our art which preceded the discovery of the motif as [the] intrinsic association of ideas, limiting itself to the use, however meager in its yield, of extrinsic association through motion or word (dance or song). It is easy to understand, accordingly, why music, on such occasions, assumes a rhetorical, declamatory character, with verbal associations lurking ghostlike behind the tones. (Schenker [1906] 1954, 14)


16 “und so voll sind wir noch heute, beim Anhören eines Bach’schen Stückes, der Plastik seiner Motive und Sprachähnlichkeit seiner Tonfälle, daß wir unwillkürlich dabei denken an Alles, was plastisch unseren Sinnen je entgegentrat, oder in der gehobenen Rede der Menschen je Eindruck auf uns machte. Hinter seiner Plastik können wir eine ganze Welt—sehen, in seinen Tonfällen die gemeine Sprache der Menschen—wieder hören, Frage, Antwort, Bitte, Drängen, Beharren, Laune, Lachen u.s.w.” (Federhofer 1990, 216; trans. Schenker 1988, 135).

17 “Wenn auch nur vorübergehend, erinnert die Musik in solchen Situationen an jenen Ur- und Naturzustand unserer Kunst, in welchem das interne Assoziationsprinzip des Motivs noch nicht entdeckt und nur durch Bewegungs- und Wortassoziationen (Tanz und Lied) notdürftig ersetzt war. Es erklärt sich daher von selbst, warum gerade bei solchen Gelegenheiten...
While language still haunts music even after the rise of the instrumental motive, Schenker makes a startling claim: music without motivic repetition—music that has not transcended the illusory coherence of language—is hardly music at all.\(^{18}\) Therefore, “Music became art in the real sense of this word only with the discovery of the motif and its use” (Schenker 1954, 4).\(^{19}\)

\(^{18}\) Due to its lack of repetition, Schenker (1954, 3) writes, “Greek music never was real art” (“daß ebensowenig je die griechische Musik schon wirklich Kunst gewesen” [1906, 3]).

\(^{19}\) “Erst mit der Entdeckung und Einführung des Motivs ist die Musik wirkliche Kunst geworden” (Schenker 1906, 4).
§ 2.2.2. First Principles II: Association and Abbreviation

Similar to the “Geist” essay, Schenker’s Harmonielehre begins with motivic development. This might seem odd at first, for we typically expect a harmony treatise to begin with the overtone series, the generation of fundamental chords, or the construction of scales. But Schenker is not concerned with tonal materials per se; rather, he is concerned with the psychological principles that underlie their realization. These principles first emerge through the motive. Moreover, motives not only give rise to more complex forms (as in many nineteenth-century Formenlehren)—they give rise to the tonal system.

Schenker (1954, 3) claims that artistic creation—including poetry, sculpture, and painting—begins by imitating Nature. Music is unique because it does not imitate Nature, although it does imitate itself: “The motif thus substitutes for the ageless and powerful associations of ideas from patterns in Nature” (4). The motive is defined as a “recurring series of tones,” but a psychological constraint is added: a motive “can be recognized as such only where its repetition follows immediately” (4–5). Yet motivic repetition is

20 As Kevin Korsyn (1993, 117) writes, “If we take Schenker’s appeals to psychology seriously, his Harmonie, for example, becomes quite a different book.”

21 “Das Motiv ist solcherart berufen, der Musik das zu ersetzen, was den anderen Künsten zum Segen geworden, nämlich die ewige und gewaltige Ideenassoziations der Natur” (Schenker 1906, 4).

22 “Motiv ist eine Tonreihe, die zur Wiederholung gelangt. Jede Reihe von Tönen kann Motiv werden, jedoch ist sie als solches erst dann anzuerkennen, wenn die Wiederholung unmittelbar folgt” (Schenker 1906, 4; emphasis added to match the Sperrdruck [widely spaced type] in the original). This constraint is Gestalt psychology’s law of proximity. See Gjerdingen (2002, 967–69) for more on Gestalt psychology’s influence at the turn of the twentieth century. Ernst Mach’s (1903) work on melodic perception interests Gjerdingen in particular. Mach began his appointment at the University of Vienna in 1895 (Johnston 1972, 182). Kevin Korsyn (1993, 109–16) suggests that Mach may have shaped Schenker’s early work in particular, even writing an encouraging postcard in 1896 (Federhofer 1985, 14–15). First, Korsyn (110; emphasis mine) describes how Mach “envisioned a psycho-physics which would analyze the psychological bases
subject to an additional constraint: the law of abbreviation. This law limits a motive’s life to a few fateful moments (*Schicksalswendungen*; 13). As such, Schenker likens a motive to a hero in a play:

> The motif is led through various situations. At one time, its melodic character is tested; at another time, a harmonic peculiarity must prove its valor in unaccustomed surroundings; a third time, again, the motif is subjected to some rhythmic change: in other words, the motif lives through its fate, like a personage in a drama.²³ (Schenker [1906] 1954, 13)

Not all possible motivic variants are essential in a work, just as a playwright omits the main characters’ mundane daily activities (e.g., eating lunch, sleeping). Therefore, the life of a hero and the life of a motive are both “quantitatively reduced and stylized” (13).²⁴

Schenker’s conception of motivic development *qua* drama has its origins in Wagner’s aesthetic writings. In his famous “Beethoven” essay, Wagner links music’s inability to represent ideas found in Nature with the motive as a dramatic character subject to stylized abbreviation:

> Seeing that Music does not portray the Ideas inherent in the world’s phenomena, but is itself an Idea of the World, and a comprehensive one, it naturally includes the Drama in itself; as Drama, again, expresses the only world’s-Idea proportionate (*adäquat*) to Music. . . . As a drama does not depict human characters, but lets them display their immediate selves, so a piece of music gives us in its motives the character of all the world’s appearances according to their inmost essence (*Ansich*).²⁵ (Wagner [1870] 1896, 106)


²⁴ “Freilich sind diese Schicksale im Drama wie in der Musik durch das Abbreviationsgesetz sozusagen quantitativ reduziert und stilistisch gestutzt” (Schenker 1906, 20).

²⁵ “Die Musik, welche nicht die in den Erscheinungen der Welt enthaltenen Ideen darstellt, dagegen selbst eine, und zwar eine umfassende Idee der Welt ist, schließt das Drama ganz of experience, organized according to the principle of the association of ideas.” Second, Korsyn (115) suggests that “Mach might have urged Schenker to view music in Darwinian terms,” or in the terms of the biological forces and procreative urges (described below).
Wagner describes how two motives in Beethoven’s *Coriolan* Overture represent “the defiant Coriolanus in conflict with his inmost voice.” By tracing these motives, “we shall at like time be following the course of a drama whose own peculiar method of expression embraces all that held our interest, the complex plot and clash of minor characters, in the acted work of the playwright” (Wagner [1870] 1896, 108). At this point Schenker breaks with Wagner and sides with Hanslick: he claims that the musical drama unfolds only in the realm of tones—tones that are imbued with biological forces. Schenker describes these forces using the following analogy:

In Nature: procreative urge → repetition → individual kind; 
In music, analogously: procreative urge → repetition → individual motif. (Schenker [1906] 1954, 6–7)

Through repetition, abbreviation, and association, the drama of motivic development is born into existence. Our ability to make associations does not require exact repetition, for we are able to comprehend a variety of related motives:

The musical image [*musikalische Gleichnis*, or resemblance] created by repetition need not be, in all cases, a painstakingly exact reproduction of the original series of tones. Even freer forms of repetition and imitation, including manifold little contrasts, will not cancel the magical effects of association. (Schenker [1906] 1954, 7)
The phrase *musikalische Gleichnis* in the above quotation is telling: it alludes to Schenker’s earlier, unpublished manuscript “Der Weg zum Gleichnis” (see appendix 1). In “Gleichnis,” we learn that motivic resemblance is based on a model-copy paradigm. Although such resemblances are often melodic in nature, they might also occur with respect to rhythm, harmony, or counterpoint.\textsuperscript{29} Example 2.2.2 presents Schenker’s analysis of motives in the D-minor prelude from J. S. Bach’s *The Well-Tempered Clavier*, book I. Notice how the descending triads are grouped together, cutting across the triplet rhythms. The opening of Brahms’s Rhapsody in G Minor, op. 79, no. 2, is shown in example 2.2.3. Here an ascending four-note motive is transposed up by step. The model-copy paradigm is clear in both examples, including the prescription that a motive be repeated immediately.

The *misalignment* of melodic grouping and metrical structure is one way to engender synthesis (*Synthese*)—or unity through variety. Schenker (2005a, 53) describes synthesis as “the connectedness of form” (*die Gebundenheit der Form, ihre Synthese*).\textsuperscript{30} A composer’s goal is “to find a selection of motives and to bind these together,” adding that “to bring variety to the statements of individual themes, the masters liked to let their motives proceed from weak beats.”\textsuperscript{31}


\textsuperscript{30} See Korsyn (1988, 19–43) for more on *Synthese* and its roots in Kant’s philosophy.

\textsuperscript{31} “Folgt die Notwendigkeit zu abbrevieren und zu stilisieren schon aus der Natur des begrenzten menschlichen Schaffens überhaupt[?], so kann dieses künstlerische Geschäft, eben eine Auslese von Motiven zu treffen und diese zu binden, doch nur als Synthese verstanden
example of this phenomenon occurs in Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i (example 2.2.4). A similar example appears in Harmonielehre ([1906] 1954, ex. 3; example 2.2.5), where the rhythmic aspects of this motive are further emphasized (see the iambic gestures bracketed across the bar lines). In Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik, Schenker (1976, 30) describes how this motive appears throughout the movement, although the iambic rhythm is broken off in mm. 43–45 (see example 2.2.6)—namely, the iambic motive across the bar line (mm. 39–42; labeled \( a \)) eventually becomes a trochaic motive contained within the measure (mm. 43–44; labeled \( b \)).\(^3\) Yet these motivic parallelisms are imbued with biological force; or, as Schenker writes in Ornamentik, “Every [motivic] entry strives to sustain itself as long as possible, as though it were an organic being endowed with an instinct for self-preservation” (30).\(^3\)

\(^3\) All annotations in example 2.2.6 are my own.

\(^3\) “Als wäre er gar ein organisches, mit einem Selbsterhaltungstrieb begabtes Wesen, strebt ein jeder Einsatz danach, seine Art, so lange es nur geht, zu erhalten” (Schenker 1908, 12).
EXAMPLE 2.2.4 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i, mm. 1–4 (OC 83/12)

EXAMPLE 2.2.5 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i, mm. 1–4 (Schenker 1906, 7, ex. 3)

EXAMPLE 2.2.6 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i, mm. 39–50
The change coincides with the G₅–F♯₅ motive in the upper voice (m. 43). And going beyond Schenker’s analytical observations, the trochaic motive in mm. 43–44 gives way to yet another rhythmic variant in mm. 47–50 (labeled c). Unlike motive a, this iambic motive is contained within the measure, foreshadowing the melody’s new rhythm in m. 55ff. (see example 2.2.10 below). Finally, in example 2.2.7, Schenker traces the original iambic motive a throughout op. 90’s second movement. This motive bridges a formal boundary between mm. 31 and 32—an example of linkage technique (Knüpftechnik).³⁴

The motives identified in op. 90 are likely clear to many listeners, but Schenker cautions that other motives may be concealed so that even experienced listeners might be unable to detect them.³⁵ For example, he uncovers a hidden motivic repetition in op. 90/i by comparing the bass voice in mm. 55 and 67 (see examples 2.2.8 and 2.2.9 respectively).³⁶ This comparison illustrates how motives can define larger formal units. For now, I use the neutral term “formal unit” to avoid ascribing a particular formal function—while a motive creates a higher-order complex, I do not yet define that complex’s formal function.

Example 2.2.10 reconstructs the analysis implied by comparing mm. 55 and 67. The downbeat of m. 55 is a point of arrival as the fortissimo V⁹ chord in mm. 53–54 (not shown) gives way to the local B-minor tonic. This moment coincides with a piano dynamic and a change in texture, in which broken sixteenth notes accompany a melodic figure descending two octaves

³⁶ Schenker refers to m. 54 in “Gleichnis,” but this is an error; the example shows m. 55.
**Example 2.2.7** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/ii, mm. 28–35 (Schenker 1906, 7, ex. 4)

![Example 2.2.7 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/ii, mm. 28–35 (Schenker 1906, 7, ex. 4)](image)

**Example 2.2.8** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i, mm. 55–56 (OC 83/15)

![Example 2.2.8 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i, mm. 55–56 (OC 83/15)](image)

**Example 2.2.9** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i, mm. 67–68 (OC 83/15)

![Example 2.2.9 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i, mm. 67–68 (OC 83/15)](image)
EXAMPLE 2.2.10 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i, mm. 55–81
through open fifths and fourths (F♯–B♭–F♯–B♭–F♯). The G–F♯ step in mm. 55 and 59, which recalls m. 1, embellishes this descending melodic figure. Meanwhile, the downward-pointing beams in the bass highlight the ascending B♭–C♯–D♭ motives in mm. 55, 56, and 57. This bass motive is repeated in m. 58, although it continues past D♭ up to F♯ by beat 3 of m. 59. Here the ascending bass motive and descending melodic figure converge on F♯, with the expansive registral space in m. 55 compressed into a single octave. (This entire process begins anew in m. 61ff.)

Schenker’s comparison of mm. 55 and 67 suggests how motives can define larger formal units through a process of self-completion. Measures 55–60 compose a formal unit comprising four iterations of the bass motive; mm. 61–66 compose a varied repetition. Both units project a B-minor Stufe: the scalar motive in the bass ascends from B♭ to its upper third (D♭), and then from B♭ to its upper fifth (F♯). Schenker’s comparison also reveals how the bass motive is compressed into a single measure in m. 67, where it resounds in stark octaves. This shortened form of the motive is repeated in m. 71, followed by echoes of the melody’s G–F♯ motive in the upper voice.

In Ornamentik, Schenker (1976, 30) discusses the metrical placement of motives in Beethoven’s op. 90/i and op. 106/i. Perhaps he is drawing on previous work in the “Gleichnis” manuscript, since therein, after analyzing op. 90/i, he turns to op. 106/i (examples 2.2.11–15). Schenker identifies an iambic rhythmic motive in op. 106’s opening measures (example 2.2.11). This motive is developed in mm. 38–40 and 47–48 (see examples 2.2.12 and 2.2.13 respectively). In example 2.2.14, the original iambic motive (labeled a) and a trochaic motive (labeled b) are combined into a larger complex (labeled c). In example 2.2.15, the trochaic motive b emerges.

---

37 Grouping mm. 55–60 and 61–66 together is based on the ascending stepwise bass motive, but these units also overlap in m. 61 by virtue of the bass’s cadential motion F♯–B♭ (mm. 66–67 repeat this motion). Some editions of op. 90/i even include a B♭ eighth note on the downbeat of m. 61, which would resolve the melody’s A♯ in m. 60.
**EXAMPLE 2.2.11** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 1–3 (OC 83/16)

**EXAMPLE 2.2.12** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 38–40 (OC 83/19)

**EXAMPLE 2.2.13** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 47–48 (OC 83/19)

**EXAMPLE 2.2.14** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 1–2 (OC 83/19)

**EXAMPLE 2.2.15** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 17–19 (OC 83/19)
Schenker (1976, 30) hints at this rhythmic shift from iambic to trochaic, writing, “In bars 16–17 of Op. 106, one type of entrance is overcome for the sake of another that follows.”38

These motivic analyses are all quite traditional. Motives adhere to a model-copy paradigm, while variants are related based on melody, rhythm, or their combination. In the next section, I show how new motives requires new harmonies (or new Stufen). As a result, Schenker’s traditional approach to motivic analysis and his innovative concept of the Stufe converge to create form at a higher level.

§ 2.3. FROM MOTIVE TO TONAL SYSTEM: J. S. BACH’S FUGUE IN D MINOR

Motivic development is the impetus for Schenker’s early generative theory; indeed, the generation of the tonal system depends on it. In Harmonielehre, Schenker writes,

Thus the motif constitutes the only and unique germ cell of music as an art. Its discovery had been difficult indeed. No less difficult, however, proved to be the solution of a second problem, viz., the creation of a tonal system within which motivic association, once discovered, could expand and express itself. Basically, the two experiments are mutually dependent: any exploration of the function of the motif would, at the same time, advance the development of the tonal system, and, vice versa, any further development of the system would result in new openings for motivic association.39 (Schenker [1906] 1954, 20)

38 “In der oben zitierten Sonate von Beethoven, op. 90, sind es die Takte 43 bis 45, in der Sonate op. 106 die Takte 16 bis 17, in denen der eine Einsatz zu Gunsten eines nächsten andern niedergerungen wird” (Schenker 1908, 12). I have altered the original English translation: the word niedergerungen, with its Nietzschean overtones, is translated as “overcome” rather than “interrupted.”

39 “Ebenso schwierig als die Entdeckung des Motivs, des einzigen originalen Keimes der Musik, gestaltete sich die Schaffung des Systems der Töne, innerhalb dessen das endlich entdeckte assoziative Treiben der Motive nunmehr zum Ausdruck kommen konnte. Im Grunde liefen die Experimente parallel: lernte man die Wege des Motivs erforschen, so arbeitete man zugleich am System, und umgekehrt, da man das System baute, ergaben sich neue Resultate und Wege auch für das Motivische” (Schenker 1906, 32).
As motives seek further development, new harmonic possibilities are required. But harmony has another purpose: it provides a means to *unify* that content.\(^{40}\) As Schenker writes, “It is the mission of harmony to enhance the planning of ample melodic ideas and, at the same time, to co-ordinate them” (169).\(^{41}\)

The triad (particularly the major triad) serves as a motivic matrix. Example 2.3.1 shows this three-stage process: First, the major triad is derived from a fundamental and its first four overtones (26). Second, these tones are abbreviated to fall within an octave (28). Third, this close-position triad (transposed here to A-flat major) is realized as a melody. By deriving the major triad from the Nature-given overtone series, Schenker privileges it within his theory. Conversely, since the minor triad cannot be derived from the overtone series, it is considered a product of the artist; it is artificial (49–50; *künstlich*). The artist invents the minor triad due to the necessities of motivic development. Schenker writes, “Only melodic, i.e., motivic, reasons could have induced the artist to create, artificially, the minor triad as the foundation of the system; and in my opinion it was merely the contrast to the major triad that incited him to fashion his melos accordingly” (50).\(^{42}\)

Just as the primary triads (I, IV, and V) in the major mode have the same major quality, the primary triads in the minor mode should also have the same minor quality. The major (Ionian) and minor (Aeolian) modes are privileged for this reason. The qualities of the primary triads for the other diatonic modes are not uniform; therefore, “such irregular configurations of the I, V,

---

\(^{40}\) See Carl Schachter’s ([1995] 1999c) conception of the triad as both place and action.

\(^{41}\) “Wie denn überhaupt der Geist des Harmonischen im letzten Grunde vielleicht nur dazu berufen ist, weite melodische Entwürfe planvoll entstehen zu machen und sie zugleich zu ordnen” (Schenker 1906, 214).

\(^{42}\) “Es können nur melodische, d.i. motivische Gründe dafür maßgebend gewesen sein, den Molldreiklang überhaupt als die erste Grundlage des Systems künstlich zu kreieren, und meines Erachtens ist es eben bloß die Gegensätzlichkeit zum Durdreiklang allein, die den Künstler gereizt hat, das Melos danach zu formen” (Schenker 1906, 64–65).
EXAMPLE 2.3.1 The motivic matrix realized in Haydn’s Piano Sonata in A-flat Major, Hob. XVI:46/i, mm. 1–3 (Schenker 1906, 39, 41, 46, exx. 20, 22, 25)

1. Overtone series

and IV steps are most inappropriate for the [carrying out of] motivic intentions” (55–56).43

Schenker claims that the fugue “has been historically the touchstone of . . . [such] motivic-harmonic experiments” (56).44 For example, in J. S. Bach’s D-minor fugue, from book I of The Well-Tempered Clavier, the subject begins on the first scale degree (see example 2.3.2). Yet, “The subject, thus put down, is possessed of an inherent urge toward the dominant to complete its nearest and strongest stage of development” (50).45 (Perhaps this is due to the implied Phrygian half cadence on the downbeat of m. 3.) Schenker proposes a transposed answer that begins on

43 “Nun wird es aber nach dem bereits im § 23 Gesagten klar sein, daß sich so ungleichmäßige Konfigurationen der ersten, fünften und vierten Stufe für die Durchführung motivischer Absichten gar nicht eignen, jedenfalls zu weit unnaturlicheren Resultaten führen müssen, als es der Stil überhaupt gestatten kann” (Schenker 1906, 71–72).

44 “So würde es in der Fuge, die meiner Auffassung nach historisch der Brennpunkt und Probierstein dieser motivisch-harmonischen Experimente gewesen, zweifellos zur Verletzung der Natürlichkeit führen” (Schenker 1906, 72).

45 “Wenn J. S. Bach das Fugenthema [example 2.3.2 shown here] setzt, so hat er, da ihn der Trieb der Entwicklung zur Oberquint als zu dessen erstem und stärkstem Stadium emporführt” (Schenker 1906, 65).
EXAMPLE 2.3.2 J. S. Bach, Fugue no. 6 in D Minor, *The Well-Tempered Clavier*, book I, BWV 851, mm. 1–3 (Schenker 1906, 65, ex. 46)

![Musical notation](image)

the fifth degree (see example 2.3.3); it is in the major mode for reasons that are not clear (50).

This hypothetical answer proves unsatisfactory; Schenker much prefers Bach’s minor-mode answer instead (see example 2.3.4). He claims that Bach rejected the major-mode answer for two reasons. First, Bach’s minor-mode answer is more “natural” and therefore has privileged status. This may seem counterintuitive, since the major triad and the major mode are both derived from Nature, but Schenker likely has an analogy in mind: just as all three primary triads in the major mode are uniform in their major quality, it is most “natural” when all three primary triads in the minor mode are uniform in their minor quality. This uniformity allows for the exact replication of motives under transposition. Thus, the answer in example 2.3.3 is not suitable.

Second, Schenker argues that a major-mode answer is more appropriate in the fugue’s development rather than its exposition (50). Bach recognized this, too:

> [He] sensed that both processes [the major- and minor-mode versions of the answer] had different effects; he recognized clearly which of the two was more natural, and he preferred to conform to Nature by keeping the exposition of his fugue clear of elements which would find their place more appropriately in a later phase. Thus the exposition remained exposition, the development was what it should have been: each part was in its right place and carried its right meaning. Thus the fugue attained its functional structure and its own style.46 (Schenker [1906] 1954, 50–51)

46 “Jedenfalls empfand er einen Unterschied zwischen beiden Wirkungen, hatte ein klares Gefühl darüber, welche von beiden die natürlichere ist, und so konnte er mit Hilfe der Naturlichkeit die Exposition der Fuge von Elementen freihalten, die besser ihren Platz im späteren Stadium der Fuge haben. Exposition blieb eben Exposition, Durchführung war eben das,
EXAMPLE 2.3.3 Hypothetical major-mode answer (Schenker 1906, 65, ex. 47)

EXAMPLE 2.3.4 J. S. Bach, Fugue no. 6 in D Minor, *The Well-Tempered Clavier*, book I, BWV 851, mm. 3–5

While the major-mode answer is not appropriate in the fugue’s exposition, it would be appropriate in the development. These observations all suggest that *m motivic-harmonic relationships have form-functional implications.*

This conclusion is supported by further analysis of Bach’s fugue. Example 2.3.5 shows the subject (voice 1) in m. 1, the answer (voice 2) in m. 3, and the subject’s return (voice 3) in m. 6. The subject’s entry in m. 8 (voice 1) is altered, creating a leap of a fourth (rather than a step) across the bar line into m. 9. (A more literal version of this entry would transpose all of m. 9 a third lower, or all of m. 8 a third higher after the downbeat.) In mm. 11–12, a fragmented form of the subject is elided with the preceding sixteenth notes (voice 3); in m. 13ff., a major-mode answer (voice 1) with C♯ is introduced. Other versions of the subject and answer occur in later measures, which only heighten the major-minor conflict, including the conflict between F♯ and F in versions of the subject and conflict between C♯ and C♯ in versions of the answer. This modal conflict within forms of the answer (voice 3) begins in mm. 17–18, where C♯₃ is replaced by C♯₃.

was sie sein sollte, alles und jedes an seinem Platze in seiner rechten Bedeutung: so erlangte die Fuge ihre zweckgemäße Durchbildung—ihren Stil” (Schenker 1906, 65–66).
EXAMPLE 2.3.5 J. S. Bach, Fugue no. 6 in D Minor, *The Well-Tempered Clavier*, book I, BWV 851, mm. 1–30
Another form of the answer enters in stretto (m. 18ff.), which reverses this course, replacing C♯₄ with C₄. Yet another answer enters in m. 21, but here only C♯₃ is present. Indeed, C♯ wins out, with the dominant Stufe (now major) preparing for the recapitulation in m. 28.⁴⁷

Since motivic-harmonic relationships have form-functional implications, this modal conflict would be out of place in the exposition, although it is appropriate in the fugue’s development (Durchführung). This creates a heightened sense of tension, and with that tension, the expectation for resolution to the tonic and the subject’s return. Yet the major-minor conflict is not resolved; it also infiltrates the recapitulation (see example 2.3.6). The subject’s (voice 3) F♯₃ in m. 39 is replaced by F♯₄ in m. 40, while in mm. 40–41, the subject’s (voice 2) F♯₄ is replaced by F♯₄. (This is parallel to the answer’s entries in mm. 17–18.) Furthermore, F♯ is replaced by F♯ in the fugue’s final measures (a Picardy third): as A major prevailed over A minor in the measures leading to the recapitulation in m. 28, D major prevails over D minor at the fugue’s end. This is all in keeping with Schenker’s arguments in Harmonielehre: the major-minor conflicts are reserved for the development (and recapitulation), and the “artificial” minor mode is restored to the “natural” major.

For another example of how motivic development directly affects harmony in this fugue, consider the Neapolitan chord in m. 9 (see example 2.3.5). The subject-entry (voice 1) in m. 8 begins on E♯₄ in the key of D minor, E♯ is replaced by E♯ in m. 9, and as a result, the quality of the II chord in m. 9 is major rather than diminished. This alteration is made due to motivic considerations: the perfect fourth from B♯₄ up to E♯₃ in m. 9 corresponds to the subject’s perfect fourth from F♯₄ up to B♯₃ in m. 2. The hypothetical answer in example 2.3.7 is based on what

⁴⁷ Placing the tonic return in m. 28 rather than m. 25 follows Schenker’s analysis in Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, fig. 156). Note that the subject returns in its original form in m. 28.
Schenker calls “the diminished triad of the Phrygian dominant (56–57).” He hears this answer as unfolding a diminished triad on D Phrygian’s fifth degree (A–C–Es), which he describes as a “Procrustean bed”: a motive expressing this diminished harmony “would be altogether insufferable” (56). On the other hand, the Neapolitan triad affords motivic replication on the supertonic Stufe in the minor mode because it avoids this situation. And, as Schenker writes, “the motif is not always happy at the thought of possibly finding itself in the position of a diminished triad” (110).
We have seen how new motives require new harmonies (a centrifugal force), yet harmony binds motives together (a centripetal force). Regarding this dynamic process, Schenker writes,

To the extent that the harmonic concept uses as its interpreter the motif, which, as we saw earlier, constitutes the primal part of content—to this extent harmony and content become one. . . . Thus each harmony is not merely asserted but unfolded and demonstrated in this unfolding; as content and harmony join each other, the feeling for the scale-step awakes in us. . . . If we follow the phases of this process, two things become clear: Gradually we understand the form of a composition, and, vice versa, it is this form that reveals and stresses the psychology of the step progression.51 (Schenker [1906] 1954, 212)

It is with this feeling for the Stufe—now awakened—that we turn to the Stufengang, cadences, and form on a higher level.

§ 2.4. FROM STUFE TO PERIODE

To understand Schenker’s early Formenlehre, we must cast aside our modern definitions of music theory’s most basic concepts. Schenker never explicitly defined many of his ideas—and in practice, he applied them flexibly. Often we must infer their meaning based on fragmentary analyses, while resisting the urge to fill in the gaps with preconceived notions or more familiar

motivischen Bedürfnissen,—nur daß es diesmal Bedürfnisse der II. Stufe, die ja die zweite Oberquint ist, . . . Ich sagte schon, daß dem Motiv nicht immer die Lage eines verminderten Dreiklangs erwünscht ist” (Schenker 1906, 144).

51 “In dem Maße nun aber, als der harmonische Begriff zu seinem Dolmetsch eben das Motiv benützt, das ja den primärsten Teil des Inhaltes bildet, verwachsen Harmonie und Inhalt derart, daß von nun ab nur ein. . . . Es wird solchermaßen eine jegliche Harmonie nicht bloß behauptet, sondern auch auskomponiert und dadurch erst erwiesen); wie denn eben aus diesem Bunde des Inhaltes und der Harmonie zugleich auch das Gefühl der Stufe (vgl. § 76ff.) in uns erblüht. . . . Verfolgen wir die Phasen dieses Bundes weiter, so wird uns, wenn auch schrittweise, sowohl die Form des Stückes klar, wie umgekehrt mit aus dem Grunde der Form nun auch die Psychologie des Stufenganges ihre wesentliche Bedeutung erst so recht nachdrücklich erweist” (Schenker 1906, 282).
concepts belonging to Schenker’s later work.\textsuperscript{52} That he failed to define even basic concepts is ironic, however, since he was starting from first principles, building his new \textit{Formenlehre} from the ground up. But in many cases, he merely reproduced earlier approaches. He was “against” the nineteenth-century \textit{Formenlehre} tradition in two senses: he wanted to discredit it, of course, but he was also unable to break through that tradition and create something new.\textsuperscript{53}

That Schenker built his approach from the ground up should come as no surprise. He was obsessed with music’s origins, first causes, and eternal laws. This was true in the “Geist” essay, where he chronicled music’s development from the instinctive singing of early humans to modern-day harmony and counterpoint. And it was true in \textit{Harmonielehre}, where Schenker’s obsession with origins manifests through digressions on ancient Greek music (§ 1); the Bach family tree (§ 10; see example 2.4.1);\textsuperscript{54} the music of “primitive peoples” (§ 25); and harmony’s first unfoldings through melody in folksong and plainchant (§ 76). Yet \textit{Harmonielehre} tells another story—that of an individual composer. In Schenker’s treatise, as the tonal materials are generated from simple to complex, a \textit{Künstler} persona is led from naïveté to mastery, which is attained largely through improvisation. Generative theory is thus conflated with music history; or, to put this in the terms of nineteenth-century evolutionary biology, ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{52} For an example of the latter, see the introduction and footnotes added by Oswald Jonas to the English translation of \textit{Harmonielehre} (Schenker [1906] 1954).

\textsuperscript{53} Perhaps this is why Schenker (1912, vii) never published his long-promised “Entwurf einer neuen Formenlehre.”

\textsuperscript{54} This example is used to explain tones derived from the overtone series through a “sequence and simultaneity of generations” (Schenker 1954, 23; “Was wir hier [example 2.4.1] sehen, ist ohne Zweifel nebst dem Nacheinander der Zeugung und Fortpflanzung auch ein Nebeneinander der Generationen” [1906, 36]).

\textsuperscript{55} See Gould (1977).
§ 2.4.1. The *Stufe*: Beethoven’s *Diabelli* Variations, op. 120, variation 15

*Stufen* are not individual chords; they are idealized scale-steps (often chordal roots) that together function as an imaginary *cantus firmus* below the bass voice.\(^{56}\) Example 2.4.2 illustrates: in strict counterpoint, the perpetual cycle of consonance and dissonance heard in relation to a *cantus firmus* is analogous to free composition, in which free voice leading is heard in relation to imaginary *Stufen* below the bass.\(^{57}\) These imaginary *Stufen*—which, I emphasize, are chordal roots

\(^{56}\) Schenker belongs to a long tradition of nineteenth-century Viennese fundamental-bass theorists that extends into the twentieth century, including Simon Sechter (1853–54), Anton Bruckner (1950), Rudolf Louis and Ludwig Thuille (1907), and Arnold Schoenberg (1911, 1954). For an introduction to Viennese fundamental-bass theory, see Wason (1985).

\(^{57}\) Although this example was not included in the English-language edition of *Harmonielehre*, it may still be familiar to some; it appears in Jonas ([1934] 1982, 57).
EXAMPLE 2.4.2 The Stufengang as an imaginary cantus firmus (Schenker 1906, 204)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strenger Satz</th>
<th>Freier Satz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kontrapunkt:</td>
<td>Kontrapunkt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantus firmus:</td>
<td>freie Stimmführung</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

but not chords (except when they are!)—serve important functions: they bind voice-leading spans (or motives) together through a common (imaginary) pedal point, and they distinguish these spans from one another. At the same time, the continuous flow of voice leading is contrary to the premise of any Formenlehre—namely, grouping music into discrete units.

In example 2.4.3, Schenker (1906, ex. 164) identifies the Stufen underlying variation 15 from Beethoven’s Diabelli Variations, op. 120. I have revised the original example in Harmonielehre, providing pedal points beneath the bass voice rather than Roman numerals alone: this is what Schenker’s Roman-numeral notation truly asks us to hear. These imaginary pedal points subdivide mm. 1–16 into four four-measure groups, with each group based on an individual Stufe.\(^{58}\) A short-short-long rhythmic motive (labeled \(a\)) carries across the bar lines in mm. 1–8. At the next higher level of form, mm. 1–4 are bound together by the tonic Stufe (motive \(A\)), which comprises a descending leap followed by a repeated \(G_4\) (i.e., motive \(A\) comprises four iterations of motive \(a\)).\(^{59}\) Motive \(A\) is repeated in mm. 5–8 but altered to

\(^{58}\) The fourth group (mm. 13–16) is an exception; although based on the subdominant Stufe, there is a return to the tonic in m. 16. By definition, a cadential segment will always contain at least two Stufen.

\(^{59}\) This is an example of durational rhythm (the \(a\) motives) interacting with tonal rhythm of the scale steps comprising the Stufengang; see Schachter ([1976] 1999a).
EXAMPLE 2.4.3 Beethoven, *Diabelli* Variations, op. 120, variation 15, mm. 1–16 (based on Schenker 1906, 206, ex. 164)

**EXAMPLE 2.4.3** Beethoven, *Diabelli* Variations, op. 120, variation 15, mm. 1–16 (based on Schenker 1906, 206, ex. 164)

Accommodate the dominant *Stufe* (see A'). A I\(^7\) harmony occurs in mm. 9–12 (motive B). This analysis is remarkable: every chord from beat 2 of m. 8 to beat 1 of m. 12 is heard over a C pedal, yet the note C does not sound in any voice. Schenker ([1906] 1954, 161) observes that the melody begins on E\(_4\) in m. 8 and ends on G\(_4\) in m. 12, outlining a third belonging to the I\(^7\) harmony. (This E\(_4\)–G\(_4\) third may also be heard in relation to the G\(_2\)–E\(_2\) third in the bass, creating a chromaticized voice exchange.) A change in surface rhythm coincides with a new harmony as
rhythmic motive $a$ (short-short-long) gives way to rhythmic motive $b$ (long-long). Additionally, the repeated $G_4$ in motive $a$ is transformed into a half step in motive $b$—that is, the upper voice in motive $b$ features ascending half steps, while the bass voice features descending half steps.

Example 2.4.3 illustrates how *Stufen* unify surface motives to create higher-order formal units while differentiating those units from one another. The smallest rhythmic motives ($a$ and $b$) are combined into four-measure groups through a single *Stufe*. These four-measure groups are then combined at yet a higher level to create an entire *Stufengang*: I–V–I$^7$–IV–I. Moreover, the pronounced change in surface rhythm at the I$^7$ in m. 8 supports the thesis introduced in § 2.3: harmonic-motivic development has form-functional implications. A change in harmony signals a change in motivic design (and *vice versa*).

§ 2.4.2. The *Taktgruppe*: Beethoven’s Symphony no. 9 in D Minor, op. 125/i, and Piano Trio in G Major, op. 1, no. 2/ii; W. A. Mozart’s Symphony no. 39 in E-flat Major, K. 543/i

In addition to *Stufen*, Schenker grouped measures according to their larger hypermetrical context. Perhaps this approach betrays Anton Bruckner’s influence. Bruckner, through his studies with Otto Kitzler (1861–63), composed according to a fixed number of measures. For example,

---

Both motives share the same weak-strong accentual pattern across the bar line. Furthermore, the motivic-harmonic grouping in this example does not coincide with the notated meter. Instead, all groups—both at the rhythmic motives’ lower level and at the four-measure groups’ higher level—are heard against the notated meter. Schenker apparently prefers examples that exhibit a mismatch between metrical structure and grouping structure at local levels (cf. examples 2.2.2–3, 2.2.5–7, and 2.2.11–13, p. 91ff.). However, in some examples shown below, he conflates hypermeter (rather than meter) with grouping, causing these parameters to be in phase with each other at levels beyond the measure, including the *Periode* (often eight measures). (The distinctions between meter, hypermeter, and grouping were not as clear in Schenker’s early thought as presented here. See Lerdahl and Jackendoff [1983, 12–35] for an introduction to meter versus grouping.)
he divided a *zweiteilige Liedform* into *Perioden* of equal lengths (8 + 8) and a *dreiteilige Liedform* into *Perioden* of unequal lengths (8 + 10 + 8). This compositional approach may have inspired the metrical numbers that appear in Bruckner’s autographs from ca. 1876 onward. On the other hand, Timothy Jackson (1990, 103–4) suggests that it was Bruckner’s earlier studies with Simon Sechter (1856–61) that inspired the metrical numbers in his compositions and revisions. Jackson describes Bruckner’s metrical numbers as follows: “They generally appear beneath the lowest musical staff to represent the number of measures within component phrases of from two to thirty-four measures” (102). That Bruckner aligns these numbers with phrases suggests they are as much an aspect of form (or grouping) as they are an aspect of (hyper)meter. This supports Jackson’s hypothesis that one of the metrical numbers’ most important functions “is to pinpoint the ‘downbeat,’ i.e., first, accented measure of the individual phrase” (102). Often this downbeat is where the melody enters. In other words, the beginning of a melodic group is assumed to be hypermetrically strong. Yet Bruckner is also concerned with the metrical placement of important cadences—namely, that cadences should also occur on strong (odd-numbered) measures (Grandjean 2001, 85–98). These preferences for strong melodic beginnings and strong cadential endings often conflict with each other.

Bruckner’s analysis of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony is an excellent example of these principles at work. Example 2.4.4 shows Bruckner’s metrical numbers for the first 87 measures of the symphony’s first movement. Two features stand out: the prevalence of eight-measure

---

62 Jackson (1990, 103) suggests that Bruckner’s interest in Sechter “may have been reinsified in 1876, when Bruckner began teaching at the University of Vienna.” See Grandjean (2001, 43–60) for how Sechter’s approach to rhythm and meter may have influenced Bruckner.
63 This analysis, discussed in Grandjean (2001, 82–93), likely dates from ca. 1876–78.
EXAMPLE 2.4.4 Bruckner’s (hyper)metrical analysis of Beethoven’s Symphony no. 9 in D Minor, op. 128/i, mm. 1–87 (based on Grandjean 2001, 90, ex. 17)
Perioden and the layers of (hyper)metrical numbers, which give some measures as many as three interpretations (e.g., see mm. 73–74). For example, Bruckner begins a new eight-measure group in m. 3, which overlaps with the initial six-measure group. The odd (strong) measures in the first group map onto odd measures in the second, and even (weak) measures map onto even.

(Bruckner begins a new group in m. 3 due to the entrance of the main motive, distinguishing the motive’s entrance from the two introductory measures.) A similar overlap occurs in m. 17, where the main motive enters in a fortissimo orchestral tutti two measures before the preceding group reaches its conclusion (notice that Bruckner still maintains the integrity of the eight-measure Periode where possible). Wolfgang Grandjean (2011, 90) suggests that the new group beginning in m. 63 signals the onset of the transition section (Überleitung), while the group beginning in m. 80 signals the onset of the second theme (Seitenthema). If so, Bruckner is adjusting his metrics to reflect the form so that each new section (group) is beginning-accented.

Bruckner may have introduced Schenker to these ideas at the Vienna Conservatory, where Schenker was Bruckner’s student from 1887 to 1889 (Federhofer 1985, 5–6). In the “Niedergang” typescript, Schenker is particularly interested in how strong and weak measures combine into higher-level groups (what he calls Taktgruppen), writing.

Within a synthesis there arises, in an entirely natural way, the grouping of bars, i.e. their ordering and arrangement in stressed and unstressed or, if you prefer, strong and weak bars. The basic form of the ordering of bars is again two- or three-part, seldom five-part. Composite forms are based on simpler ones. The same applies to the individual beats within the bar itself. (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 53)

---

64 I show the beginning of such overlaps with bold metric numbers enclosed by a box.
65 Schenker (1912, 2) hears this exposition differently: Einleitung (mm. 1–16), subdivided into 4 + 4 + 4 + 4; I. Gedanke (mm. 17–70), subdivided into Vorder- (mm. 17–35) and Nachsatz (mm. 35–70); Modulationspartie (mm. 71–79); and II. Gedanke (m. 80ff.).
66 *Innerhalb einer Synthese entsteht auf ganz natürlichem Wege die Gebundenheit der Takte, das heisst ihre Ordnung und Zusammensetzung aus betonten und unbetonten Takten.*
This is hypermeter, even if Schenker does not use the term: as beats are heard as strong or weak within a measure, individual measures are heard as strong or weak within a Taktgruppe (hypermeasure). However, this approach, like Bruckner’s, conflates grouping and (hyper)meter.\textsuperscript{67} Arguably this is not hypermeter alone; it is an approach based largely on the initiation of melodic motives.\textsuperscript{68}

Schenker uses the scherzo from Beethoven’s Piano Trio in G Major, op. 1, no. 2, to illustrate these ideas (see example 2.4.5). He focuses on the piano part:

Bars 9–12 are initially intended to represent a parallelism to bars 5–8, with the same four-bar ordering retained. Meanwhile, Beethoven uses the last bar (bar 12), verily in opposition to the tendency of parallelism, as the starting point of a new motivic phenomenon, thus making it the head of a new grouping of bars. The repeat of the latter, in bars 14–15, shows that the motive (bars 12–13) has a two-bar organization. From bar 12, then, the ordering is as follows: 12 + 13, 14 + 15. Thus we have a reinterpretation of what was originally a weak twelfth bar as a strong first bar of the new grouping.\textsuperscript{69} (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 54)

In example 2.4.5, Schenker’s Taktgruppen are indicated below each system; motives are indicated above the piano part with solid-line brackets. (The three wavy-line, open-ended brackets in
EXAMPLE 2.4.5 Beethoven, Piano Trio in G Major, op. 1, no. 2/ii, mm. 1–16

mm. 1–4 indicate other instances of the motive that Schenker does not discuss.) Measures 5–8 are parallel to mm. 9–12, with m. 12 heard as a “weak twelfth bar” (indicated by counting 1 through 12). This hearing assumes—parallel to mm. 5 and 9—that m. 1 is metrically strong (odd).

However, signals in the music counteract this hearing, including the long G₂ in the cello (m. 2ff.) and the half notes in m. 4 (E₄ in the violin, C₄ in the piano). An alternative interpretation,

---

70 Lerdahl and Jackendoff’s (1983, 84) metrical preference rule (MPR) 5a states, “a metrical structure in which a relatively strong beat occurs at the inception of . . . a relatively long
shown above the two systems in example 2.4.5, would hear mm. 2 and 4 as strong, with the
cello’s motive in m. 1 and the violin and piano’s motives in m. 3 as anacrases—but this hearing
would set the hypermeter against the melodic grouping.

Like Bruckner, Schenker usually prefers to hear hypermeter and grouping in phase at
levels beyond the measure (earlier we saw that the same is not true of meter and motives at the
level of the measure).71 Rothstein (1995, 173) calls this “the rule of congruence, meaning congruence
between the rhythmic grouping of a melody and its metrical organization.” Schenker’s description
of the hypermetric reinterpretation in m. 12 (example 2.4.5) makes this clear when he writes,
“Beethoven uses the last bar (bar 12) . . . as the starting point of a new appearance of the motive,
thus making it the head of a new motivic phenomenon.”72 These measures would presumably
combine to create a four-measure group parallel to mm. 5–8 and mm. 9–12, although it is unclear
whether the cadence in m. 16 would also be included. Regarding this analysis, Schenker writes,

Music has, in fact, among other things the property that the end-point of one
theme can be elevated to become the starting point of the next, without
prejudicing other possibilities of continuing the content. And when, in a weak
beat, the cadence of one theme and the start of the second converge, then it often
occurs that the starting bar must, precisely for the sake of the second subject, be
perceived as strong, i.e. as the beginning of a new metric ordering.73 (Schenker

pitch-event” is preferred. In Schenker’s hypermetric analysis, the durational accents in mm. 2 and
4, which are syncopated against the prevailing hypermeter, foreshadow the reinterpretation 12 =
1 (m. 12). See Temperley (2008) for more on gradual hypermetric shifts.

71 Rothstein (2011, 98) writes, “German metrical hearing, with its tendency to perceive
phrases and metrical units as congruent, will suggest that a four-cycle be counted ‘1–2–3–4’ (first
beat strong), corresponding to the metrical theories of Gottfried Weber, Moritz Hauptmann,
Anton Bruckner, and Heinrich Schenker.” See Rothstein (2008) for more on German metrical
hearing (as opposed to Franco-Italian metrical hearing).


73 “Die Musik hat nämlich unter anderem die Eigenschaft, dass der Endpunkt eines
Gedankens zu einem Anfangspunkt des nächsten erhoben werden kann, unbeschadet anderer
Möglichkeiten[,] den Inhalt fortzuführen. Wenn nun in einem schwachen Takt die Kadenz des
A melodic beginning determines the onset of a Taktgruppe, while an in-phase relationship between hypermeter and grouping is assumed. Phrase endings are an afterthought.

An analysis of Mozart’s Symphony no. 39 in E-flat Major, K. 543/i, illustrates how Taktgruppen create form at higher levels (see example 2.4.6). In fact, Taktgruppen are only one level of form within a larger hierarchy extending from motives, to Perioden, to Gedankengruppen (themes in a sonata exposition). Schenker describes this passage in the “Niedergang” typescript:

And [we may consider] a similar metric within a larger group of themes. Take for example the first group of themes from Mozart’s Symphony in E, K. 543. The group consists of three sections. The first section alone (bars 1–28) is two-part, that is, it is made up of an antecedent and consequent, each part of which comprises 14 bars resulting from the relationship $8 + 6$. The middle section (bars 29–35), with forte character, contains 7 bars; [. . .] the third and last section (bars 36–45) is again two-part, this time with a relationship of $5 + 5$ bars. The result is, first of all, the impression of three-part construction for the entire group which offers the ear a more irrational ordering than two-part construction, even if it is also less complicated. Secondly, the six-bar group following an eight-bar group in the first section represents a second irregularity. Thirdly, the seven-bar length of the middle section is certainly an irrational situation; and finally we have the two five-bar constructions of the last section, which are again far from being simple structures.

(Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 54)
**EXAMPLE 2.4.6** W. A. Mozart, Symphony no. 39 in E-flat Major, K. 543/i, mm. 26–72 (string parts only; renumbered as mm. 1–47)

**Gedankengruppe (mm. 1–45)**

**erste Teil (mm. 1–28)**

**Vordersatz (mm. 1–14)**

**Vordersatz (mm. 1–14)**

**Takte: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 2 3 4 5 6**

**Nachsatz (mm. 15–28)**

**mitgliederte Teil (mm. 29–35)**

**letzte Teil (mm. 36–45)**

**Takte: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 1 2**
The entire Gedankengruppe comprises three contrasting parts: mm. 1–28, 29–35, and 36–45. The first part is subdivided into a Vordersatz (mm. 1–14), ending with a half cadence, and a Nachsatz (mm. 15–28), ending with a perfect authentic cadence (with the latter cadence resolving to tonic harmony in m. 29). (Because Schenker never mentions these cadences, they are shown with question marks in example 2.4.6.76) The authentic cadence overlaps with the beginning of the mit[t]lere Teil (m. 29ff.), although Schenker’s grouping does not recognize this. Strangely, the Nachsatz (mm. 15–28) does not include the final tonic Stufe that completes its own Stufengang. This suggests that grouping (qua melodic structure) is weighted more heavily than cadential articulation, which is also true of previous Formenlehren by nineteenth-century theorists, such as Marx (1837–47) and Riemann (1889; 1902–3a).

Examples 2.4.5 and 2.4.6 share this feature in other places as well. In Beethoven’s scherzo, the authentic cadence (m. 16) was not part of the implied four-measure group (mm. 12–15). In Mozart’s symphony, the same phenomenon occurs in mm. 45–46: the authentic cadence’s tonic resolution is not included in the five-measure group (mm. 41–45) or the higher-order third Teil (mm. 36–45). Schenker’s adherence to the rule of congruence is so strong that new phrases often write over the old, lessening the role that cadences play in articulating parts of the form. We might therefore think of form in two ways: beginning-oriented, which emphasizes the onset of themes, and end-oriented, which emphasizes cadential goals. Most nineteenth-century theories of form fall into the former category, whereas eighteenth-century theories fall into the latter.

Schenker’s early Formenlehre is clearly aligned with the nineteenth century.

---

76 Throughout this dissertation, cadences that Schenker explicitly mentions are indicated using modern designations such as I:HC or V:PAC. Cadences that Schenker does not mention explicitly but likely would have heard are indicated using question marks (e.g., I:HC?). Schenker’s conception of the cadence is discussed in § 2.4.3 and summarized in table 2.4.1, p. 126.
§ 2.4.3. The Schluß: W. A. Mozart’s Piano Sonata in C Major, K. 330/i; Chopin’s Ballade in G Minor, op. 23; C. P. E. Bach’s Keyboard Sonata in F Minor, H. 173/ii; Other Works

In example 2.4.6, Schenker combined Taktgruppen to create a Periode (mm. 1–28). His analysis of Mozart’s K. 330/i, shown in example 2.4.7, introduces a new element: the cadence. Schenker begins with this passage’s motivic content, observing that mm. 1–2 unfold a C-major triad. This triad has six possible harmonic meanings: it can function either in three major keys (as I, IV, or V) or in three minor keys (as III, VI, or VII) (213). Thus, “harmony . . . calls for a further clarification, which, in turn, creates in us the need and expectation of a continuation” (213). Measures 5–8 provide this clarification by introducing new Stufen, which coincide with changes in motivic design. In m. 5, the subdominant Stufe coincides with the ascending arpeggio. In m. 7, the dominant Stufe coincides with the descending scalar figure (214). In m. 8, the dominant Stufe resolves to the tonic, creating a “preliminary, relative kind of satisfaction” because “we lack the conceptual association which would be introduced by a repetition” (215). This repetition follows in mm. 9–12. While the IV–[I]–V–I Stufengang is the same for both Vorder- and Nachsatz, “the melody, with the reappearance of the tonic, brings merely the third instead of the root itself [in m. 8], the authentic cadence here is imperfect” (217). Therefore, three factors

---

77 “So verlangt denn also für ihren Teil die Harmonie schon allein nach weiterer Erläuterung, wer sie sei, wodurch das Bedürfnis und damit zugleich die Erwartung einer Fortsetzung in uns entsteht” (Schenker 1906, 283).

78 It is unclear whether Schenker hears a tonic Stufe in m. 6; therefore, I have placed this Roman numeral in square brackets. His analysis of mm. 9–10 suggests that mm. 5–6 should be heard similarly.

79 “Die Befriedigung, zu der wir in den beiden Fällen unserer Beispiele gelangen, können wir indessen noch nicht als eine endgültige, sondern nur erst als eine vorläufige, eine relative bezeichnen, da es zunächst ja noch an der für die Deutlichmachung des bereits gewonnenen Inhaltes unerlässlichen Assoziation der Wiederholung fehlt” (Schenker 1906, 285).

80 I have modified Borgese’s translation so the terminology is consistent with modern usage; emphasis is added to match the original. “Der Stufengang ist freilich derselbe wie im
EXAMPLE 2.4.7 W. A. Mozart, Piano Sonata in C Major, K. 330/i, mm. 1–18 (based on Schenker 1906, 282, 284–85, exx. 246, 248, 250)

interact to produce a cadence: the motivic design, the *Stufengang*, and the degree of melodic closure. In the opening of Mozart’s K. 330/i, the *Nachsatz* answers the *Vordersatz*, which fulfills our need for repetition, while the progression IV–[I]–V–I provides harmonic closure for both segments (216). Regarding the second cadence,

Such step progression, IV–V–I, may occur anywhere—at the beginning, in the middle, or at the end of a musical thought. . . . If we consider such a step progression . . . from the harmonic angle alone and disregard any question of form, we find that it emphasizes, first of all, the tonic [*Stufe*] and, second, the key of the tonic. If we now consider that, in addition, the return to the tonic [*Stufe*] coincides

Nachsatz, da in des die Melodie im Moment des Eintreffens der Tonika bloß die Terz des Tonikadreiklangs und nicht schon den Grundton selbst bringt, so ist der Ganzschluß hier eben nur ein unvollkommener” (Schenker 1906, 288).
with the formal conclusion—as it does in this consequent—and that it thus signifies a return to the harmonic point of departure, we see that the motion has reached its goal: form as well as harmony have closed their cycle.\(^1\) (Schenker [1906] 1956, 217)

Schenker’s metaphor suggests that there are two cycles: one models the step-progression’s departure from and return to the tonic; the other models form’s beginning-middle-end paradigm. These cycles may or may not be aligned—again, a IV–V–I progression might occur anywhere in a musical thought—although they must align to create a satisfactory cadence. For example, an authentic cadence occurs only when the *Stufengang* returns to the tonic and form’s cycle reaches its end. When cadences do occur, the final harmonies are described as *Stufen als Satzteiler*, or *Stufen* that divide the form.\(^2\)

Schenker returns to this idea in his analysis of Chopin’s G-minor ballade, shown in example 2.4.8(a). This example suggests that a single thought (a *Vordersatz*) can incorporate at least three motions toward the tonic *Stufe*. The first motion begins off tonic. The third motion reaches only as far as the dominant—thus, a half cadence (although one might hear m. 12 as part of an authentic cadence overlapping with m. 13 [not shown]). However, this example is telling not for

---

\(^1\) I have modified this translation; Borgese translates *Kreislauf* as “circle” rather than “cycle.” “Dieser Stufengang IV, V, I kann indessen wohl überall—am Anfang, in der Mitte wie auch am Schlusse eines Gedankens—vorkommen. . . . Harmonisch allein betrachtet und von jeder Form losgelöst, sehen wir einen solchen Stufengang . . . seine Wirkung immer zunächst zu Gunsten einer Tonika und in weiterer Folge auch ihrer Tonart äußern. Kommt aber dazu noch die Tatsache, daß—wie oben im Nachsatz des Mozartschen Beispiels (Fig. 250) [example 2.4.7, mm. 9–12]—die Tonika gar nun mit dem Ende der Form zusammenfällt und somit denn auch die Rückkehr zum ersten harmonischen Ausgangspunkt bedeutet, so sehen wir die treibenden Kräfte endlich an ihrem Ziele, Form wie Harmonie haben einen vollen Kreislauf absolviert” (Schenker 1906, 287–88). This passage is also discussed in Arndt (2012, 7–10).

\(^2\) Although the phrase *Stufen als Satzteiler* might generally describe cadences in Schenker’s early work, he uses this term to describe modifications made to half cadences in particular (see note 90, p. 128). He later describes dominant *Stufen* as dividers of the form in the edition of J. S. Bach’s *Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue* (Schenker [1910] 1984, 23, 23n9).
EXAMPLE 2.4.8 *Stufen als Satzteiler:* Chopin, Ballade in G Minor, op. 23

(A) Chopin, Ballade in G Minor, op. 23, mm. 8–12 (OC 83/418; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

(B) Chopin, Ballade in G Minor, op. 23, mm. 8–12

(C) Chopin, Ballade in G Minor, op. 23, mm. 20–36 (OC 83/417; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
what it includes but for what it leaves out. In example 2.4.8(b), the two melodic ideas (Abschnitte) and three harmonic cycles are out of phase until the half cadence arrives. There is only one Satzteiler—the Stufengang alone is unable to create a cadence.\(^{83}\) The Nachsatz in example 2.4.8(c) shows a similar three-stage process, although the third motion toward the tonic Stufe is discontinuous (written V\(^7\) || I\(^6\)). Schenker likens this to a deceptive cadence (Trugschluß), but the notation Halb. after m. 31 (see above the Roman numeral V) suggests that he initially heard it as a half cadence (Halbschluß).

On the left-hand side of example 2.4.8(a), a vertical line separating two dominants indicates a similar discontinuity. Perhaps this line represents the boundary between the introduction and the main theme; or, perhaps this line is meant to draw attention to the discontinuity (Halbschluß) that occurs when we reach the dominant at the end of the Vordersatz in m. 12, although this division is felt even more strongly once the Nachsatz repeats the first Abschnitt.\(^{84}\) According to either interpretation, this vertical line manifests a force intruding from outside the logic of voice leading and harmonic progression—a force strong enough to split what might otherwise be a single dominant Stufe into two distinct entities. Before Schenker incorporated interruption (Unterbrechung) into his mature theory, no explanation based on harmony or voice leading alone could account for this phenomenon.\(^{85}\) Until then it was a division based on grouping, design, and the larger Periode schema.

---

\(^{83}\) Here the Stufengang is linked with a formal division through the half cadence, but in Schenker’s later work, cadences have an increasingly ambivalent relationship with formal divisions. In fact, in his later theory, cadences are often defined by their Stufengang aspect alone rather than their form-defining aspect. This is discussed further in § 3.2.2.

\(^{84}\) On the right side of example 2.4.8(c), Schenker writes, “A\(_1\) a) VS/2.” This indicates that within the A\(_1\) section, a\(_{11}\) is a Periode whose Vordersatz ends with a half cadence.

\(^{85}\) See Samarotto (2005) for a nuanced account of interruption.
Table 2.4.1 Schenker’s cadence types (Schenker [1906] 1954, §§ 119–24; cf. table 1.3.1, p. 39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haupttypen</th>
<th>Cadence Type</th>
<th>Stufen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic cadence (der Ganzschluß; § 119): Conclusive, a full stop</td>
<td>(A) Perfect authentic cadence (der vollkommene Ganzschluß): Melody ends with Ė over I</td>
<td>Primarily: V–I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Imperfect authentic cadence (der unvollkommene Ganzschluß): Melody ends with either Ė or Ć over I</td>
<td>Often: IV–V–I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Substitution: II–V–I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often: IV (or II)–V♯¾–I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half cadence (der Halbschluß; § 120): Less conclusive, as if a question mark in language</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primarily: I–V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often: I–IV [or II]–V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deceptive cadence (der Trugschluß; § 121): VI substitutes for I, as if an authentic cadence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primarily: V–VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often: V–IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagal cadence (der Plagalschluß; § 122): IV substitutes for V, as if an authentic cadence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primarily: IV–I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often: V–IV–I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4.1 summarizes the cadences described in Harmonielehre (Schenker [1906] 1954, §§ 119–24). There are three main types (Haupttypen): authentic, half, and deceptive (224). The authentic cadence provides complete closure. It comprises the progression V–I, which is often expanded to IV–V–I, II–V–I, or IV–V♯¾–I (216, 228–29). The two types of authentic cadence include those ending with Ė over the tonic Stufe (der vollkommene Ganzschluß), and those ending with either Ė or Ć over the tonic Stufe (der unvollkommene Ganzschluß). The half cadence is likened to an inconclusive punctuation mark in language, such as a question mark (219). Half cadences occur when an incomplete Stufengang ends on a dominant Stufe, including I–IV–V or I–II–V (219). Schenker also allows half cadences to end with a dominant seventh chord.⁸⁶ In Schumann’s “Im wunderschönen Monat Mai” (example 2.4.9), he emphasizes the dominant’s added seventh. That Schenker indicates the seventh is unusual;⁸⁷ in this case, the Roman numeral indicates both a chord and a note belonging to an imaginary cantus firmus.

---

⁸⁶ Caplin (1998, 75; 2004, 70) does not, preferring the term dominant arrival in these cases. Burstein (2014, 210–18) questions this restriction.
⁸⁷ Schenker often does not indicate chordal sevenths, even when they are present.
EXAMPLE 2.4.9 R. Schumann, “Im wunderschönen Monat Mai,” *Dichterliebe*, op. 48, no. 1, mm. 23–26 (Schenker 1906, 291–92, ex. 254)

While authentic cadences and half cadences demarcate parts of the form, such as at the end of a *Vorder-* or *Nachsatz*, the deceptive cadence (V–VI) typically does not. The submediant *Stufe* in the deceptive cadence substitutes for the tonic as if it were an authentic cadence (221–22).

Schenker uses a novel metaphor to describe the deceptive cadence occurring in the last two measures of Chopin’s B-minor prelude, shown below in example 2.4.10(a):

Here the author gets ready to conclude his thought, as results obviously from the step progression V–I–V–VI and V, in measures 7–9 [mm. 15–17 in the score] of this example [example 2.4.10(a)]. At the last moment, however, instead of using the I step, which would have brought the closing effect, he introduces a VI, viz., G, which, here in the minor mode, lies half a tone above V. This, for the time being, defers the closing effect. Apparently, the effect of the tonic, B, is omitted, since it has been replaced by the VI; but if we hear and feel how the expected B arrives not as root tone but as a third, imprisoned, so to speak, by another root tone (viz., that of VI, G), we will understand that we are dealing here with a type of closing effect which is fittingly called a “deceptive cadence.”88 (Schenker [1906] 1954, 221–22; emphasis added to match the original)

---

88 “Hier schickt sich der Autor bereits an, den Gedanken zu schließen, wie man aus der Stufenfolge: V, I, V, VI und V in den Takten 7 bis 9 des Beispieles, leicht entnehmen kann. Im letzten Moment aber gebraucht er statt der ersten Stufe, welche die erwartete Schlußwirkung gebracht hätte, eine sechste Stufe, nämlich G, das hier in Moll um einen Halbton höher als die fünfte liegt, wodurch zunächst die Schlußwirkung vertagt wird. Scheinbar entfällt hier der Effekt der Tonika H, da statt ihrer die sechste Stufe gekommen ist; hört und empfindet man aber, wie das erwartete H zwar nicht selbst als Grundton gekommen ist, als Terz jedoch gleichsam in die Gefangenschaft eines anderen Grundtones (nämlich der sechsten Stufe G) geraten ist, so begreift man, daß hier eine Nuance der Schlußwirkung vorliegt, die psychologisch sehr treffend als ‚Trugschluß’ bezeichnet wird” (Schenker 1906, 293–94).
Continuation is required since, “for the time being, [the deceptive cadence] defers the closing effect” (221). The “tonal prisoner” must be set free:

The author now is faced with the task—to continue our metaphor—of delivering the tonic from its imprisonment, i.e., to express it now in terms of scale-steps; he must find the way from VI, which is heard as the third fifth (in rising order), back to the tonic, descending through the second and first fifths.⁸⁹ (Schenker [1906] 1954, 222)

This task is accomplished by repeating mm. 15–18 (cf. mm. 19–22). A perfect authentic cadence brings final closure in example 2.4.10(b), mm. 21–22.

After establishing the three cadential Haupttypen, Schenker ([1906] 1954, §§ 122–24) provides examples of how each might be modified in practice. By modifying the authentic cadence, he derives the plagal cadence—that is, IV–V–I becomes V–IV–I (see table 2.4.1 above). He cites the passage in example 2.4.3 (p. 110), hearing the I–V–I⁷–IV–I progression as a variant of I–V–IV–I. In example 2.4.11, the chord at the fermata is heard as an altered half cadence. Schenker writes, “The half-close, too, allows for various modifications; for, besides the dominant, there are other scale-steps which can be used as temporary conclusions” (224).⁹⁰ The F-sharp-major triad in m. 96—or at least its root—belongs to the prevailing E-minor Diatonie. This harmony is heard as II⁷ in E minor rather than V in B minor; nonetheless, this “cadence” has the same effect as a half cadence. A passage from Beethoven’s Pastoral Symphony illustrates how the deceptive cadence might be modified. The V–VI progression in example 2.4.12 is altered to V–III⁷, yet the latter progression creates the same effect as the former. In other words, III⁷ is

⁸⁹ “Der Autor sieht sich daher vor die Aufgabe gestellt, die Tonika—um in unserem Bilde zu bleiben—aus der Gefangenschaft zu befreien, d.h. es gilt—um im Sinn der Stufen zu sprechen—von der sechsten Stufe, die als dritte Oberquint empfunden wird, den Weg zur Tonika zurück über die zweite und erste Oberquint fallend zu suchen” (Schenker 1906, 294).

⁹⁰ “Auch vom Halbschluß lassen sich verschiedene Modifikationen denken, da ja außer der Dominante noch andere Stufen als Satzteiler komponiert werden können” (Schenker 1906, 297).
EXAMPLE 2.4.10 Cadences in Chopin’s Prelude in B Minor, op. 28, no. 6, mm. 9–23

(A) Deceptive cadence (Trugschluß), mm. 9–18 (Schenker 1906, 286, ex. 251)

(B) Authentic cadence, mm. 18–23 (Schenker 1906, 294, ex. 257)
Example 2.4.11 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Major, op. 109/ii, mm. 92–105 (Schenker 1906, 297, ex. 260)

Example 2.4.12 Beethoven, Symphony no. 6 in F Major, op. 68/ii, mm. 39–41 (Schenker 1906, 305, ex. 263)

replaced by the expected tonic Stufe in m. 41 (and 3 is held prisoner rather than 1). A similar modification occurred in example 2.4.8(c) (see p. 124), where the progression V4–II3 stood for a deceptive cadence (V–VI).
Other modifications are also possible. Although most cadences identified in *Harmonielehre* involve root-position chords, cadences are not limited to such chords in all instances. Because cadences involve ideal (or imaginary) *Stufen*, inversion does not cancel their effect.\(^91\) For example, in *Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik*, Schenker ([1903, rev. 1908] 1976, 40–41) identifies an authentic cadence in C. P. E. Bach’s Keyboard Sonata in F Minor, H. 173/ii, where both the V and I chords are inverted (see example 2.4.13). This movement begins with a motive that arpeggiates the tonic triad (F major). Based later on a D triad (first minor, then major), the motive is transferred from the lower voice to the upper voice in mm. 25–26. Schenker ([1903] rev. 1908, 18) describes mm. 26–27 as *eine kleine Kadenz nach c-moll*, but the dominant appears as V\(\frac{3}{2}\) by the end of m. 26 and resolves to I\(^6\) on the downbeat of m. 27. The *Reprise*, beginning in m. 28, likely influences this hearing: because it is an important point in the form, Schenker is willing to acknowledge a cadence despite the inverted chords. Yet the C-minor triad in m. 27 does not relate to the following F-major triad directly:

> When the F-major triad occurs [in m. 28], it is easy for the listener to realize what is expected of him, namely that his own instincts must supply the necessary chromatic change from C–Eb–G to C–E–G [in m. 27]. It is of no importance that the intent of the composer, especially in regard to the rests, becomes clear only at the entrance of the F-major chord; all music, as we know, is made up of similar *a posteriori* events.\(^92\) (Schenker [1903, rev. 1908] 1976, 41)

It is unclear whether this imaginary C-major chord participates in a half cadence in m. 27 or a full cadence in mm. 27–28.

---

\(^91\) Caplin (1998, 43; 2004, 70) claims that chord inversion cancels the effect of a cadence.

\(^92\) “Kommt nun der f-dur-Dreiklang, wie leicht hat es der Zuhörer zu merken, was der Autor von ihm verlangt: daß er nämlich selbst, aus dem eigenen Instinkt heraus, die hier nötige Chromatisierung des c es g nach c e g vollziehe. Es verschlägt nichts, daß ihm erst mit dem Eintritt des f-dur-Akkordes die Tendenz des Autors, bezw. der Pausen offenbar wird: ist doch alle Musik—wie bekannt—von Haus aus auf ein ähnliches *a posteriori* gestellt” (Schenker [1903] rev. 1908, 19).
EXAMPLE 2.4.13 C. P. E. Bach, Keyboard Sonata in F Minor, H. 173/ii, from the third collection für Kenner und Liebhaber, mm. 1–2, 21–29

§ 2.4.4. The Periode: Chopin’s Prelude in B Minor, op. 28, no. 6

The Periode is the most important schema in Schenker’s early Formenlehre. Thematically, a Periode may have either two parallel sections (see example 2.4.6, mm. 1–28, p. 119) or two contrasting sections (see example 2.4.7, p. 122). A Periode may be either symmetrical, where Vorder- and Nachsatz are the same length (again, see example 2.4.6, mm. 1–28), or asymmetrical, where Vorder- and Nachsatz are different lengths (again, see example 2.4.7). The cadence at the end of each Satz is also flexible. In example 2.4.6, the Vordersatz ends with a half cadence in m. 14; the Nachsatz ends with a perfect authentic cadence in mm. 28–29. In example 2.4.7, the Vordersatz ends with an imperfect authentic cadence in m. 8; the Nachsatz ends with a perfect
authentic cadence in mm. 11–12. In some cases, a *Vordersatz* can even end with a perfect authentic cadence.\(^{93}\) Schenker writes,

One might feel tempted to think that the perfect authentic cadence should be used only at the conclusion of the consequent, while the antecedent should always be concluded by an imperfect authentic cadence. This may hold true for most cases; such a connection between form and cadence, however, is not absolutely obligatory, and a perfect authentic cadence may occur also at the conclusion of an antecedent. For example: [example 2.4.14] in which . . . the perfect authentic cadence (despite even the fermata) is not strong enough to obliterate our desire for mental association, i.e., in this case, for a consequent. Thus . . . the cadence rests [first of all] on the harmonic principle of step progression. When form enters as a codetermining factor, the cadence reaches a point of satisfaction as soon as a resting point, however minimal, is formally reached.\(^{94}\) (Schenker [1906] 1954, 217–18)

Schenker’s conception of the *Periode* is a versatile type that accommodates a wide variety of tokens. It does not require any particular proportion (symmetrical or asymmetrical), thematic design, or cadential syntax. It is a simple proposition-response paradigm that results whenever two *Sätze* are yoked together.

---

\(^{93}\) Compare this with Caplin (1998, 51), who claims by definition that the “perfect authentic cadence cannot be used to close an antecedent phrase, since this strong cadence achieves complete harmonic and melodic closure,” although he allows an imperfect authentic cadence to close an antecedent. Rothstein ([1989] 2007, 18) limits the terms *antecedent* and *consequent* to cases where the antecedent ends in a half cadence. His conception of the period, however, is still rather general (and much like Schenker’s): “the term period can refer to any phrase that contains at least two smaller phrases; it is not necessary that any of the smaller phrases end with a half cadence.”

\(^{94}\) I have modified Borgese’s translation to reflect modern terminology. “Man könnte freilich danach versucht sein zu glauben, daß der vollkommene Ganzschluß vielleicht immer nur ans Ende des Nachsatzes, dagegen ans Ende des Vordersatzes stets ein unvollkommener gehöre. Mag dies auch in den meisten Fällen zutreffen, so ist dennoch ein solcher Zusammenhang von Form und Kadenz keineswegs ein unbedingter, und es kann auch am Ende des Vordersatzes ein vollkommener Ganzschluß vorkommen, wie z.B.: [example 2.4.14] wo der vollkommene Ganzschluß (selbst trotz \(\text{𝄐}\)) dennoch nicht die Macht hat, unser Bedürfnis nach der Assoziation d.h. hier nach dem Nachsatz aufzuheben. Wie man sieht, beruht das Wesen der Kadenz also in erster Linie auf dem harmonischen Gesichtspunkt des Stufenganges, wobei es ihr, sobald zugleich auch die Form mithbestimmend wirkt, schon genügt, wenn diese bei einem noch so kleinen Ruhepunkt anlangt” (Schenker 1906, 288–90).
Schenker’s analysis of Chopin’s B-minor prelude demonstrates how motives, the Stufengang, cadences, and the larger Periode schema all interact. This analysis—which I have reconstructed from brief commentary in Harmonielehre, in addition to Schenker’s personal copy of the score located in the Jonas Collection—follows the generative stages of his Formenlehre from a single motive to an entire Periode.\footnote{For another analysis of Chopin’s B-minor prelude, see Burkhart (1973).} The prelude’s opening idea, shown in example 2.4.15, reveals the bond between motive and harmony: “it is the motif that gives life to the abstract concept of the triad, $B$, $D$, $F$-sharp. . . . [so that] harmony and content become one” (Schenker 1954, 211–12).\footnote{“So z.B. macht in Chopins Prélude, Op. 28, Nr. 6 erst das Motiv: [example 2.4.15] den abstrakten Dreiklangsbeviff H, D, Fis so recht lebendig, wogegen [example of a B-minor triad in first inversion] allein bloß etwa die Wirkung einer zunächst nur skizzierten Behauptung} The opening motive (labeled $c$) comprises the initial arpeggio (labeled $a$) and the stepwise...
example 2.4.15 a composite motive: Chopin’s Prelude in B Minor, op. 28, no. 6, mm. 1–3
(based on Schenker 1906, 281, ex. 244; JC 31/19)

third (labeled b and b’).97 Schenker identifies only the first instance of motive c, while I show
related variants in example 2.4.16 using solid brackets.98 In some instances, motive c extends to the
downbeat of a third measure (e.g., mm. 1–3), whereas in other instances, it is either two measures
long (e.g., mm. 9–10) or dissolves into cadential material (e.g., mm. 5–6).99 Variants of motive b
are indicated using wavy-line brackets.100 Unlike motive a, motive b sometimes occurs in the
upper voice: see mm. 7–8 (the E5–D5–Cě5 descent that leads to a half cadence), mm. 14–15 (the
Cě5–B4–Aě4 descent that leads to the entrance of a new melody in the lower voice), and mm. 22–
23 (although the B4–Aě4–Fě4 motive outlines a fourth instead of a third).

In keeping with Schenker’s early theory, motive c produces new Stufen. In mm. 1–4, two
instances of motive c initially express a B-minor triad, which has six possible harmonic meanings.
This ambiguity requires further clarification, which is provided in mm. 5–6 through the VI, IIě5,
and V Stufen that follow. A half cadence occurs in m. 8, resulting in “only a preliminary, relative
EXAMPLE 2.4.16 A Periode: Chopin’s Prelude in B Minor, op. 28, no. 6 (based on Schenker 1906, 281, 283–84, 286, 294, exx. 244, 247, 249, 251, 257; JC 31/19)

Periode (mm. 1–22)
Vórdersatz (mm. 1–8)

B minor: I I VI II\(\text{VII}\) V I

Nachsatz (mm. 9–22)

Deceptive cadence

[LPAC] [Codetta]

sostenuto pp ppp
kind of satisfaction,” since the cadence is inconclusive (215). Moreover, the proposition has not received its response; additional content is required to satisfy the law of repetition. Parallel to m. 1ff., the Nachsatz begins with motive c in m. 9. This Satz concludes with a perfect authentic cadence in mm. 21–22, although this conclusion is initially delayed by the deceptive cadence in mm. 17–18. This delay motivates yet another repetition, as the new melodic idea in the bass in mm. 15–18 is repeated in mm. 19–22. Measures 23–26 function as a codetta.

§ 2.4.5. Conclusion

Motives and Stufen together create higher-order complexes. Once this bond is established, both seek further development: motives are further subject to the law of repetition, while harmony seeks further clarification due to the triad’s multivalence. Taktgruppen, in coordination with cadences, give rise to higher-order units, such as a Vordersatz. Together, two Sätze compose a Periode—a remarkably flexible schema. Yet the analysis of Mozart’s K. 543/i in example 2.4.6 (p. 119) introduced another hierarchical level: the Gedankengruppe. Together these large sections make up what Schenker (1906, 219) calls der Form im Großen. At this level, a Gedankengruppe functions as an essential part of a sonata-form exposition.

101 “Die Befriedigung, zu der wir in den beiden Fällen unserer Beispiele gelangen, können wir indessen noch nicht als eine endgültige, sondern nur erst als eine vorläufige, eine relative bezeichnen, da es zunächst ja noch an der für die Deutlichmachung des bereits gewonnenen Inhaltes unerlässlichen Assoziation der Wiederholung fehlt, von der in § 5 [of Harmonielehre] die Rede war” (Schenker 1906, 285).
§ 2.5. **Gruppenbildung: A Hallmark of Cyclic Form**

*Gruppenbildung* is the penultimate stage in Schenker’s generative *Formenlehre*. First introduced in *Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik* ([1903, rev. 1908] 1976), this concept reveals the improvisatory logic behind C. P. E. Bach’s keyboard sonatas (among other works in sonata form, or what Schenker sometimes called “cyclic form”). Bach’s diversity of ideas, his lack of any standardized form or mechanical modulation—these qualities were Schenker’s (1976, 33–36) antidote to what he viewed as the nineteenth century’s two plagues: (1) program music by the New German School, which was based on external sources; and (2) absolute music by “pseudo-classicists,” which was based on preexisting forms. Yet another conflict in *Ornamentik* lay much closer to the surface: a battle over the origins of Viennese Classicism. Schenker establishes C. P. E. Bach’s sonatas as the definitive precursor to the sonata style of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, and rejects Riemann’s proposed origin for this style: the Mannheim School of symphonists. Given Schenker’s decline narrative in the “Niedergang” typescript, the stakes could not be higher: sonata form, as it existed in the works of eighteenth-century masters, embodies music’s highest values—values that might one day redeem German musical culture for future generations. A battle over sonata form’s origins was at once a battle over its destiny.

---

102 I thank Hedi Siegel for sharing the 1903 version of *Ornamentik* with me. In the 1908 revision, Schenker included a new preface, section headings, and footnotes that often refer to *Harmonielehre* (1906), which was published in the interim. For more on this essay and its place within Schenker’s development, see Koslovsky (2010) and Petty (1995, § 2.1).


104 This is based on Koslovsky (2010, 61–63), who writes, “Schenker’s thoughts [in *Ornamentik*] actually begin with his historiographic agenda: that is, to show why Bach should be considered the only forefather of the Viennese school. The 1908 Preface makes this clear, for it is nothing less than an attack on the work of Hugo Riemann in his early editions of the *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Bayern*. There, Riemann wagered that Johann Stamitz and the Mannheim School of composition . . . were the proper precursors to Viennese Classicism.” See Riemann (1902–3b).
§ 2.5.1. “By the Grace of an Improvisatory Imagination”: C. P. E. Bach’s Keyboard Sonata in G Major, H. 246/i

Gruppenbildung is characterized by its improvisational qualities (Koslovsky 2010, 61–64), which Schenker ties directly to C. P. E. Bach’s keyboard works:

What first strikes one about Bach’s compositional technique is the absence of any kind of schematic formula, whether in regard to form, idea, or harmony. To invent something in advance, in isolation and out of context, only to insert it into a strained patchwork later on—this does not lie in his nature. Instead, everything . . . exists by the grace of an improvisatory imagination.105 (Schenker [1903, rev. 1908] 1976, 27)

This “improvisatory imagination” leads to “a wealth and variety of ideas”—ideas made distinct through contrasts in dynamics and rhythm.106 Schenker uses a passage from Bach’s Keyboard Sonata in G Major, H. 246/i, to illustrate (see example 2.5.1):

Here, starting on the third eighth of bar 8, and ending on the third eighth of bar 22, we find an unbroken flow of various short phrases and motives. The unifying factor that combines these elements into one group is the D-major tonality. Yet the individual constituents of the group are still recognized as such; we hear a cadence on the tonic in bar 12, a rise to the dominant in bars 15 and 16, a return to the tonic in bars 16–18, and a cadence in bars 20–22, all of which clearly point up the independent character of each element. From this example we may easily determine the role of tonality: it tonally unites the diverse elements into a single group, without sacrificing the independence of the individual parts.107 (Schenker [1903, rev. 1908] 1976, 28; emphasis added to match the original)

---


107 “Hier läuft, vom Takt 8 angefangen, beziehungsweise von dessen drittem Achtel an, eine Mehrzahl von Sätzen und Motiven ununterbrochen bis zum Takt 22, beziehungsweise bis zu dessen drittem Achtel. Was diese Vielheit hier zu einer Gruppe bindet, ist die Tonalität D-dur. Gleichwohl sind aber die einzelnen Bestandteile der Gruppe als solche zu erkennen, da im Takt
EXAMPLE 2.5.1 C. P. E. Bach, Keyboard Sonata in G Major, H. 246/i, from the second collection *für Kenner und Liebhaber*, mm. 1–29 (see Koslovsky 2010, 65, ex. 1)

The D-major tonality (*Tonalität*) in mm. 8–22 unifies the group’s four parts: mm. 8–12, 12–16, 16–18, and 18–22.\(^{108}\) Despite this unity, Schenker emphasizes contrasts in rhythm through the placement of melodic beginnings: *Teil* 2.1 (m. 8) and *Teil* 2.2 (m. 12) begin on beat 2, whereas *Teil* 2.3 (m. 16) and *Teil* 2.4 (m. 18) enter an eighth note earlier in their respective measures (29).\(^{109}\) Bach’s dynamics support this hearing, since the changes in dynamic coincide with changes in design: *Teil* 2.1 is marked *forte* (although this dynamic is Schenker’s own); *Teil* 2.2 is marked *piano*; *Teil* 2.3 is again marked *piano* (which contrasts with the *forte* in m. 14); and *Teil* 2.4 is again marked *forte* (30–31).

Schenker’s analysis can be extended to include two additional groups, which I have labeled *Gruppe* 1 (mm. 1–8) and *Gruppe* 3 (mm. 22–29). In example 2.5.1, I show the first group’s division into *Teile* 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 using wavy-line brackets above the score. These divisions are based on motivic parallelism, dynamic contrasts, and the underlying *Stufengang* (the analysis of which is my own, following Schenker’s early practice). The initial motive (*Teil* 1.1) is repeated in mm. 3–4 at a *piano* dynamic. This satisfies the law of repetition, yet harmony calls for further development: *Stufen* other than the tonic pedal are needed to establish the key of G major. In m. 5, a new melodic idea (*Teil* 1.3) is introduced at a *forte* dynamic, accompanied by a complete *Sechter’sche Kette* (I–IV–VII–III–VI–II–V–I). Only after the motive has been repeated and the *Stufengang* has defined the key, *Gruppe* 1 reaches a half cadence in m. 8.\(^{110}\)

---

\(^{108}\) Felix Salzer analyzes mm. 8–22 in his dissertation (Koslovsky 2010, 66). Salzer divides this passage into three segments rather than Schenker’s four—that is, mm. 8–12, 12–15, and 16–22 (Salzer 1926, 11–12). Also see Petty (1995, § 9.5, exx. 9.13, 9.15).

\(^{109}\) This is in contrast to Bruckner, whose themes Schenker criticizes for typically beginning on strong beats.

\(^{110}\) Schenker only mentions the cadence in m. 12. I have added the other cadences in mm. 8, 22, 26, and 28/29 to this analysis.
In m. 22, the second group ends with a perfect authentic cadence in the key of the dominant (D major), followed by a third group in the same key. Schenker writes,

In bars 22–28 of the same sonata movement [example 2.5.1], we see how the dynamic markings underscore the internal organization of a single idea, and how they alternate and contrast to point up the individual elements that make up the idea. Thus the \( p \) in bar 22 corresponds to the \( pp \) in bar 26, while the \( f \) in bar 24 corresponds to the \( f \) in bar 27; it should also be noted that both \( f \)'s enter on the second eighth of the bar.\(^{111}\) (Schenker [1903, rev. 1908] 1976, 31; emphasis added to match the original)

In example 2.5.1, this passage (\textit{Gruppe 3}) is subdivided into \textit{Teile} 3.1 (mm. 22–24), 3.2 (mm. 24–26), 3.3 (mm. 26–27), and 3.4 (mm. 27–28/29). \textit{Teile} 3.1 and 3.3 correspond based on their \textit{piano} dynamic, along with their dotted rhythms and placement within the measure; \textit{Teile} 3.2 and 3.4 correspond based on their \textit{forte} dynamic, in addition to their placement within the measure, descending scalar figures, and cadential bass motions. Therefore, at a higher level, mm. 22–26 (\textit{Teil} 3.1 + \textit{Teil} 3.2) are parallel to mm. 26–28/29 (\textit{Teil} 3.3 + \textit{Teil} 3.4). This is reinforced by the cadential structure: a perfect authentic cadence ends the first segment (m. 26); an imperfect authentic cadence ends the second (m. 28/29). Schenker would likely divide the entire exposition into three sections: \textit{Gruppe} 1 functions as the \textit{Hauptsatz}, \textit{Gruppe} 2 functions as the \textit{Seitensatz}, and \textit{Gruppe} 3 functions as the \textit{Schlußsatz}.

\(^{112}\) This exposition has three parts instead of four.\(^{113}\) The lack

\(^{111}\) “Betrachten wir z.B. die Takte 22 bis 28 derselben Sonate II, pag. 9, so sehen wir, wie auch hier, als in einem \textit{einzeln}en Gedanken bloß, die dynamischen Zeichen den Organismus des Gedankens führlich bloßlegen, wie sie wechselnd und kontrastierend, zugleich die einzelnen Elemente anzeigen, aus denen der Gedanke zusammengesetzt ist. So korrespondiert das \( p \) im Takt 22 mit \( pp \) im Takt 26, dagegen das \( f \) im Takt 24 mit dem \( f \) im Takt 27, wobei zu beachten ist, daß die beiden \( f \) beim zweiten Achtel angebracht sind” (Schenker [1903] rev. 1908, 12–13).

\(^{112}\) Schenker does not use these terms in \textit{Ornamentik}; however, he does use them in his analysis of Beethoven’s Sting Quartet in F Minor, op. 95/i, in § 129 of \textit{Harmonielehre}.

\(^{113}\) See Grandjean (2001, ex. 13) for a comparison of how different \textit{Formenlehren} would subdivide a sonata-form exposition. For example, Lobe ([1850] 1858) and Richter (1852) label four parts, whereas Bruckner labels three parts in his studies with Kitzler and in a later analysis of
of a transition (or Modulationspartie) does not present a problem, since Schenker does not consider this to be an essential part of the form (see § 3.3) He might have derived this three-part exposition from Bruckner’s teachings. Of course, this is one of Schenker’s typical modes of discourse: to write a fierce polemic against an idea, only to rely on it in practice.

§ 2.5.2. “More Complex Groups”: C. P. E. Bach’s Keyboard Sonata in A Major, H. 186/i

Not all of C. P. E. Bach’s sonata-form expositions divide neatly into three groups. Schenker’s commentary on Bach’s Keyboard Sonata in A Major, H. 186/iii, suggests that its exposition comprises only two (see example 2.5.2). Schenker uses mm. 17–46 to illustrate what he calls “more complex groups.” A few pages later, he cryptically asks the reader to “note the events in bars 8, 25, 29, and 36” (38). He then clarifies the layout of mm. 17–46, writing: “The interpolation of bars 36–38 between the two parallel phrase groups [Gruppen] of bars 29–36 and 39–46 is both surprising and original” (38). The following analysis is derived from these scant comments.

his Fourth Symphony. A. B. Marx’s ([1837–47] 1887–90) conception of the exposition is more complicated. While he divides the exposition into four parts, he does not have a separate transition section, as Lobe and Richter do. Marx preferred to include the “transition” within the latter part of the Hauptsatz (qua motion toward the Seitensatz). Marx’s fourth part of the exposition is the Gang located between the Seitensatz and the Schlußsatz; see example 1.3.8(d), p. 24. In other words, Marx’s exposition, much like Bruckner’s and Schenker’s, has only three main parts (Sätze).

114 “Es mögen hier aber noch einige kompliziertere Gruppen der Beachtung empfohlen werden; z.B. . . . pag. 42 [example 2.5.2], Takt 17 bis Ende des ersten Teiles” (Schenker [1903] rev. 1908, 11). Also see Schenker ([1903, rev. 1908] 1976, 28).

115 “Man bemerke die Situationen der Takte 8, 25, 29, 36. Sehr überraschend und originell ist die Lage der Takte 36 bis 38, zwischen den parallelen Gruppen 29 bis 36 und 39 bis 46” (Schenker [1903] rev. 1908, 17).
In example 2.5.2, the exposition’s two groups (Gruppen 1 and 2) comprise mm. 1–16 and 17–46 respectively. Schenker asks us to consider events in mm. 8, 25, 29, and 36. Measure 25 (the beginning of Teil 2.2) is marked by a piano dynamic following an imperfect authentic cadence in the key of the dominant (E major). Measure 29 begins a new segment (Teil 2.3) marked by a forte dynamic, lasting until m. 36; the interpolated mm. 36–38 are marked piano. Teil 2.4 (mm. 39–46/47) is heard as parallel to Teil 2.3 (mm. 29–36); both sections end with a perfect authentic cadence in the key of the dominant (E major).

From these observations, when Schenker asks that we “note the events in bars 8, 25, 29, and 36,” he is asking us to observe divisions within groups. Therefore, I also interpret m. 8 as an internal division that subdivides Gruppe 1 into two segments: Teil 1.1 (mm. 1–8) ends with an imperfect authentic cadence in the primary key (remember, cadences do not have to involve root-position chords); Teil 1.2 (mm. 9–16) ends with a half cadence in the key of the dominant. Schenker draws attention to the modulatory nature of Teil 1.2, for careful consideration of mm. 8–16 yields the observation that in those sections of a composition which are generally considered modulatory, Bach never permits such modulation to take place mechanically. . . . The harmonic drive is made subservient to the musical idea, and new ideas, new motives. . . . are invented to attract our sensibilities. The new idea is, so to speak, the spearhead of the modulation. (Schenker [1903, rev. 1908] 1976, 32–33; emphasis added to match the original)

---

116 Schenker does not mention any of the cadences labeled in example 2.5.2, as indicated by the question marks.

117 In contrast to the other segments within this group, including all of the other segments within the entire exposition, the motives in mm. 36 and 37 begin on beat 2 rather than beat 1.

118 “Prüfen wir Taktgruppen wie z.B. pag. 6, Takt 8 bis 12, . . . so erkennen wir, daß selbst solche Teile der Komposition, die man gewöhnlich Modulationssteile nennt, bei Bach niemals bloß mechanisch vor sich gehen. . . . Diesen Willen der Harmonien weiß er vielmehr dem Gedanken unterzuordnen, u. zw. ist es immer ein neuer Gedanke, ein neues
\*\*EXAMPLE 2.5.2\*\* C. P. E. Bach, Keyboard Sonata in A Major, H. 186/iii, from the first collection für Kenner und Liebhaber, mm. 1–47

Motiv \ldots die wohl in erster Linie unsere Empfindung anzuziehen berufen sind. Der neue Gedanke ist sodann sozusagen Pate der Modulation” (Schenker [1903] rev. 1908, 14).
Bach’s modulatory passage in mm. 9–16 brings a new motivic idea: the descending scales in the upper voice (mm. 8–9, 10–11, and 12–13), each corresponding to a new note in the descending bass line (A₂–G₂–F₂, reaching E₂ in m. 14). The E dominant seventh chord in m. 14 resolves to a tonic triad in A major; however, that tonic triad is immediately reinterpreted as a subdominant in the key of E major, which leads to the half cadence in m. 16. This half cadence prepares Gruppe 2’s tonal area (E major) through its own dominant (B major).

By drawing attention to this modulation, Schenker emphasizes the important role that tonality plays in Gruppenbildung:

Of particular note are the harmonies used to begin and end each segment. No less important is the relationship of the sum of the individual harmonies of each segment to the tonality of the work as a whole. . . . Here the tonic, here the dominant, and there the subdominant or yet another diatonic step (Stufe) introduces or closes a segment. Sometimes the scope of each tonal area [Tonalität] is unified and somewhat restricted; at other times, however, it extends to more distant keys.119 (Schenker [1903, rev. 1908] 1976, 29; emphasis added to match the original)

First, he recognizes that groups—and especially segments within groups—may begin and end on harmonies other than the tonic.120 Second, he recognizes that key changes help to define formal boundaries. For example, in Bach’s G-major sonata (example 2.5.1), the key of the dominant (D major) unified Gruppe 2. (A similar situation occurs in example 2.5.2, mm. 17–47.) It seems that

---

119 “Insbesondere ist im einzelnen zu beachten: welche Harmonien den jeweiligen einzelnen Teil beginnen und welche ihn beenden; nicht minder aber, in welchem Verhältnisse sodann die Summen der den einzelnen Teilen zugehörigen Harmonien zur gesamten Tonalität stehen. . . . So ist nun einmal die Tonika, einmal die Dominante, ein andermal die Unterdominante oder eine andere Stufe der Diatonie, die den Teil einleiten oder beschließen; bald ist die Tonalität strenger und einheitlicher, bald aber um entferntere Tonarten vermehrt” (Schenker [1903] rev. 1908, 11).

120 This off-tonic beginning anticipates Schenker’s concept of the auxiliary cadence (Burstein 2005a). That Schenker emphasizes groups beginning on harmonies other than the tonic should be read in response to Bruckner’s music. In a letter to Karl Grunsky, Schenker criticizes Bruckner for too often beginning parts of the form on the tonic chord (see § 1.3.4).
Schenker’s unifying *Tonalität* operates at the level of an individual *Gruppe*, but his analysis of Beethoven’s String Quartet in F Minor, op. 95/i, in *Harmonielehre* (discussed below) suggests that the keys unifying individual groups are in fact *Stufen* (or *Stufen der Tonalität als Tonarten*) that operate in a larger diatonic context spanning an entire piece.\(^{121}\) To use Schoenberg’s terminology, local keys have become regions of the monotonalität.\(^{122}\)

§ 2.5.3. *Stufen als Tonarten*: Beethoven’s String Quartet in F Minor, op. 95/i

The analysis of Beethoven’s op. 95/i in *Harmonielehre* is reconstructed in example 2.5.3.\(^{123}\) By m. 24, the subordinate key (D-flat major) has already been established in the preceding *Modulationspartie* (not shown). Motive 1 (see the viola part) expresses tonic and dominant *Stufen* (mm. 24–25). However, writes Schenker, the “motif, as well as harmony, calls for a continuation—the motif needs its repetition; the harmony, an enlargement of its sphere by drawing in other diatonic scale-steps” ([1906] 1954, 243).\(^{124}\) The cello repeats this motive (mm. 26–27), yet the harmony again does not develop beyond tonic and dominant. The law of repetition is satisfied, but the need for harmonic development remains. As listeners, “we feel bound to hear the total of those four measures [mm. 24–27] as the antecedent, leaving us in the expectation of a

\(^{121}\) For example, see the sketch of the Largo from J. S. Bach’s Sonata no. 3 in C Major for solo violin, BWV 1005 (Schenker [1925] 1994, 32–33, fig. 1).

\(^{122}\) Schoenberg ([1954] 1969, 19) writes, “The concept of regions is a logical consequence of the principle of *monotonality*. . . . there is only one *tonality* in a piece, and every segment formerly considered as another tonality is only a region, a harmonic contrast within that tonality.”

\(^{123}\) Koslovsky (2010, 66–73, exx. 2 and 3) also discusses this analysis.

\(^{124}\) “dennoch bedürfen sowohl das Motiv als die Harmonie einer Fortführung und zwar bedarf das Motiv seiner Wiederholung und die Harmonie einer Erweiterung des Kreises durch Heranziehung anderer Stufen der Tonart” (Schenker 1906, 323).
EXAMPLE 2.5.3 Beethoven, String Quartet in F Minor, op. 95/i, mm. 24–47 (based on Schenker 1906, 319–23, ex. 273; see Koslovsky 2010, 68–71, exx. 2–3)
consequent” (243). The Nachsatz (mm. 28–34) begins with another motivic repetition in the second violin (motive 3), although this section is again limited to tonic and dominant Stufen.

Finally, other diatonic steps are introduced in mm. 31–33, leading to a half cadence in m. 34. Like other cadences involving inverted chords, this cadence ends with a V\(^6\) chord on the music’s surface; “thus harmonic exigencies again make it necessary to continue the development of the content, as if the consequent were no final fulfillment of the antecedent but both together a kind of antecedent of a higher order” (243).\(^{126}\)

The cello’s pedal C\(_2\) unifies mm. 34–37, while “a considerable abundance of new motivic content and scale-steps (VI–II–V)” follow in mm. 38–42 (243).\(^{127}\) However, the formal relationship between mm. 34–37 and 38–42 is unclear (Schenker does not suggest a Vordersatz-Nachsatz relationship in his commentary). The cadence structure is equally unclear: is the V–VI progression in mm. 37–38 a deceptive cadence?\(^{128}\) This is plausible, along with hearing an imperfect authentic cadence in mm. 42–43, although Schenker never mentions this either. And if

\(^{125}\) “Da indessen auch in diesen Takten entscheidende Stufen ausbleiben, so fühlen wir uns noch immer nicht befriedigt: die Summe der vier Takte glauben wir daher nicht anders, denn als Vordersatz empfinden zu können und harren des Nachsatzes” (Schenker 1906, 323). It is unclear what kind of cadence Schenker might have placed at the end of the Vordersatz in m. 28, if any. He may have heard none at all, since the Stufengang is of a relatively small scope, alternating merely between tonic and dominant harmonies. This would decouple the concept of a Vordersatz from the form-defining cadence often associated with it.

\(^{126}\) “so legen denn die Bedürfnisse des Harmonischen nun von neuem die Notwendigkeit nahe, den Inhalt fortzuführen, als wäre der Nachsatz keine endgültige Erfüllung des Vordersatzes und vielmehr beide erst eine Art Vordersatzes höherer Ordnung” (Schenker 1906, 323). While Schenker only mentions the initial tonic Stufe (m. 30) and the concluding dominant Stufe (m. 34), the progression I–[IV–V–III\(^1\)–VI–II]–V is most likely what he would have heard.

\(^{127}\) “Lebhafter regt es sich erst in den Takten 15–19 [mm. 38–42], die bereits einen ansehnlichen Reichtum an neuem Inhalt und Stufen (VI–II–V) aufweisen und endlich denn auch (im Takt 20 [m. 43]) die lang ersehnte Tonika herbeiführen” (Schenker 1906, 324).

\(^{128}\) The A-major chord in m. 38 is interpreted as an enharmonic respelling of a B\(^\natural\) Stufe; similarly, the D-major chord implied in m. 39 is interpreted as an enharmonic respelling of an E\(^\natural\) Stufe (Schenker ([1906] 1954, 244, ex. 209).
mm. 24–34 comprise an “antecedent of a higher order” (243), might mm. 34–42 comprise a consequent of a higher order, since a *Vordersatz* logically implies a *Nachsatz*? The cadential structure again supports this interpretation: the higher-order *Vordersatz* would end with a half cadence (m. 34), and the *Nachsatz* would end with an imperfect authentic cadence (m. 43).

Meanwhile, in the last five measures of example 2.5.3, tonic and dominant *Stufen* alternate above a D$_3$ tonic pedal. Schenker interprets mm. 43–46 as two two-measure groups: mm. 43–44 might be said to compose a *Vordersatz*, to which mm. 45–46 would form the *Nachsatz*. Together these measures function at an even higher level: the *Seitensatz* (mm. 24–42) stands in a *Vordersatz*-*Nachsatz* relationship with the *Schlußsatz* (m. 43ff.). Schenker writes,

> Here, finally, on this pedal point it sounds as if the whole tension, accumulated in the statement during measures 1–19 [mm. 24–42], were released in the long-expected consequent. He who already hears the concluding idea on this pedal point must marvel even more at such an organic connection between a so-called “subsidiary” section and the closing section—a connection which formally makes of the subsidiary section the introductory antecedent of the closing section.\(^{131}\)

(Schenker [1906] 1954, 244)

This illustrates how a *Seitensatz*-*Schlußsatz* complex emerges from nested *Vordersatz*-*Nachsatz* relationships. The *Periode* and *Gedankengruppe* are not mutually exclusive categories, nor is the

---

\(^{129}\) See note 126 above for Schenker’s original German. Koslovsky (2010, ex. 3) also infers a *Nachsatz* (mm. 34–42) in relation to the *Vordersatz* (mm. 24–34).

\(^{130}\) The English translation of *Harmonielehre* does not make this clear on p. 244. Schenker’s German reads, “wenn man gerade die Takte 20 und 21 [mm. 43 and 44] gleichsam als Vordersatz der Takte 22–23 [mm. 45–46] zu definieren Lust hat” (Schenker 1906, 324). The words *gleichsam* and *Lust hat* suggest that the assignment of antecedent and consequent functions in mm. 43–46 is tentative.

\(^{131}\) “Und nun endlich erst hier, bei diesem Orgelpunkt, klingt es, als würde die gesamte in den Takten 1 bis 19 [mm. 24–42] aufgehäufte Vordersatzspannung sich in den lange erwarteten Nachsatz entladen. Wer indessen bei eben diesem Orgelpunkt gar bereits den Schlußgedanken empfindet, muß über eine solche organische Verbindung von einem sogenannten Seiten- und einem Schlußsatz noch mehr erstaunen,—über eine Verbindung, die den Seitensatz förmlich zu einem Vordersatz des Schlußgedankens gemacht hat” (Schenker 1906, 324).
Gedankengruppe a higher-order form than the Periode by default (even if a Gedankengruppe often contains one or more Perioden). Although Schenker treats some Gedankengruppen as internally divided into two parts, applying the concepts of Vorder- and Nachsatz, in the case of Beethoven’s op. 95/i, a Vordersatz–Nachsatz relationship organizes two Gedankengruppen. Beethoven achieves this effect by employing an economy of Stufen:

However one may look at this situation, this much is clear, that Beethoven, instead of basing his conception on one single theme, has offered here a major group of several variegated motifs and elements, which nevertheless yield the effect of a closed conceptual unit. He reached this effect by using few, relatively very few, scale-steps for each single element while attempting to make the most, motivically, of each given scale step.\footnote{Doch betrachte man die Situation wie man will, so viel ist immerhin klar, daß hier Beethoven, statt den Gedanken auf einen einzigen Grundstoff zu stellen, vielmehr eine große Gruppe von mehreren und mannigfaltigen Motiven und Elementen geboten hat, und zwar mit der Wirkung einer völlig geschlossenen Gedankeneinheit. Diese erreichte er aber damit, daß er für das einzelne Element nur wenig, relativ sehr wenig Stufen verwendet, dafür aber desto mehr motivischen Inhalt aus der gegebenen Stufe herauszuschlagen gesucht hat” (Schenker 1906, 325; quoted in Koslovsky 2010, 72–73).}

Thus, we have reached a level of form involving the main parts of a sonata-form exposition (and to the Seitensatz and Schlussesatz, we should add the implicit Hauptsatz). Each part of the exposition is created through the dynamic process of Gruppenbildung. That each group is based on a few Stufen is the hallmark of sonata form (245), for a Stufengang unfolds over the course of an entire exposition:

The psychological nature of step progression, which we have described so far in the context of form in the narrower sense, manifests itself in a marvelous, mysterious way also in the context of form in a wider sense—on the way from thematic complex to thematic complex, from group to group. In the form of established keys we have the same step progression, albeit at a superior level.\footnote{Aber auch in der Form im großen—auf dem Wege von Gedankenkomplex zu Gedankenkomplex, von Gruppe zu Gruppe—offenbart sich in wunderbar-mysteriöser Weise die bisher in der kleinen Form von uns dargelegte psychologische Natur des Stufenganges. Wir haben (Schenker [1906] 1954, 246)}
**Example 2.5.4** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i (based on Schenker 1906, 330, ex. 278)

The same principles governing a *Stufengang* within a group (step-progression by fifths and thirds, sometimes seconds) govern a *Stufengang* encompassing an entire exposition—or perhaps even an entire movement. Schenker explains this is why, for example, most expositions in the major mode modulate to the key of the dominant (247).

Example 2.5.4 reconstructs Schenker’s analysis of groups and their corresponding *Stufen* in Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i.\(^{134}\) This movement begins on a tonic *Stufe* (corresponding to the *Hauptsatz*), progresses to a submediant *Stufe* (corresponding to the *Seitensatz* and *Schlußsatz*), and reaches a subdominant *Stufe* in the *Durchführungspartie*. The measure numbers in this example correspond to the key changes notated in the score—B-flat major (m. 1ff.), G major (m. 45ff.), and E-flat major (m. 130ff.)—although this may not correspond to the precise boundaries that Schenker has in mind. Schenker’s early *Formenlehre* has come full circle: *Gruppen* (rather than motives) share an intimate bond with *Stufen* that display themselves as key areas (*Stufen als Tonarten*).

\[^{134}\text{See Schenker ([1906] 1954, \S\ 131). For more on “key succession as large-scale chord progression,” see Schachter ([1986] 1999b, 143–48).}\]
§ 2.6. Recapitulation Theory (Haeckel’s Law)

Nebular spirals solidify and become stars. Music, born from the original irrational state as if from a nebular spiral, and made ever more dense with diminution, grew into a star in the heavens of the spirit.

—Heinrich Schenker, Der freie Satz (1935)

Schenkerian theory, whether early or late, is a theory of origins (Cook 2007, 311–13). It explains how a piece is generated from the simple to the complex according to prescribed laws. Yet this process unfolds on another timescale—that of music history. These two perspectives—microcosm and macrocosm, individual and species—become one. In “Der Geist der musikalischen Technik,” Schenker describes how early humans first sang in response to external stimuli. Shepherds later sang aimlessly in their fields, “dissociating singing from its immediate stimuli and establishing it as an independent, specialized field” (Schenker [1895] 2007, 319). Through the rise of texted vocal melody, music imitated language for its coherence, but this coherence was only illusory. Combining melodies led to polyphony; from polyphony grew harmony. Music later developed into an independent art only through the form-generative laws of repetition, association, and abbreviation—laws that gave birth to the instrumental motive.

Schenker then concludes the “Geist” essay by reiterating the importance of melody:

It is only because of this, I think, that people today, as in the past, turn their awareness of externals toward the artificial proliferation of melodies in a single movement, and yet feel themselves drawn above all and most intensely to the melodies themselves, which seem to be the intrinsic nature of music. (Schenker [1895] 2007, 332)

135 See note 11 (p. 83) for the original German.
136 “Nur darum glaube ich, man heute noch wie früher mit äusserlicher Aufmerksamkeit auf die künstliche Vermehrung der Melodien in Einem Satz gespannt und fühlt
This “proliferation of melodies” parallels Schenker’s early approach to form. Motives subject to the law of repetition require new harmonies. New harmonies coalesce to create a Stufengang. Cadences emerge from the interaction of the Stufengang and form, which has a force all its own. Together cadences help to articulate the two component parts that make up a Periode.

Meanwhile, modulations help to differentiate higher-order Gedankengruppen from one another.

Taking Schenker’s biological metaphors of growth and development seriously, and with nineteenth-century theories of evolutionary biology in mind, we arrive at something akin to recapitulation theory—namely, Haeckel’s law that ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny. A piece’s generative development (ontogeny) parallels music’s historical development (phylogeny).

Schenker would maintain this position throughout his entire career. He even begins the last chapter of Der freie Satz by conflating music’s phylogenic development (form’s development since Palestrina) with the ontogenetic process of diminution (the composing-out of passing and neighboring tones):

In the music of the early contrapuntal epoch, including even Palestrina, the basic voice-leading events, such as passing tones or neighboring tones, had not yet come to fruition, like flowers in bud. Who would have suspected, at that time, that these phenomena, through the process of diminution, were to become form-generative and would give rise to entire sections and large forms! Although the art of prolongation and diminution ultimately expanded and enriched the form, it was the force of the first passing tone, the first neighboring note, the power of the first structural division which bound form to take on organic unity; and the composer had to make these inner necessities of the background his own. (Schenker [1935] 1979, 128)

sich vor Allem doch am intensivsten hingezogen zu den Melodien selbst, die die eigentliche Natur der Musik zu sein scheinen” (Schenker 1895, 326).

137 See Gould (1977, 78–85) and Morgan (2014, 43–44).
138 “In der vertikal-kontrapunktischen Epoche, sogar noch bei Palestrina, lagen die Stimmführungserscheinungen wie z.B. die eines Durchganges, einer Nebennote u. dgl. noch knospenhaft da—wer hätte damals geahnt, daß sie je förmenträchtig werden und durch Diminuierung ganze Formteile und große Formen erstehen lassen könnten! Haben zuletzt die
According to Schenker, when we gaze into the background, we not only witness the generative past of one particular piece, we witness music’s historical past—as if seeing the light from some distant star. Despite his innovative concept of the Stufe and its relationship to the motive’s generative impetus, Schenker still faced a dilemma that continued to persist nearly a decade after the publication of Harmonielehre: What causal mechanism would animate this cosmos? Until he had apprehended the Urlinie and the background’s dynamic transformation into the foreground, he based his generative theory on motives, Stufen, cadences, and changes in key to differentiate large thematic groups from one another.

Künste der Auskomponierung die Form reich gestaltet, so war es doch wieder der Zwang des ersten Durchganges, einer ersten Nebenernote, einer ersten Gliederung usw., die die Form zur Einheit ihrer Gestalt gebändigt haben: mußte doch auch der Komponist so, wie der Hintergrund mußte und wollte!” (Schenker 1935, 207).
CHAPTER 3
A CONFORMATIONAL APPROACH TO FORM

§ 3.1. SCHENKER’S FORMS AND THEIR PRECURSORS

Pages and pages of handwritten notes concerning form are scattered throughout file 83 of the Oster Collection. This archive, located at the Music Division of the New York Public Library, contains a large portion of Schenker’s Nachlass. Items in file 83 range from complete unpublished essays, such as “Der Weg zum Gleichnis” (OC 83/2–43; see appendix 1), to scraps of paper with jottings that provide only a cursory outline of a single work or movement. Most of these documents are not dated and appear in Schenker’s handwriting, while other documents appear in the handwriting of Jeanette Kornfeld (née Schiff), whom Schenker later married (Federhofer 1985, 37). Of the documents in Jeanette’s handwriting, most are dated (usually between 1911 and 1916).

It should come as no surprise that Schenker was actively working on a theory of form in the 1910s (and perhaps even earlier). By then he had completed Harmonielehre (1906) and the first book of Kontrapunkt (1910)—a Formenlehre would traditionally follow. In the preface to his monograph on Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, published in 1912, Schenker even promised an “Outline of a New Theory of Form” (Entwurf einer neuen Formenlehre). Perhaps the notes in file 83 of the Oster Collection are all that remain of this unfinished project (Schenker [1912] 1992, 4n3).

1 For an introduction to the Oster Collection, see Kosovsky (1999). Other important collections located in the United States containing portions of Schenker’s Nachlass include the Oswald Jonas Memorial Collection, Special Collections & University Archives, UCR Libraries, University of California Riverside; and the Felix Salzer Papers, 1897–1995, Music Division, The New York Public Library for the Performing Arts.
It is also not clear why this new *Formenlehre* was ultimately abandoned. Around this time, Schenker was also working on the first three explanatory editions (*Erläuterungs-Ausgaben*) of Beethoven’s late piano sonatas: op. 109 (1913), op. 110 (1914), and op. 111 (1916). By 1917 he had even completed a draft of “Freier Satz,” which was intended to be part of *Kontrapunkt* (Siegel 1999, 14). But perhaps there was another reason—other than being occupied with new projects—why Schenker abandoned the *Entwurf einer neuen Formenlehre*: its approach was far more conformational than any of his earlier writings might have suggested. Perhaps he did not explicate his new theory of form until *Der freie Satz* (1935) because, until then, he lacked a generative approach surpassing the nineteenth century’s dual legacy of *thematische Arbeit* and *Stufentheorie*.

This chapter outlines the conformational approach to form that Schenker developed in the 1910s—and rehabilitated after he apprehended the guiding hand of the *Urlinie* (Cook 2007, 285). Six schematic forms are introduced, and their precursors in the theories of A. B. Marx, Hugo Riemann, and Stefan Krehl are considered. For the remaining chapter, Schenker’s forms are described in detail, each illustrated by published and unpublished analyses of compositions by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Chopin, and Brahms.

§ 3.1.1. On Division and Repetition, Early and Late

Example 3.1.1(a), taken from file 83 of the Oster Collection, shows the six full-movement forms that Schenker devised perhaps even before the publication of *Harmonielehre* (1906). A transcription follows in example 3.1.1(b).² At the top of the document, Schenker writes, *Auf*

² The transcriptions in this chapter were completed with the assistance of the University of Massachusetts Amherst Translation Center (Görkem Cilam, Assistant Director).
**Example 3.1.1** Schenker’s six conformational forms

(A) In Schenker’s handwriting (OC 83/255; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

(B) Transcription (OC 83/255)

Auf Teilung u. Wiederholung.

*Formen:*

(1-teil. Form: N.B.)

2-teil. Form: $a_1 - a_2$

3-teil. Form: $a_1 - b - a_2$

4-teil. Form: $a_1 - b_1 - a_2 - b_2$

5-teil. Form: $a_1 - b_1 - a_2 - c_1 - a_3$

oder:

\[
\begin{aligned}
& a_1 - b_1 - a_2 - c_1 (+b_2) - a_3 \\
\end{aligned}
\]

6-teil. Form: $a_1 - b_1 - c_1 (Df) a_2 - b_2 - c_2 \quad (= a_1 - b - a_2)$
Theilung u. Wiederholung (On Division and Repetition). In the left-hand column, under the word Formen, six schemas are listed from simple to complex: one-part form (einteilige Form), two-part form (zweiteilige Form), and so on, until the progression ends with six-part form (sechsteilige Form).

On the right-hand side of the page, schemas for each form use lowercase letters to indicate similar sections; subscript Arabic numerals attached to these letters indicate repetitions. For example, the schema $a_1-b-a_2$ indicates a three-part form whose outer sections are similar ($a_1$ is a repetition or slight variant of $a_2$), while the $b$ section contains contrasting material. On the left-most side of the document, these schemas are organized hierarchically using tree diagrams. For example, four-part form ($a_1-b_1-a_2-b_2$) is derived through two binary divisions: the first division creates the two main branches; the second divides these into $a_1-b_1$ and $a_2-b_2$ respectively. To generate five-part form, two three-part forms ($a_1-b_1-a_2$ and $a_2-c_1-a_3$) are combined with an elision of the $a_2$ sections ($a_1-b_1-a_2-c_1-a_3$), as the arcs drawn on the diagram for this schema suggest.

In § 5 of Harmonielehre (1906), Schenker provides us with a glimpse at how he derives these schemas. The laws of repetition and association, which together create the psychological basis for generating form at the lowest level (motives), also generate form at the highest level (entire works or movements):

The principle of repetition, once successfully applied to the understanding of the microcosm of musical composition [i.e., the motive], now could be applied on a larger scale as well. For if the significance of a small series [Reihe] of tones results clearly only after it has been repeated, it should seem plausible that a chain [Kette] of such small series [Reihen] would also acquire individuality and meaning by way of simple repetition. This is the origin of the two-part form $a : a$; or, more exactly, $a_1 : a_2$.\(^3\) (Schenker [1906] 1954, 9)

\(^3\) “Ist es so gelungen, im Kleinen und Kleinsten den Tönen Bedeutung zu geben, so konnte man es wagen, dasselbe Prinzip auch im Großen durchzuführen. Denn erfährt man, was eine kleine Reihe von Tönen bedeutet, erst dann, wenn und nachdem sie noch einmal gesetzt wird, so ist es einleuchtend, daß auch eine Kette von mehreren kleinen Reihen einfach durch Wiederholung zur Offenbarung ihres Sinnes gelangt. So entstand die zweiteilige Form $a : a$ oder
Schenker goes on to describe how three-part form \((a_1–b–a_2)\) is derived from two-part form \((a_1–a_2)\) through the introduction of a contrasting element:

If there are, for example, two members, \(a_1\) and \(a_2\), associatively linked, it is possible to insert an extraneous member \(b\), which, so to speak, increases the tension and thereby emphasizes the effect of the repetition. Thus, apparently, there arises a three-part form. It should be stressed: “apparently.” For a true three-part form should consist of three members, viz., \(a : b : c\)—a form whose application to music is simply unthinkable and is probably ruled out forever. The form \(a_1 : b : a_2\), on the other hand, which seems to be the only three-part form applicable to music, can be reduced ideally to the two-part form, \(a_1 : a_2\), on which it is originally founded. The inserted member \(b\), however, whose function it is to delay the repetition, must be so characterized that it should not require, in its turn, a repetition for its clarification. For, in that case, we would obtain the form \(a_1 : b_1 : a_2 : b_2\), in other words, a four-part form with an underlying two-part basis.\(^4\) (Schenker [1906] 1954, 10–11)

These comments are reminiscent of A. B. Marx’s *Formenlehre*—particularly his increasingly complex rondos, where each new form compensates for an imperfection in a previous form (cf. example 1.3.8, p. 24). In Schenker’s case, for example, three-part form heightens our desire for the repetition underlying two-part form through delay. And if the \(b\) section of this three-part form is unable to stand on its own, it might be repeated to reinforce its independence, resulting in a four-part form. Schenker’s hierarchical tree diagrams on the left side of example 3.1.1(a) gradually emerge by chaining sections together, one after the other.

\(^4\) “Z.B. wenn zwischen den assoziativ verbundenen Gliedern \(a_1\) und \(a_2\) ein fremdes \(b\) eingeschoben, das gleichsam die Spannung mehr und dadurch erst recht die Wirkung des Gleichnisses steigert. Es entsteht somit dem Scheine nach eine dreiteilige Form. Ich betone: dem Scheine nach, denn eine wirklich dreiteilige Form müßte drei verschiedene Glieder aufweisen, also: \(a : b : c\) lauten,—eine Form, die in der Musik schlechtthin unerklärbar und für alle Zeiten wohl ausgeschlossen ist. Kann aber in der Musik die dreiteilige Form nun einmal nicht anders lauten als \(a_1 : b : a_2\), so hat man hinter ihr offenbar doch nur die zweiteilige, nämlich \(a_1 : a_2\) als die ursprüngliche und grundlegende Form zu erkennen” (Schenker 1906, 12).
It is striking that the forms in example 3.1.1(a) closely resemble those described in chapter 5 of *Der freie Satz* (Schenker [1935] 1979, 128–45). Table 3.1.1 provides a comparison. The only noticeable difference involves sonata form. Schenker’s early conception of sonata form involves a three-part exposition \((a_1–b_1–c_1)\) and a three-part recapitulation \((a_2–b_2–c_2)\), for a total of six parts.\(^5\) Through the addition of a development section (*Durchführung*) emerges a three-part form of a higher order: exposition–development–recapitulation (notated \(a_1–b–a_2\)). Sonata form is described as a “cyclic form” for this reason: the three-part structures in the exposition and the recapitulation are replicated at a higher level (exposition–development–recapitulation). In *Der freie Satz*, Schenker emphasizes this higher-order three-part form and downplays his original six-part conception. Perhaps this is due to the principle of the “mysterious number five” (*geheimnisvolle Fünfzahl*), first described in *Harmonielehre* (1906, 51, 268).\(^6\) At the end of *Der freie Satz*, Schenker writes, “Strangely, in agreement with the principle of the number 5 which I mentioned in my *Harmony* (§ 11), the number five also represents the limit in the world of form!” ([1935] 1979, 145).\(^7\) Yet he did not always hold this belief so dearly, as the handwritten diagram of six-part form in example 3.1.1(a) attests.

But a more important difference between the early and late schemas exists: their derivation.\(^8\) Schenker partitions forms based on their “outer” thematic resemblances in his early notes, whereas his explanation in *Der freie Satz* is based primarily on “inner” divisions of the

---

\(^5\) This is the same three-part form \((a–b–c)\) that Schenker discounted above (“a form whose application to music is simply unthinkable”); although, in this context, he is describing an exposition, whereas in *Harmonielehre*, he is likely describing the form of an entire movement.


\(^8\) Also see Kalib (1973, 1:235–306) for the derivation of forms in Schenker’s late work.
TABLE 3.1.1 Forms in Schenker’s early notes (OC 83/255) compared with those in Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, 128–45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Auf Theilung u. Wiederholung (OC 83/255)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-part form</td>
<td>[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-part form</td>
<td>$a_1$–$a_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-part form</td>
<td>$a_1$–$b$–$a_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-part form</td>
<td>$a_1$–$b_1$–$a_2$–$b_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-part form (rondo form)</td>
<td>$a_1$–$b_1$–$a_2$–$c_1$–$a_3$ or $a_1$–$b_1$–$a_2$–$c_1$ ($+b_2$)–$a_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-part form (cyclic form)</td>
<td>$a_1$–$b_1$–$c_1$ ($Df$) $a_2$–$b_2$–$c_2$ ($= a_1$–$b$–$a_2$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Urlinie** and the composing-out of Stufen at deep levels of the middleground.9 For example, he claims that undivided (one-part) form is based on an uninterrupted Urlinie:

The undivided progression of the fundamental line generates undivided form. Repetitions indicated by ɳ, or those written out in full, constitute neither an interruption of the fundamental line nor, consequently, a division of the form.10 (Schenker [1935] 1979, 130)

Likewise, two-part form is derived through a division of the Urlinie, not thematic resemblances or repeated sections:

Two-part form evolves most naturally from the division 3–2 || 3–2–1, 5–2 || 5–1, or 8–5 || 5–1. This has nothing to do with the extent of the piece, which may be short . . . or . . . the result of more elaborate repetition.11 (Schenker [1935] 1979, 132)

---

9 It was not until the late 1910s that Schenker had developed the idea of the Urlinie. The term first appeared in print in his 1921 explanatory edition of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 101 (Pastille 1990b, 74). By referring to “inner divisions of the Urlinie” and “outer thematic resemblances,” I allude to concepts of inner and outer form respectively (Rothstein [1989] 2007, 104; Salzer 1952, 1:223–26).

10 “Der ungeteilte Ablauf des Urlinie-Zuges wird zur ungeteilten Form; etwaige mit ɳ eingeforderte oder ausgeschriebene Wiederholungen bedeuten keine Unterbrechung des Zuges, also auch nicht der Form” (Schenker 1935, 211).

11 “Zur zweiteiligen Form führt am natürlichsten die Gliederung 3 2 || 3 2 1, 5 2 || 5 1, 8 5 || 5 1, werde das Stück an Umfang klein . . . oder durch reichere Wiederholung auch umfangreicher” (Schenker 1935, 213).
This approach is exemplified by example 3.1.2: a sketch of Brahms’s Waltz in B Major, op. 39, no. 1. The undivided Uurlinie (3–2–1) makes for an undivided form despite this waltz having two repeated sections. (The first repeat sign is notated at the third level [3. Schicht]; the second repeat sign, which is not shown, appears in the score at the double bar at the end of the sketch.) This matter is complicated, however, when Schenker ([1935] 1979, 129) writes, “The omission of repeats [in performance], which is so widespread today, must be viewed as a violation of form.”

In other words, a latent tension remains between a conception of form derived from thematic resemblances, repeated sections, and the like, and a conception derived purely from inner spans of voice leading (Schichten).

In Der freie Satz, the schemas in table 3.1.1 are purportedly derived from divisions of the Uurlinie and the composing-out of middleground Stufen, for all forms “have their origin in, and derive from, the background” (Schenker [1935] 1979, 130). For example, three-part form (a₁–b–a₂) arises through four distinct voice-leading paradigms: (1) the mere composing-out of the bass arpeggiation (I–V–I); (2) interruption (Unterbrechung), where the dividing dominant supporting ₂ at the interruption is composed out to become the b section; (3) mode mixture in the Uurlinie.
EXAMPLE 3.1.2 Undivided (one-part) form based on an undivided Urlinie: Brahms’s Waltz in B Major, op. 39, no. 1 (Schenker 1935, fig. 49.2)

(e.g., in the major mode, 43–53–43 is supported by the progression I–VI–I); and (4) the composing-out of a deep-middleground neighbor note and its harmonic support (e.g., 34–3 is supported by the progression I–IV–I) (Schenker [1935] 1979, 132–33). The second paradigm, which has interruption as its basis, is conceptually a two-part form prior to it becoming a three-part form. On the other hand, the first paradigm, which has the I–V–I bass arpeggiation as its basis, does not go through this intermediate (two-part) stage.15

Such correspondences between inner and outer form confounded Schenker even after he had discovered them, writing,

---

15 As Allen Cadwallader (1990, 14) observes, “basic formal patterns . . . derive from tonal process and characterize different levels of tonal structures. Consequently, a theory of form must be a theory of transformations that traces the evolution of formal patterns as they develop from one level to another.” Taking this view to its extreme, all forms begin as one-part forms.
The key to form lies, in some hidden way, in the number of parts (Teile). Just as 2, 3, 4, and 5, differ from one another, so do the forms derived from these numbers differ in their inner nature and significance.16 (Schenker [1935] 1979, 145)

This passage, which appears in the epilogue to the chapter on form in Der freie Satz, betrays the earlier approach based on the schemas in example 3.1.1(a) (see p. 158) in addition to the Urlinie and its divisions. And if the key to form lies hidden in the number of parts—meaning the parts composing the outer form—then it is even more important that we understand Schenker’s early conception of outer form on its own terms. I contend that to understand the Formenlehre expressed in Der freie Satz, we must first understand the conformational approach that had existed before Schenker redefined form according to divisions of the Urlinie and its lower-level replicates.

§ 3.1.2. Precursors to Schenker’s Forms in the Works of A. B. Marx, Hugo Riemann, and Stephan Krehl

It is not clear which theorists might have influenced Schenker’s unique taxonomy in example 3.1.1(a). A. B. Marx’s (1856, 39–43) rondos offer one possibility, although these schemas do not all map easily onto Schenker’s. Example 3.1.3 shows some potential correspondences. Schenker’s two-part form corresponds to Marx’s first rondo, assuming that Marx’s Gang is not treated as an independent section. Similarly, Schenker’s three-part form corresponds to Marx’s second rondo. It is doubtful whether Schenker’s four-part form corresponds to any of Marx’s rondos, since it is based on binary divisions, whereas Marx’s forms are based primarily on ternary divisions. Comparing Schenker’s four-part form to Marx’s third rondo, the last Hauptsatz (HS) has

16 “Der Schlüssel zu den Formen liegt in der Zahl der Teile wie in einem Mysterium beschlossen: wie 2, 3, 4, 5 voneinander unterschieden sind, so unterscheiden sich auch die aus diesen Zahlen gezogenen Formen dem inneren Wesen nach” (Schenker 1935, 231–32).
EXAMPLE 3.1.3 A comparison between Schenker's conformational forms (OC 83/255) and Marx's rondo forms (Marx 1856, 39–43; trans. Burnham 1997, 78–83)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Schenker's two-part form: } & a_1 - a_2 \\
\text{Marx's first rondo: } & HS - G - HS \\
\text{Schenker's three-part form: } & a_1 - b - a_2 \\
\text{Marx's second rondo: } & HS - SS - G \not\sim HS \\
\text{Schenker's four-part form: } & a_1 - b_1 - a_2 - b_2 \quad ? \\
\text{Schenker's five-part form: } & a_1 - b_1 - a_2 - c_1 - a_3 \\
\text{Marx's third rondo: } & HS - SS.1 - G \not\sim HS - SS.2 - G \not\sim HS \\
\text{Schenker's five-part form: } & a_1 - b_1 - a_2 - c_1 - a_3 \quad ? \\
\text{Marx's fourth rondo: } & HS - SS.1 - G \not\sim HS - SS.2 - G \not\sim HS - SS.1 \\
\text{Schenker's six-part form: } & a_1 - b_1 - c_1 - \{(Df)\} - a_2 - b_2 - c_2 \\
\text{Marx's sonata form: } & HS - SS.1 - G \not\sim SZ \mid \textit{Durchführung} \mid HS - SS.1 - G \not\sim SZ
\end{align*}\]

no correspondent (see the question mark).\(^{17}\) A better correspondence exists between Marx's third rondo and Schenker's five-part form: the five parts align perfectly. Marx's fourth rondo has no analog in Schenker's taxonomy: while aligning most parts of this form with Schenker's five-part rondo is possible, the last \emph{Seitensatz} (SS) has no clear correspondent (again, see the question mark). Schenker's six-part form does closely resemble Marx's sonata form. Both theorists divide the

---

\(^{17}\) Neither does Schenker's four-part form map easily onto Marx's sonatina form (see example 1.3.8[c], p. 24). The two main sections in Marx's sonatina form each divide into three parts (\emph{Hauptsatz–Seitensatz–Schlußsatz}), whereas the two main sections in Schenker's four-part form each divide into two parts (\(a_1-b_1\) and \(a_2-b_2\) respectively). In practice, however, Schenker analyzes movements as four-part forms that Marx would classify as sonatina form (Kalib 1973, 1:277–78).
exposition and recapitulation into three sections. Marx divides the exposition into *Hauptsatz* (HS), *Seitensatz* (SS), and *Schlußsatz* (SZ), whereas Schenker divides the exposition into what he only labels as $a_1$, $b_1$, and $c_1$. Both theorists also divide sonata form as a whole into three sections. Schenker labels these as $a_1$, $b$, and $a_2$ on the right-hand side of example 3.1.1(a) (see p. 158).

Schenker may have also had the work of other theorists in mind. Riemann’s (1889) large forms (*große Formen*) provide yet another taxonomy (see table 1.3.7, p. 73), but Stephan Krehl’s *Musikalische Formenlehre* (1902–3) was perhaps the most influential. We know Schenker likely owned the 1905–6 reprint of Krehl’s treatise, since it was included in a catalog of books auctioned after Schenker’s death in 1935 (Eybl 1995, 159, 172). And Krehl’s reprint was published just as Schenker might have begun work on his own *Formenlehre*. In fact, in a diary entry dated July 11, 1907, Schenker records that he was developing “ideas toward a ‘new theory of form.’”

Krehl’s *Formenlehre* begins with a literature section listing previous treatises, including those surveyed in chapter 1: Reicha’s *Traité de haute composition musicale* (1824–26), Marx’s *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition* (1837–47), Lobe’s *Lehrbuch der musikalischen Komposition* (1850–67), and Riemann’s *Katechismus der Kompositionslehre* (1889). Like Riemann’s treatise, Krehl’s is divided into two main parts: *Die reine Formenlehre* and *Die angewandte Formenlehre*. The

---

18 This three-part design discounts any possible influence from Lobe (1850–67) or Richter (1852), who both understood sonata form as having two large sections (see table 1.3.2, p. 42).
19 Krehl (1864–1924) taught at the Leipzig Conservatory, where Riemann was also on the faculty, and wrote textbooks on a variety of musical topics (Damschroder and Williams 1990, 152). Schenker corresponded with Krehl in the summer of 1923, when Schenker was invited to present a lecture at the first Congress of German Musicology in Leipzig, although this never came to fruition (diary entry dated July 17, 1923; Schenker Documents Online; transcr. Marko Deisinger, transl. Scott Witmer; available from http://www.schenkerdocumentsonline.org/documents/diaries/OJ-03-04_1923-07/r0017.html; Internet; accessed May 4, 2016).
20 “Ideen zu einer ‘neuen Formenlehre’” (JC 1/6; see Bent 2005, 96).
21 More specifically, Riemann’s treatise is divided into *Die allgemeine Formenlehre* and *Die angewandte Formenlehre*. 
former part describes a system of structural relationships (form per se); the latter part describes genres such as the sonata, concerto, and symphony. Krehl’s *reine Formenlehre* shows Riemann’s influence in other ways as well. It begins by outlining four levels of musical structure—or, as Krehl ([1902–3] 1905–6, 1:9) titles the third chapter, “The Elements of Musical Composition” (*Die Elemente der musikalischen Schreibweise*). These elements include the *Taktmotiv*, *eigentliche Motiv* (actual motive), *kleine Satz*, and *ganze Satz*. In other words, Krehl recapitulates Riemann’s eight-measure *Satz* (or *Periode*) and its component parts, but uses different terminology for each level.

Examples of Krehl’s elements are shown in table 3.1.2.22 The *Taktmotiv* comprises an upbeat followed by a downbeat across a bar line (cf. example 1.3.22, p. 66). Two *Taktmotive* combine into an *eigentliche Motiv*, such that a weak (*leicht*) measure leads to a strong (*schwer*) second measure, similar to Riemann’s *Gruppe*. Krehl’s *kleine Satz* combines two *Motive*, which can be either parallel (notated 1–1) or contrasting (notated 1–2), similar to Riemann’s *Halbsatz*. Krehl’s *große Satz* combines two *kleine Sätze* for a total of four *Motive*, similar to Riemann’s *Satz*. Krehl highlights four patterns of motivic resemblance using Arabic numerals (1–1–1–1, 1–2–1–2, 1–2–3–1, and 1–2–3–4) but acknowledges that other patterns are possible.

Having established the *große Satz*, Krehl ([1902–3] 1905–6, 1:43–44) introduces six full-movement forms (*große Formen*, *Grundformen*), followed by chapters dedicated to each. Krehl’s taxonomy, from one-part form to sonata form, is shown in example 3.1.4.23 Equivalent to a *große Satz*, one-part form (*einteilige Form*) is usually found in “the smallest songs or song-like pieces,”

---

22 The following discussion summarizes Krehl ([1902–3] 1905–6, 1:9–42 and passim).
23 Krehl ([1902–3] 1905–6, 1:44) also lists Übergangsformen and the Phantasieform, describing them as freer formations (*freiere Bildungen*). For example, the Übergangsformen freely combine sections (*Teile*). Krehl (115–16) analyzes the first movement of Schumann’s *Faschingsschwank aus Wien*, op. 26, as an elaborate rondo: $A\rightarrow B\rightarrow A\rightarrow C\rightarrow A\rightarrow D\rightarrow A\rightarrow E\rightarrow A\rightarrow F\rightarrow A,$ plus a coda.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taktmotiv</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eigentliche Motiv</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>der kleine Satz</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Motive: 1–1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>der kleine Satz</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Motive: 1–2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>der große Satz</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Motive: 1–1–1–1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>der große Satz</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Motive: 1–2–1–2; 1–2–1–1 and 1–2–2–2 are also possible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>der große Satz</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Motive: 1–2–3–1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>der große Satz</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Example" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Motive: 1–2–3–4; 1–2–3–2 and 1–2–3–3 are also possible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Example 3.1.4** Krehl’s six große Formen (Krehl [1902–3] 1905–6, 1:43)

1. die einteilige Form;
2. die zweiteilige Form;
3. die leichte dreiteilige Form;
4. die zusammengesetzte dreiteilige Form;
5. die Mondsonatentform;
6. die Sonatenform.


although its main function is to serve as a building block for the other forms. In example 3.1.5, Schumann’s song “Der Abendstern,” Krehl (45–46) identifies four Motive. The melody’s highpoint (*Höhepunkt*) falls on the *Schwerpunkt* of the third *Motiv* in m. 6 (see the F♯). Although this song begins in the key of A major, Krehl observes that mm. 3–4 modulate to the “parallel key” (*Paralleltonart*), whereby the C-sharp-major chord in m. 4 is heard as a dominant in the key

---

25 The other *Schwerpunkte* all fall on the downbeats of the even-numbered measures.
of F-sharp minor. Measures 5–6 modulate to the parallel key of the subdominant (the B-minor chord in m. 6 is “parallel” to D major). Krehl emphasizes that the piece concludes on the tonic in the primary key (m. 8), but cadences rarely determine form in his treatise.

Example 3.1.6(a), a menuet by J. S. Bach, illustrates Krehl’s (53–58) two-part form (zweiteilige Forn). The tick marks notated on the downbeats of the even-numbered measures indicate Schwerpunkte. In this case, both eight-measure große Sätze are repeated: the first begins in the key of E-flat major and modulates to B-flat major; conversely, the second begins in B-flat major and modulates back to the primary key. Although these sections share internal similarities (e.g., mm. 1, 5, and 6 are related motivically), they are not parallel to one another. This form is therefore best represented as a–b (ignoring the repeats), which is rather different from Schenker’s two-part schema a₁–a₂. In fact, Krehl (53) claims that merely repeating a Satz cannot create a two-part form. Since two-part forms must offer some thematic contrast (a–b), he claims that Handel’s theme in example 3.1.6(b) is best classified as a one-part form.

Krehl’s (59–67) small three-part form (kleine dreiteilige Forn), on the other hand, is divided into three sections (Hauptsatz–Zwischensatz–Hauptsatz) that are all based on the same motivic material. The Zwischensatz usually emphasizes the dominant harmony of the primary key, although it can modulate to a subordinate key instead. In either case, the Zwischensatz should not end with a definitive close (keinem rechten Abschluß). In example 3.1.7, Krehl divides Schumann’s “Soldatenmarsch” into three sections. The Hauptsatz, shown in example 3.1.7(a), begins in the primary key, modulates to the key of D major, and ends with an authentic cadence (Ganzschluß). The Zwischensatz, shown in example 3.1.7(b), begins in the key of D major (where the Hauptsatz

26 Krehl uses Riemann’s “parallel” relationship, which maps C major onto A minor (and vice versa). This is equivalent to the relative operation (R) in current neo-Riemannian theory (Cohn 1998, 171–72, fig. 2).
EXAMPLE 3.1.6 Krehl’s *zweiteilige Form*

(A) J. S. Bach, French Suite no. 4 in E-flat Major, BWV 815, Menuet (Krehl [1902–3] 1905–6, 1:54, ex. 50)

![Musical notation for Bach's Menuet](image)

(B) Doubtful as an example of *zweiteilige Form*: G. F. Handel’s Suite in D Minor, HWV 437, Sarabande (Krehl [1902–3] 1905–6, 1:57, ex. 53)

![Musical notation for Handel's Sarabande](image)

EXAMPLE 3.1.7 Krehl’s *kleine dreiteilige Form*: R. Schumann’s “Soldatenmarsch,” *Album für die Jugend*, op. 68, no. 2

(A) *Hauptsatz* (Krehl [1902–3] 1905–6, 1:64, ex. 60)

![Musical notation for Schumann's Hauptsatz](image)

---

This explicit mention of a cadence in connection with a formal boundary is unusual. Like Marx and Riemann, Krehl will sometimes mention the presence of a cadence, but cadences are neither sufficient nor are they necessary to demarcate the end of a formal section.
EXAMPLE 3.1.7 CONTINUED

(B) *Zwischensatz* (Krehl [1902–3] 1905–6, 1:64, ex. 61)

(c) Return of the *Hauptsatz* (Krehl [1902–3] 1905–6, 1:64, ex. 62)

left off) but soon modulates back to the primary key (G major). The *Hauptsatz* returns in example 3.1.7(c) but it does not modulate this time. To summarize: A *Zwischensatz* is not necessarily shorter than a *Hauptsatz* (despite the *Hauptsatz* being repeated in this example), but it is tonally dependent on and motivically related to the *Hauptsatz*.

In contrast, the middle section (*Mittelsatz*) of Krehl’s (72–79) composite three-part form (*zusammengesetzte dreiteilige Form*) is independent of the outer *Hauptsätze*. All three sections should end on a tonic harmony, although the *Mittelsatz* (or *Trio*) is usually set in a contrasting key.

Krehl uses the first two sections of Schumann’s “Volksliedchen,” shown in example 3.1.8, to

---

28 Contrary to Krehl’s claim that the middle section should not end with a definitive close, here the *Zwischensatz* ends with an authentic cadence, which he does not mention.

29 Both the *Zwischensatz* and the *Hauptsatz* are then repeated—a fact that Krehl does not acknowledge.

30 Krehl’s *kleine dreiteilige Form* resembles Riemann’s *zweiteilige Form* (cf. table 1.3.7, p. 73).

31 Krehl’s *zusammengesetzte dreiteilige Form* is comparable to Riemann’s *dreiteilige Liedform* (cf. table 1.3.7, p. 73).
EXAMPLE 3.1.8 Krehl’s zusammengesetzte dreiteilige Form: R. Schumann, “Volksliedchen,” Album für die Jugend, op. 68, no. 9

(A) *Hauptsatz* (Krehl [1902–3] 1905–6, 1:73, ex. 68a)

(B) *Mittelsatz* (Krehl [1902–3] 1905–6, 1:73, ex. 68b)

illustrate these features. The *Hauptsatz* in example 3.1.8(a) is eight measures long and set in the key of D minor. The *Mittelsatz* in example 3.1.8(b), which is the same length as the *Hauptsatz* when the repeat is accounted for, provides contrasting thematic material and a change in mode from D minor to D major. Yet the *Mittelsatz* is not entirely independent: it ends inconclusively on the dominant (a fact that Krehl fails to mention), contradicting his earlier description of this form. The *Hauptsatz* then returns to complete the three-part structure (not shown), bringing with it the opening motives and the primary key (D major).

Yet Krehl (75–77) has works with more substantial *Mittelsätze* in mind (see table 3.1.3). He categorizes works typically occurring in zusammengesetzte dreiteilige Form into three genres: (1) songs (*Lieder*); (2) dance pieces or scherzos from sonatas (*Tanzstücke oder Scherzosätze der Sonaten*); and (3) movements from chamber works and symphonies (*Kammermusikwerken und Symphonien*).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Lieder</td>
<td>L. van Beethoven: In questa tomba&lt;br&gt;Schubert: Das Fischermädchen&lt;br&gt;“”“”“” Der Doppelsänger&lt;br&gt;“”“”“” An den Mond op. 57 Nr. 3.&lt;br&gt;l. Schumann: Widmung op. 25 Nr. 1&lt;br&gt;“”“”“” Frühlingsnacht op. 29 Nr. 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Tanzstücke oder Scherzosätze der Sonaten</td>
<td>J. S. Bach: englische Suite Nr. 3, Gavotte&lt;br&gt;L. van Beethoven: Nubante der Sonate op. 28&lt;br&gt;Schubert: Moment musical op. 94 Nr. 1&lt;br&gt;Chopin: Polonaises op. 40&lt;br&gt;W. A. Mozart: Allegro op. 93 Nr. 2&lt;br&gt;Beethoven: op. 26 Nr. 1, Gavotte&lt;br&gt;L. van Beethoven: op. 26 Nr. 1, Walzer&lt;br&gt;W. A. Mozart: op. 17 Nr. 2, Menuett.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Kammermusikwerken und Symphonien</td>
<td>W. A. Mozart: 2. Streichquartett (d moll) Menuett.&lt;br&gt;L. van Beethoven: Streichquartett op. 18 Nr. 4 Menuett.&lt;br&gt;Schubert: Symphonie B-dur op. 100.&lt;br&gt;Beethoven: Symphonie B-dur, Menuetto.&lt;br&gt;W. A. Mozart: Symphonie A-dur op. 90.&lt;br&gt;W. A. Mozart: Claviertrio op. 63 D moll. 2. Satz,&lt;br&gt;Symphonie D moll op. 120, Scherzo,&lt;br&gt;Beethoven: Stringe op. 18. Gavotte Menuetto.&lt;br&gt;Symphonie D-dur op. 91, Allegretto.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within Krehl’s first category, Schumann’s song “Widmung,” from the cycle Myrthen, op. 25 (not shown), has a clear three-part structure reflected by its contrasting keys (A-flat major–E major–A-flat major), melodic ideas, and piano accompaniments. But the Mittelsatz does not end with an E-major tonic harmony; instead, it remains harmonically open for the thematic return over a dominant pedal in the primary key (a characteristically Schumannesque blurring of formal boundaries). Within Krehl’s second category, the Andante from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in D Major, op. 28, is also set in three large sections—the first in D minor, the second in D major, and the third again in D minor (not shown). The first Hauptsatz and the Mittelsatz are both structured as kleine dreiteilige Formen with two repeated sections (as in rounded binary form, to use modern
terminology), whereas the second *Hauptsatz* has varied reprises that are fully written out. Within Krehl’s third category, we find minuets and scherzos from string quartets and larger symphonic works by composers ranging from Mozart to Brahms. In these examples, the *Mittelsätze* are designated as trios—namely, independent sections set in a contrasting key (or mode) featuring contrasting motivic ideas. For example, in the wistful *Poco Allegretto* from Brahms’s Symphony no. 3 in F Major, op. 90, the outer *Hauptsätze* are set in the key of C minor; the *Mittelsatz* is set in the key of A-flat major (not shown).

One of Krehl’s (79–84) most detailed analyses is of the last movement from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in C Minor, op. 13. This movement illustrates rondo form, which is organized as a large, more developed three-part structure (A–B–A; *eine erweiterte große dreiteilige Form*) whose outer A sections are further divided into three parts. This results in a seven-part structure overall: A–B–A | C | A–B–A.\(^{32}\) Each of these sections may be structured either as a *Thema* or a *Themengruppe*. As table 3.1.4 shows, the A section in Beethoven’s rondo comprises a *Hauptthema* and a short appendix (*Anhang*) set in the key of C minor, a second *Thema* (also in C minor), and a transition (*Überleitung*) that modulates to E-flat major.\(^{33}\) The B section is structured as a *Themengruppe*, also in E-flat major, that is divided into three *Sätze*, which together are followed by a coda and a retransition (*Rückleitung*) to the primary key (C minor).\(^{34}\) The A section returns in

\(^{32}\) Krehl (86) acknowledges that other rondo forms are possible. He analyzes the last movement of Mozart’s Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, K. 281, as a nine-part rondo with three unique *Mittelsätze* (B, C, and D), the first of which is repeated. This results in the form A–B–A–C–A–D–A–B–A.

\(^{33}\) In table 3.1.4, subsections listed in parentheses, such as the *Anhang* and *Überleitung* in the first A section, are treated as connecting ideas rather than true *Sätze* (or *Themen*). Information appearing in square brackets, including key areas and measure numbers, is based on my own reconstruction of Krehl’s analysis.

\(^{34}\) To illustrate the minimal role that cadential articulation plays in Krehl’s *Formenlehre*, notice that he never mentions the perfect authentic cadence that occurs in the subordinate key
**Table 3.1.4** Krehl’s *Rondoform*: Beethoven, Piano Sonata in C Minor, op. 13/iii (Krehl [1902–3] 1905–6, 1:80–84, exx. 72–78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teil</th>
<th>Satz</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Krehl’s Incipits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A</em></td>
<td><strong>Themengruppe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A</em></td>
<td><strong>Hauptthema</strong></td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>[1–8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Anhang)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[C minor]</td>
<td>[9–12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <em>Thema</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>[C minor]</td>
<td>[12–17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Überleitung)</td>
<td></td>
<td>→ E-flat major</td>
<td>[18–25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. <em>Satz</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E-flat major]</td>
<td>[25ff.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Vermittlung)</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <em>Satz</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E-flat major]</td>
<td>[37ff.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <em>Satz</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>[E-flat major]</td>
<td>[44ff.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Coda)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[E-flat major]</td>
<td>[50ff.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Rückleitung)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[E-flat major → V of C minor]</td>
<td>[56–61]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A</em></td>
<td><strong>Hauptthema</strong></td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>[62–69]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Anhang)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[C minor]</td>
<td>[70–73]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. <em>Thema</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>[C minor]</td>
<td>[73–78]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>C</em></td>
<td><strong>Mittelsatz</strong></td>
<td>A-flat major</td>
<td>[79–86]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Zwischenspiel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>[95–98?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. <em>Satz</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>A-flat major → V of C minor</td>
<td>[98ff.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A</em></td>
<td><strong>Hauptthema</strong></td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>[121–28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Anhang)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[C minor]</td>
<td>[129–34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>B</em></td>
<td><em>(etwas verkürzt)</em></td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>[134ff.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A</em></td>
<td><strong>Hauptthema</strong></td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>[171ff.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(E-flat major) at the end of the second *Satz* (m. 43; see table 3.1.4). In other approaches to sonata form, such as Koch ([1782–93] 1983) and Hepokoski and Darcy (2006), this cadence would mark an important point of closure.
abbreviated form to complete the first large three-part structure \((A\text{–}B\text{–}A)\). The \(C\) section (Mittelsatz) is set in the contrasting key of A-flat major, although a transition to this new key is absent. The \(C\) section is divided into three Sätze. The third Satz effects a retransition from A-flat major to the dominant of C minor, which prepares the return of the second three-part structure \((A\text{–}B\text{–}A)\). Yet this large-scale repetition includes noticeable differences: (1) the initial \(A\) section lacks its second Thema (which Krehl fails to acknowledge); (2) the \(B\) section is abbreviated and now set in the key of C major; and (3) the final return of \(A\) is also abbreviated.

Krehl’s Rondoform is similar to Riemann’s große Rondoform (see table 1.3.7, p. 73) and Schenker’s second version of five-part form shown in example 3.1.1(a) (p. 158). Krehl’s schema \(A\text{–}B\text{–}A \mid C \mid A\text{–}B\text{–}A\) can be mapped onto Schenker’s schema \(a_1\text{–}b_1\text{–}a_2\text{–}c_1\text{+(}b_2\text{–}a_3\), but only if we understand that an \(a\) section between \(c_1\) and \(b_2\) has been suppressed in the latter.\(^{35\text{a}}\) Furthermore, Krehl’s Rondoform is similar to Schenker’s conception of six-part sonata form, except that Schenker’s three-part exposition and recapitulation comprise three distinct sections \((a\text{–}b\text{–}c)\), which is in contrast to Krehl’s \(A\text{–}B\text{–}A\) form. Krehl’s \(C\) section would also be replaced by a Durchführung, similar to Marx’s derivation of sonata form from his fifth rondo (see example 1.3.8[b], p. 24).

Krehl’s (88–91) conception of sonata form, which he regards as “the most perfect, most developed of all forms” (die vollkommenste, entwickeltste aller Formen), is divided into three sections: exposition (Aufstellung der Themen), development (Durchführung), and recapitulation (Wiederholung der Themen). While Schenker’s exposition comprises three themes, Krehl claims that usually there are only two.\(^{36}\) In this case, the first theme is followed by a transition (Überleitung) leading to the second theme in a closely related key. The second theme sometimes includes a Passagenteil (similar

\(^{35\text{a}}\) Suppressing an \(a\) section between \(c_1\) and \(b_2\) is also found in example 3.2.1(d) (see p. 186).

to the *Gang* at the end of the *Seitensatz* in Marx’s conception of sonata form), or the second theme might be followed by a coda. Krehl never discusses a closing theme (*Schlußsatz*).

§ 3.1.3. Schenker’s New *Formenlehre* and the Anxiety of Influence (*Tessera*)

It is clear that Schenker’s forms in example 3.1.1(a) (p. 158) were not appropriated from any one theorist. On the surface, they resemble Marx’s rondo forms, since they are increasingly complex and culminate in sonata form. However, Schenker’s one-part form has no obvious correspondent in Marx’s taxonomy; in the case of four-part form, correspondences with either Marx’s third rondo or sonatina form are not exact (although they are not absent, either). Krehl’s taxonomy of full-movement forms, which shows traces of Marx’s *Formenlehre* (1837–47) as filtered through Riemann’s (1889), provides another model that may have influenced Schenker.

Table 3.1.5 directly compares Schenker’s forms found in the Oster Collection with Krehl’s taxonomy.37 Both theorists begin with one-part form. Their two-part forms differ with respect to thematic resemblance: Krehl’s sections are contrasting (*A*–*B*), whereas Schenker’s are similar (*a*₁–*a*₂). It is unclear whether Krehl’s small three-part form more closely resembles Schenker’s two- or three-part form; it largely depends on the status of Krehl’s *Zwischensatz* and whether it counts as true “part” (*Teil*). Schenker’s three-part form corresponds to Krehl’s composite three-part form. Schenker’s four-part form corresponds to Krehl’s sonatina form (*Sonatine*), since Krehl’s exposition typically comprises only two themes.38

---

37 The schemas provided in square brackets are my own, following what Schenker and Krehl would likely have indicated.

38 However, Krehl’s ([1902–3] 1905–6, 1:90–93) sonatina form is not a “sonata form without development,” since this form sometimes includes a modest development section.
TABLE 3.1.5 A comparison of Schenker’s early forms (OC 83/255) with Krehl’s große Formen (Krehl [1902–3] 1905–6, vol. 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schenker’s Formen (OC 83/255)</th>
<th>Krehl’s große Formen ([1902–3] 1905–6, vol. 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form</strong></td>
<td><strong>Schema</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-part form</td>
<td>([a])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-part form</td>
<td>(a_1–a_2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-part form</td>
<td>(a_1–b–a_2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-part form (rondo form)</td>
<td>(a_1–b_1–a_2–b_2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-part form (rondo form)</td>
<td>(a_1–b_1–a_2–c_1–a_3) or (a_1–b_1–a_2–c_1 \text{ or } (b_2–a_3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-part form (cyclic form)</td>
<td>(a_1–b–c_1 \text{ (Df)} a_2–b_2–c_2) (= (a_1–b–a_2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schenker’s alternative version of five-part rondo form has a potential correspondence with Krehl’s, although it must be understood that an \(a\) section has been suppressed between \(c_1\) and \(b_2\).

And while Schenker’s three-part sonata-form exposition \((a–b–c)\) differs from Krehl’s emphasis on only two themes, the former can perhaps be attributed to Bruckner’s influence (see § 1.3.4).

Yet there is a more important point to be made here other than the influence of particular theorists, for despite whatever differences exist between Schenker’s schematic forms and those of his predecessors, it is abundantly clear that he is working within the nineteenth-century Formenlehre tradition—a tradition that originated with Marx and was passed down to Bruckner, Riemann, and Krehl (among many others). The forms described in Schenker’s early notes (example 3.1.1[a], p. 158)—the same forms that Schenker describes in the final chapter of Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, 128–45)—continue this tradition rather than break from it. As Nicholas Cook rightly observes, “What is at issue here is essentially the rehabilitation of certain aspects of what
Schenker saw as ‘false theory’” (2007, 285). Indeed, all of Schenker’s heated polemics against the Formenlehre tradition only betray that tradition’s enormous influence—whether in Schenker’s “Geist” essay ([1895] 2007), unpublished “Niedergang” typescript ([1905–6] 2005a), monograph on Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony ([1912] 1992), or any of his later polemics, up to and including Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, 138), where he ardently complains that previous textbooks “present rubrics, which are like a set of children’s building blocks.”39 The schemas derived in his late approach to form—schemas purportedly generated by spans of transformational voice leading—are in fact the same schemas that Schenker had devised before he ever developed the idea of the Urlinie (see table 3.1.1, p. 162).

By redefining form according to divisions of the Urlinie, Schenker attempted to complete the Formenlehre tradition through its antithesis (tessera): the continuity of voice leading.40 Voice leading and form are antipodes. As Frank Samarotto (2005, 1) writes, “voice leading is by nature an embodiment of continuity, brought about by the coherence of melodic or harmonic units, while form is about segmentation, brought about by surface articulation, repetition, cadential closure, and so on.” In Schenker’s late thought, generative voice leading is privileged over traditional conceptions of outer form; or, as Cook (2007, 285) summarizes the approach in Der freie Satz, “What are traditionally called outer forms are epiphenomena, simply the outcomes of deeper process, the projection of background and middleground on the foreground: you cannot theorise them in their own right.” But Schenker did theorise outer forms in their own right, only

39 “Statt des in einem Meisterwerk waltenden Organischen einer Sonatenform stellen die Lehrbücher Rubriken auf, eine Art Steinbaukasten zu kindischem Spiel” (Schenker 1935, 223).

40 Regarding tessera, see Bloom (1973, 14, 49–73). Bloom writes, “In this sense of a completing link, the tessera [completion and antithesis] represents any later poet’s attempt to persuade himself (and us) that the precursor’s Word would be worn out if not redeemed as a newly fulfilled and enlarged Word of the ephebe” (67).
he did so approximately twenty years earlier, jotting down cursory notes on a few pages now archived in the Oster Collection.

§ 3.2. SCHENKER'S FORMS IN CONTEXT: FROM ONE-PART TO FIVE-PART FORM

This section expounds the first five conformational forms shown in example 3.1.1(a) (see p. 158). After representing these forms schematically, Schenker provides general notes (Allgemeines) regarding each (see example 3.2.1). Example 3.2.1(a) describes two-, three-, and four-part forms; a transcription follows in example 3.2.1(b). A second page of notes, shown in example 3.2.1(c), describes five- and six-part forms, again followed by a transcription in example 3.2.1(d). (Individual pages in the Oster Collection are dedicated to each form as well.) In the subsections below, these documents are described in detail. Representative analyses, both published and unpublished, illustrate how Schenker applied these schemas to compositions by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Chopin, and Brahms.

§ 3.2.1. One-part Form

Few details regarding Schenker's early conception of one-part form are known. In example 3.1.1(a) (see p. 158), one-part form is listed as a possibility, but Schenker includes it in parentheses, does not provide a schema (writing only N.B.), and does not group it with the remaining forms through the large bracket on the right side of the page. He also does not include

41 Six-part sonata form (cyclic form) is discussed separately in § 3.3 below.
42 See Kalib (1973, 1:238–39) for Schenker's later approach to one-part form.
EXAMPLE 3.2.1 General notes on form (Allgemeines)

(A) Notes on two-, three-, and four-part forms in Schenker’s handwriting (OC 83/255; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
EXAMPLE 3.2.1 CONTINUED

(B) Transcription: Notes on two-, three-, and four-part forms (OC 83/255)

Allgemein.

2-tlg.: $a_1-\overline{a_2}$

ist durch den Wiederholungstrieb bedingt.

$a_1-b-a_2$

(b) (Mittelstück) zunächst mehr Spannungsmittel (vgl. I §.), als wirkliches Selbstzweck d.h. ein wirklich neuer Gegensatz. Braucht nicht einmal den bei jedem wirklichem Gegensatz sonst nothwendigen Gegensatz auch der Tonart mit sich zu führen, wodurch erwiesen ist, daß hinter dieser Form doch eigentlich die $\overline{a}$ sich verbirgt, daher Neigung zu Rückfällen der $\overline{a}$ in $\overline{a}$, besonders bei zu geringer Ausbildung des $b_1$ u.s.w.

Noch ist Zweck der bloßen Dyadik u. der eines Gegensatzes gleichsam im Gleichgewicht.

$b$ wird Gegensatz. Gegensatz als Selbstzweck: Beweis dessen Wiederholung. Auch Gegns. der Tonart zugleich organischer mit bedingt, wenn die Form Sinn haben soll. $b_1$ u. $b_2$

trägt mit Sicherheit selbst bereits eine ganze Form, ein größtes Stück, u. nicht leicht den Fall zu denken, wo diese Form blos in Diensten einer anderen stand.

$b_1$ – durchaus neue Tonart.

$b_2$ – ebenso eine der $a_1$ u. $a_2$ [illegible: fremde?], also neue Tonart, die aber dieselbe sein kann, wie bei $b_1$.

Diese Form weist nur einen Gegensatz auf.
EXAMPLE 3.2.1 CONTINUED

(c) Notes on five- and six-part forms in Schenker’s handwriting (OC 83/257; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
EXAMPLE 3.2.1 CONTINUED

(D) Transcription: Notes on five- and six-part forms (OC 83/257)

Fünfte tlq.

• Die Form zweier Gegensätze. –

• Die Gegensätze sind aber von einander getrennt. Es ist, als
wären 2 Formen mit einander verbunden, u. als würde jedes Mal
das \(a_1\) den jeweiligen Gegensatz an der Hand führen u. so anführen.
Daher \(a_1\), \(a_2\) u. \(a_3\) immer dieselbe Tonart aufweisen. *

*** Aus \(a_1\)–\(b_1\)–\(a_2\)–\(c_1\)–\(a_3\)–\(b_2\)–\(a_4\) entsteht durch
billige Restriction, d. i. durch Weglassung des \(a_3\) u. Zusammenziehung
von \(c_1\) u. \(b_2\) zu neuer Gruppe auch die andere Form:
\[a_1\)–\(b_1\)–\(a_2\)–\(c_1\)–\(a_3\)–\(b_2)–\(a_4\)
\(a_3\) eigentlich dann von Haus aus \(a_4\).

• Die Form zweier Gegensätze, die sogar gleich hintereinander auftreten.

• Nicht mehr die Behutsamkeit der Einführung des zweiten Gegensatzes
(wie bei der Rondoinform) mittels rückkehrende \(a_2\), vielmehr

*** Die mitten gelagerte \(Df\) ist es, die dieser Form das Eigentümliche verschafft.
Setze man statt ihrer wieder \(a\), also \(a_2\), u. wir sind sofort
bei der bloß 4-tlg. Form \(\searrow\), möge der Gegensatz noch so stark
auf den Stand neuer zusammengesetzten „Gruppen“ gebracht worden sein;
\(b_1\) u. \(c_1\) würden dann unbedingt [illegible] [illegible] aber bloß des [illegible: bekannten?] \(b_1\)
des \(\searrow\) [illegible] Gefühl erscheinen: so stark würde die
Rückkehr des \(a_2\) wirken.
Es müßte also statt \(a_2\) ein Neues gesetzt werden; d. ist der Sinn
der \(Df\).
Daß die große Inhaltsmasse den rasch hintereinander aufgebauten
Gegensatz \(b_1\) u. \(c_1\), der \(Df\) in thematischer Endsicht [illegible]
näherer Auseitung (thematische Arbeit) erfordert,
is selbstverständlich. Diese [illegible: Tendenz?] kann aber unter
Umständen auch überflüssig sein.

**** Verschleierte Rückkehr zur Urform \(\searrow\): mußig jedoch
[illegible] zu betonen. Der [illegible] gegenüber dieser liegt
darin: daß ein wirklicher Gegensatz in reiner [illegible] Tonart
gebracht wird, u. daß dieser Gegensatz eine quantitativ so
starke Erweiterung des Inhaltes aufweist.
a discussion of one-part form in the notes excerpted in example 3.2.1(a). Similar to Krehl’s *Formenlehre*, perhaps this schema is understood primarily as a theoretical necessity—a basic building block from which other forms are constructed. Or perhaps this schema is not described in detail due to one-part form’s violation of the law of repetition—the principle underlying Schenker’s entire theory (see § 2.2). It is also unclear which pieces might have been classified as one-part forms. This schema likely includes strophic songs, themes for variation sets, and pattern preludes by Baroque composers such as J. S. Bach, but it is difficult to know with certainty.

§ 3.2.2. Two-part Form: Beethoven’s Late Piano Sonatas (op. 109/ii and iii, op. 110/iii, and op. 111/ii); Other Works

Example 3.2.1(b) merely states that two-part form (a₁—a₂) arises due to an urge toward repetition (*ist durch den Wiederholungstrieb bedingt*). Example 3.2.2 provides a more detailed explanation. In example 3.2.2(a), Schenker outlines two-part form as an independent (selbstständig), single entity (*Ein einzelnes Gebilde*). At the page’s top-left corner, two schemas are listed: a₁—a₁ (an exact repetition) and a₁—a₂ (a varied repetition). These schemas, particularly a₁—a₂, are illustrated by works listed down the right side of the page (from top to bottom): the first movement of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in C-sharp Minor, op. 27, no. 2; waltzes by Schubert; movements from Schumann’s *Davidsbündlertänze*, op. 6; themes from variation sets, including those from Beethoven’s late piano sonatas op. 109 and op. 111; and the *Arioso dolente* from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A-flat Major, op. 110/iii. Near the center of the page, Schenker questions whether exact parallelism between a₁ and a₂ should be ruled out (*Vollständiger Parallelismus von a₁ u. a₂ auszuschließen?*), concluding that the a₂ section does require variety (a₂
EXAMPLE 3.2.2 Notes on two-part forms

(A) Notes on independent two-part forms in Schenker’s handwriting with transcription (OC 83/259; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
**EXAMPLE 3.2.2 CONTINUED**

**(B)** Five types of two-part form enlarged with transcription (OC 83/259; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

**(C)** Notes on dependent two-part forms in Schenker’s handwriting with transcription (OC 83/260; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
bedarf einer Abwechslung). Indeed, a modest contrast (Ein bescheidener Gegensatz) is usually required (ist in den meisten Fällen erforderlich). This contrast is achieved through a new motive (Motiv), a new key (Tonart), or both (Motiv u. Tonart). On the left side of the page, Schenker cautions that this contrast (Gegensatz) should not become too great (Die Einheit darf dadurch aber nicht gesprengt werden) because, as the note near the bottom of example 3.2.2(a) suggests, a two-part form \((a_1\rightarrow a_2)\) risks becoming a three-part form \((a_1\rightarrow b\rightarrow a_2)\), whereby the beginning of the \(a_2\) section in the former develops into the \(b\) section in the latter (discussed below).

The asterisk written at the beginning of this note at the bottom of example 3.2.2(a) corresponds with the asterisks shown in the region highlighted by the dashed rectangle. This region is enlarged in example 3.2.2(b), where two-part form’s five tonal plans, which I have designated types 1 through 5, are listed. The first type is outlined directly below the binary branch \((a_1\rightarrow a_2)\) written at the top. In this case, the \(a_1\) and \(a_2\) sections both begin and end with tonic Stufen in the primary key. The question mark written just to the right of this schema suggests that Schenker did not have a ready example from the repertoire in mind, but this schema is offered as a theoretical possibility nonetheless. In a type-2 situation, \(a_1\) begins and ends on tonic Stufen; \(a_2\) begins with a modulation to a subordinate key (Ton\[art\] mod\[uliert\]?\) and eventually returns to the primary key, which is confirmed by ending with a tonic Stufe. The type-3 schema presents a similar situation, except that \(a_1\) begins off tonic (e.g., on a supertonic or dominant Stufe).

\[\text{Page 190}\]

\[\text{This conclusion implicitly rejects the } a_1\rightarrow a_1 \text{ schema as a two-part form. Krehl reached a similar conclusion in his discussion of example 3.1.6(b) (see p. 172), claiming that two-part form is best conceived as } a\rightarrow b \text{ rather than } a\rightarrow a. \text{ Moreover, Schenker’s conception of two-part form does not require a varied repetition; he also analyzes contrasting periods } (a\rightarrow b) \text{ as two-part forms.}

\[\text{See Kalib (1973, 1:239–42) for Schenker’s later approach to two-part form, which has interruption (Unterbrechung) as its basis rather than contrasting motives and keys.}

\[\text{This off-tonic beginning is what Schenker ([1935] 1979, 89) would later describe as an auxiliary cadence; see Burstein (2005a).}\]
It is not clear how the Roman numerals beginning and ending each formal section in example 3.2.2(b) should be interpreted. Perhaps Schenker means to relate each section’s beginning and ending to the beginning and ending harmonies of its underlying Stufengang. A stronger claim would suggest that each Stufe at the end of these progressions functions as what Schenker describes in Harmonielehre (1906, 297) as a Stufe als Satzteiler, or a Stufe that demarcates a formal division (see § 2.4.3). In this case, the last Stufe in each section represents a particular kind of cadence: (1) an authentic cadence if the section ends with a tonic Stufe; or (2) a half cadence if the section ends with a dominant Stufe.

Although Schenker describes in Harmonielehre ([1906] 1956, 217) how form interacts with the Stufengang to create a cadence, this relationship became increasingly ambivalent over time. He sometimes observes a cadence at the end of a formal division; at other times, a cadence is more akin to a harmonic progression unfolding over multiple measures. We find descriptions of both types in his explanatory edition of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E Major, op. 109 (this 1913 publication is contemporaneous with the notes in example 3.2.2). Schenker relates cadences to formal punctuation in the second movement (see example 3.2.3[a]), when he writes, “The first thematic component a is divided as twice four bars, with half cadence in bar 4 and perfect authentic cadence in bar 8” ([1913] 2015, 1:43). But later he describes how, in example 3.2.3(b), “the closing theme, at first a group of four bars and a group of five bars, are juxtaposed: bars 57–60 and 61–65 respectively; but for the final cadence in bars 66–69, the bass avails itself of the first four bars of the movement” ([1913] 2015, 1:47). This “final cadence” is not a division at the end

46 “Der erste Teilgedanke a) gliedert sich in 2×4 Takte: Halbschluß in T. 4, vollkommener Ganzschluß in T. 8” (Schenker 1913, 36).
47 “Im Schlußgedanken stehen einander zunächst vier und fünf Takte gegenüber, T. 57–60 : 61–65; die letzte Kadenz aber in T. 66–69 apostrophiert wieder die ersten vier Takte” (Schenker 1913, 37).
EXAMPLE 3.2.3 Two kinds of “cadence” in Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E Major, op. 109/ii

(A) Cadence as formal punctuation, mm. 1–8 (Schenker [1913] 2015, 1:43)

(B) Cadence as harmonic progression (Stufengang), mm. 57–70 (Schenker [1913] 2015, 1:47)

of a formal section; rather, it comprises the entire Stufengang unfolding over the course of mm. 66–69. Yet this “cadence” is still associated with a formal division, at least to some extent, since it marks the end of the closing theme.

48 In other words, in example 3.2.3(a), Schenker observes a cadence in m. 4 as a formal division, whereas in example 3.2.3(b), he identifies the entire Stufengang comprising mm. 66–69 as
A more extreme divorce between the concepts of cadence and formal division occurs in the explanatory edition of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A-flat Major, op. 110 (Schenker [1914] 2015, 2:80–81). Schenker observes a cadence in each of the third movement’s first three measures, and in three different keys (see example 3.2.4): m. 1 presents a cadence in the key of B-flat minor, with the Stufengang I–IV–VII(V)–I over a tonic pedal; m. 2 presents a cadence in the key of C-flat major, with the Stufengang I–IV–V; and m. 3 presents a cadence in the key of A-flat minor, with the Stufengang I–II–V. Throughout this chapter, form-defining cadences like those in example 3.2.3(a), which Schenker mentions explicitly in his analyses, are indicated using modern designations (e.g., I:HC or V:PAC). Cadences that Schenker does not mention, but likely would have heard, are indicated using question marks (e.g., I:HC?). The two conceptions of what a cadence involves suggest that the relationship between cadential articulation and formal division is not as strong in Schenker’s early Formenlehre as it is in eighteenth-century approaches, such as Koch ([1782–93] 1983), or as it is in present-day approaches, such as Caplin (1998) and Hepokoski and Darcy (2006). Although Schenker sometimes mentions cadences as form-defining events, we should not mistake this with an approach in which cadences (qua punctuation) are necessary to demarcate formal sections.

Returning to example 3.2.2(b) (see p. 189) and the discussion of two-part form, Schenker lists Schubert’s Waltz in A-flat Major, op. 9, no. 2, as an example of the type-2 schema in particular. Example 3.2.5 reconstructs how he might have analyzed this piece ca. 1911. The a₁ section (mm. 1–8) begins and ends on a tonic Stufe in the primary key. The a₂ section (mm. 8–16) a cadence. Schenker’s description of mm. 66–69 as the “final cadence” suggests that mm. 57–60 and mm. 61–65 are perhaps heard as cadences as well.

49 Labels appearing in square brackets, such as those in example 3.2.3(b), are also my own. 50 For more on Koch’s punctuation form, see Ratner (1949) and Berger (1996).
EXAMPLE 3.2.4 Cadences as harmonic progression (Stufengang) in Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A-flat Major, op. 110/iii, mm. 1–3 (Schenker [1914] 2015, 2:80–81)

EXAMPLE 3.2.5 Type-2 two-part form: Schubert’s Waltz in A-flat Major, op. 9, no. 2
swerves away from this key, first through A-flat minor in mm. 9–10 (reinterpreted as a mediant \( Stufe \) in E major), and then through a V–I progression in the key of E major (mm. 11–12). The new E-major tonic (an enharmonic respelling of F-flat major) also functions as \( \text{I}_6 \) in the primary key. In m. 13, the \( \text{I}_6 \) chord is transformed into a German augmented sixth chord (\( \text{I}_4 \)), which leads to a perfect authentic cadence (V–I) confirming the primary key in m. 16.\(^{51}\) The melodic similarities that \( a_1 \) and \( a_2 \) share support hearing these sections as parallel despite the harmonic events at the beginning of \( a_2 \).

With the type-4 schema in example 3.2.2(b) (p. 189), the \( a_1 \) section moves from I to V; or, what the footnote at the bottom of example 3.2.2(a) describes as a development toward the dominant \( Stufe \) (\( \text{aber nur eine Entwicklung zu } V \)) that maintains a connection with the old tonic (\( \text{die alte Tonika fortbesteht} \)).\(^{52}\) But, to paraphrase Schenker’s continuing discussion: If there are new motives at the beginning of the \( a_2 \) section accompanied by new keys, then this passage becomes an embryo for the \( b \) section in a more developed three-part form (\( a_1–b–a_2 \)).\(^{53}\) The themes from the last movements of Beethoven’s piano sonatas op. 109 and op. 111 are listed as examples.\(^{54}\)

---

\(^{51}\) In Harmonielehre, Schenker ([1906] 1954, 281, exx. 255–56) describes augmented sixth chords using \( Stufen \) from two different keys (e.g., a French augmented sixth chord in the key of F minor is heard as the combination of a supertonic \( Stufe \) in F minor and a dominant \( Stufe \) in C major). However, when a submedian \( Stufe \) progresses to a German augmented sixth chord, he usually interprets the augmented sixth chord as \( \text{I}_4 \) (Schenker [1906] 1954, 270, ex. 239).

\(^{52}\) Whether or not this might also constitute a modulation to the dominant key is unclear. Schenker’s schema indicates that a return-modulation (\( \text{Rückmodulation} \)) follows, which implies a prior modulation.

\(^{53}\) “Da die Aufbau neuer Motivbildung zu Anfang das \( a_2 \) u. namentlich wenn dies auch von [illegible] Tonarten begleitet sind, ist das Embryo [illegible] nachfolg. Form [\( b \) section in a three-part form] zu erblicken” (OC 83/259). This description of the beginning of \( a_2 \) as an embryo for the \( b \) section in a three-part form is reminiscent of Schenker’s description of the “budding seventh-chord” (keimende Vierklang) in book II of Kontrapunkt ([1922] 1987, 215–17).

\(^{54}\) Schenker also lists the theme from Handel’s Aria con Variazioni, Suite in B-flat Major, BWV 434. He later changed his mind about the form of this theme, describing it as a three-part form in Der Tonwille, issues 8–9 (Schenker [1923–24] 2005b, 78; [1915] 2015, 3:79–80n2).
**EXAMPLE 3.2.6** Type-4 two-part form: Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E Major, op. 109/iii, theme (Schenker [1913] 2015, 1:55–58)

The theme from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E Major, op. 109/iii, is divided into $a_1$ (mm. 1–8) and $a_2$ (mm. 9–16), as shown in example 3.2.6. In commentary from his explanatory edition, Schenker ([1913] 2015, 1:55) identifies the two-note melodic motives highlighted by the wavy-line brackets in mm. 1, 3, 5, and 7, observing that they all lead to the note E₄. He cautions that this repetition poses the “difficulty of expressing through variations a tonal event that occurs with such purposeful urgency no fewer than four times within eight bars.”

Apart from this danger lurking from the side of compositional technique, the Theme is hostage to yet a second peril, which springs from the fact that the

---

55 “Welche Schwierigkeit es aber bedeutet, einen binnen 8 Takten nicht weniger als viermal mit so programmatischer Eindringlichkeit wiederkehrenden Tonfall durch Variationen auszudrücken” (Schenker 1913, 40).
harmonies in bars 1–8 twice make the turn to the dominant; and further, that these
turns occur in bars 4 and 8, which have special and fundamental significance for
the shaping of form. As a result the eight bars threaten from the outset to fragment
into two four-bar groups.

Beethoven, however, was aware of all these difficulties, as is clearly shown
by the means he employed to counter them: first, the application of a cresc. sign in
bars 4–5, which, to the same extent that it enables the fifth bar to follow
ineluctably from the fourth, now also compels the conceptual joining—that is to
say the unification—of all eight bars . . . and second, the very telling legato slur
that leads from the inner voice of the right hand of bar 4 across to the first tone of
the arpeggio in bar 5.

In bars 9–16 too, which represent a consequent [Nachsatz] to bars 1–8, the
danger impends on harmonic grounds of division into twice four bars; but since in
bar 12, in an apparent modulation to G[-sharp] minor [Schein-Modulation nach Gis-
moll], scale degree III (thus at least not once again the dominant of the key)
appears, the danger is lessened, so that the remedy through crescendo used in bar 4
turns out here, in bar 12, to be unnecessary.56 (Schenker [1913] 2015, 1:55–56)

Although the beginning of $a_2$ carries with it a modulation—even if this modulation is only
apparent, and despite the perfect authentic cadence that seemingly lurks in m. 12—Schenker is
not willing to grant these tonal events form-generating status by raising mm. 9–12 to the level of
a contrasting b section. Perhaps this is because he hears a parallelism in the melody between
mm. 1–4 and mm. 9–12; perhaps he wishes to maintain the unity of mm. 9–16, parallel to the

56 “Außer dieser latenten kompositionstechnischen haftet dem Thema noch eine zweite
Gefahr an, die davon herrührt, daß die Harmonien in den T. 1–8 die Wendung zur Dominante
zweimal nehmen, obendrein in den für die Formbildung mit besonderer und prinzipieller
Bedeutung in Frage kommenden T. 4 und 8, wodurch aber die 8 Takte von vornherein in zwei
4-taktige Gruppen zu zerfallen drohen. [/] Aller dieser Schwierigkeiten war sich indessen auch
Beethoven bewußt, wie es deutlich die Mittel zeigen, deren er sich eigens zu dem Zwecke
bedient, ihnen zu begegnen: 1. die Anweisung eines cresc.-Zeichens in T. 4–5, das im selben
Maße, als es die Eroberung des 5. Taktes vom 4. aus ermöglicht, nun auch die geistige
Verkettung, d.i. die Einheit sämtlicher 8 Takte . . . erzwingt; und 2. der sehr ingeniose legato-
Bogen, der von der Mittelstimme der r. H. des T. 4 hinüber zum 1. Arpeggioton des 5. Taktes
führt! [/] Auch den T. 9–16, die sich als Nachsatz der T. 1–8 darstellen, droht aus harmonischen
Gründen ebenfalls die Gefahr der Teilung in zweimal 4 Takte; da indessen in T. 12 die III. Stufe
(Schein-Modulation nach Gis-moll)—also doch mindestens nicht wieder die Dominante der
Tonart!—vorliegt, so ist die Gefahr eine geringere, weshalb denn auch das in T. 4 verwendete
cresc.-Hilfsmittel sich hier, in T. 12, als überflüssig erweist” (Schenker 1913, 40; slashes [/]
indicate new paragraphs).
unity of mm. 1–8; or, perhaps he simply wishes to acknowledge Beethoven’s repeat signs. But whatever the constellation of reasons for why he interprets this theme as $a_1-a_2$ rather than $a_1-b-a_2$, Schenker’s arguments clearly discount the importance of inner tonal processes, such as (apparent) modulations and cadences, and privilege the outer form as two parallel eight-measure units demarcated by repeats.

In example 3.2.2(b) (see p. 189), the type-5 schema further discounts inner tonal processes a determinant of form (namely, the presence of an independent $b$ section in a three-part form). In this case, $a_1$ begins on a tonic $Stufe$ and leads to a true modulation; conversely, $a_2$ begins with a return-modulation ($Rückmodulation$) and leads back to the tonic $Stufe$ in the primary key. The *Arioso dolente* from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A-flat Major, op. 110/iii, illustrates this schema (an analysis appears in the lower right-hand corner of example 3.2.2[b]). Example 3.2.7 shows this analysis in context, taking into account commentary from Schenker’s ([1914] 2015, 2:93–103) explanatory edition. There he relates the modest formal scope of this *arioso* to Beethoven’s declining health:

Thus in our case the (programmatically posited) unhappy bodily constitution of the composer naturally sets only narrow boundaries to the form, and whatever in it could at all be interpreted as will to modulation (from As minor to Cs major) and thus, at the same time, as symptom of the first conquering of the weakness, the image of a real weakness is on the contrary nurtured by the fact that the tones of the melody drift as though broken and worn out, mostly only in displacements from the rhythmically strong positions.57 (Schenker [1914] 2015, 2:93)

57 “So zieht denn also auch in unserem Falle die (programmatisch vorausgesetzte) unsele Körperliche Verfassung des Autors der Form naturgemäß nur enge Grenzen, und was in ihr allenfalls als Wille zur Modulation (von As moll nach Cs dur) und damit immerhin zugleich als Symptom einer ersten Überwindung der Ohnmacht gedeutet werden könnte, wird dem Bild einer wirklichen Ohnmacht umgekehrt wieder dadurch genähert, daß die Töne der Melodie wie gebrochen und zermürbt meistens nur in Rückungen den rhythmisch stärkeren Stellen zutreiben” (Schenker 1914, 55). For musical narratives that involve Beethoven overcoming disability, see Straus (2011, 45–62).
EXAMPLE 3.2.7 Type-5 two-part form: Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A-flat Major, op. 110/iii, *Arioso dolente* (Schenker [1914] 2015, 2:93–103)

\[ a_1 \text{ (mm. 9–16)} \]

(Klagender Gesang)

Arioso dolente

\[
\begin{align*}
9 & \quad \text{p} \\
13 & \quad \text{cres.}
\end{align*}
\]

A-flat minor: I \quad \text{V}

\[ a_2 \text{ (mm. 17–24)} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
17 & \quad \text{cres.}
\end{align*}
\]

Rückmodulation to A-flat minor: IV \quad \text{V}

\[ \text{No IHC here} \]

\[ \text{I-PAC? [Anhang]} \]
The \textit{a}_1 section (mm. 9–16) is internally divided by a half cadence in m. 12. The tonic in m. 13 is reinterpreted as VI in the key of C-flat major, followed by the confirmation of C-flat major through a perfect authentic cadence in m. 16. The \textit{a}_2 section (mm. 17–26) begins with a return-modulation (\textit{Rückmodulation}) to the key of A-flat minor. Unlike \textit{a}_1, \textit{a}_2 is not internally divided: Schenker (102), in his commentary on proper performance, explicitly denies the existence of a half cadence in m. 20 (cf. m. 12). Presumably \textit{a}_2 concludes with a perfect authentic cadence in m. 24, perhaps followed by an \textit{Anhang} in mm. 25–26.

This analysis raises a number of questions. Why might Schenker hear this passage as a two-part form rather than a three-part form? Given the half cadence in m. 12, might mm. 13–16 constitute a \textit{b} section set in a contrasting key (C-flat major)? And if one hears a half cadence in m. 12, why not also hear one in m. 20? Perhaps Schenker hears this \textit{arioso} as a two-part form due to the melodic parallelisms shared between mm. 9–12 and mm. 17–20—an approach that privileges the eight-measure \textit{Periode} schema, even when it conflicts with the tonal layout.

But by 1915, Schenker ([1915] 2015, 3:79–84) had come to recognize the form-defining significance of such tonal events in his analysis of the theme from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in C Minor, op. 111/ii, writing,

> For all that the brevity as well as the external division of the Arietta (into eight bars followed by eight bars) may suggest the assumption of only a two-part song form, according to its inner nature, as will be demonstrated in the immediately following discussion, it is far more accurately described as a three-part song form, although to be sure as one of the smallest dimensions.\textsuperscript{58} (Schenker [1915] 2015, 3:79; emphasis mine)

This theme appears in example 3.2.8. Schenker hears \textit{a}_1 (mm. 1–8) as twice progressing toward

\textsuperscript{58} “So sehr die Kürze wie die äußere Einteilung der Arietta (in 8 zu 8 Takten) die Annahme nur einer zweiteiligen Form nahelegen, ist sie ihrem inneren Wesen nach, wie gleich unten begründet wird, dennoch weit eher als eine dreiteilige Liedform, allerdings als eine solche kleinsten Ausmaßes zu bezeichnen” (Schenker 1915, 53).
the dominant, first in in m. 4, and then in m. 8 (first ending only). The second ending concludes with a tonic Stufe, which is then reinterpreted as III in the key of A minor. The b section (mm. 9–12; a four-measure Taktgruppe) is set in this new key, ending with a half cadence in m. 12. Measure 13 marks the beginning of a2 and the return of the primary key, although this section is shortened by four measures relative to its eight-measure counterpart (a1).

Despite this theme’s division into three parts (a1–b–a2) based on its tonal layout, Schenker still hears a two-part melodic-motivic design. The E5–C5–B4 melodic motion in mm. 3–4 is heard in relation to similar melodic motion in mm. 11–12, the latter recontextualized in the key of A minor. Schenker also hears a parallelism between the end of a1 and the end of a2, in which the ascending stepwise third in mm. 7–8 (B4–C5–D5) is continued by the ascending stepwise third in mm. 13–14 (D5–E5–F5). The latter ascent surpasses the space of a third (D5–F5) to complete an ascending fourth to G5 (see mm. 15, 16, and 16 bis). As a result, the melody in a1 (mm. 1–8) is largely parallel to the melody in b–a2 (mm. 9–16). Therefore, while the latent two-part melodic-motivic design conflicts with the three-part tonal plan (C major–A minor–C major):

Thus the a2 section excerpts from the a1 actually nothing more than merely its cadential gesture, and the master was all the more able to leave it at that as the middle part itself had already provided an analogy to bars 1–4, so that bars 9–16 taken as a whole yield a counterpart to the first section that may be called nearly complete—which however by no means deters me from elevating bars 9–12, as already noted, to the status of a relatively independent middle section by virtue of the decisive role of its harmony alone.60 (Schenker [1915] 2015, 3:84).

59 All Stufen notated in example 3.2.8, other than the submedian Stufe in m. 13, are mentioned in Schenker’s commentary ([1915] 2015, 3:79–84). The placement of the dominant and tonic Stufen on the downbeats of m. 1 and m. 2 respectively is unusual: the inner-voice E4 in m. 1 and the inner-voice D4 in m. 2 are both heard as upward-resolving suspensions (81, fig. 80).

60 “Somit exzerpiert der a2-Teil aus dem a1-Teil nun wirklich nichts mehr als bloß dessen Schlußwendung, und umsomehr konnte es der Meister bloß dabei allein bewenden lassen, als ja auch schon das Mittelstück in seiner Art eine Analogie zu den T. 1–4 geboten, so daß die T. 9–16 nun in Summa ein beinahe vollständig zu nennendes Gegenstück zum ersten Teil ergeben, —was mich aber durchaus nicht hindert, die T. 9–12, wie schon oben gesagt wurde, allein nur wegen
EXAMPLE 3.2.8 Three-part versus two-part form: Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in C Minor, op. 111/ii, theme (Schenker [1915] 2015, 3:79–84)

Schenker tries to have it both ways, which is not unusual. Perhaps this is the earliest example of an overt conflict between inner and outer form in his published work—except, in this case, key areas define the inner form, similar to the key areas (Stufen als Tonarten) that unify groups in Schenker’s early conception of cyclic form (see § 2.5.3). It is this correspondence between well-defined key areas and independent formal sections that increasingly became the basis for his conception of large-scale form in general, whether it is the form of an entire movement, the exposition of a sonata, or a modest theme from a set of variations.

der entscheidenden Rolle ihrer Harmonie zu einem relativ selbständigen Mittelstück zu erheben” (Schenker 1915, 54–55).
Before considering three-part form further, we turn to example 3.2.2(c) (see p. 189), which outlines Schenker’s conception of two-part form as a dependent (unselbständig) entity, or as a component part of some larger form. (In example 3.2.2[c], these schemas are highlighted by the dashed rectangle.) For instance, form diagrams for two of Chopin’s nocturnes located at the bottom of the page indicate that their \( a_1 \) sections, which are part of an overall three-part structure \((a_1–b–a_2)\), are divided further into \( a_1 \) and \( a_2 \). The first diagram shows the form of Chopin’s Nocturne in F Minor, op. 55, no. 1. The large \( a_1 \) section (mm. 1–16; not shown) comprises a Vordersatz and a Nachsatz, each beginning and ending on tonic Stufen, perhaps implying authentic cadences. The second diagram shows the form of Chopin’s Nocturne in F-sharp Major, op. 15, no. 2. Again, the large \( a_1 \) section (mm. 1–16; not shown) comprises two parallel Sätze that begin on tonic Stufen. The Vordersatz (I–V) ends on a dominant Stufe (perhaps implying a half cadence), while the Nachsatz (I–I) ends on a tonic Stufe (perhaps implying an authentic cadence).

Below these diagrams, Schenker lists the first part (erste T[ei]l) of the Adagio from Beethoven’s Sonata for Piano and Violin in F Major, op. 24.\(^61\) This analysis is reconstructed in example 3.2.9(a), based on the document from the Oster Collection shown in example 3.2.9(b).\(^62\) The latter example divides the first large section of the form \((A_1)\) into two parts (Vorder- and Nachsatz), both based on the same underlying Stufengang (I–V–V–I). In example 3.2.9(a), these Stufen mark the beginning and ending harmonies, respectively, of the two four-measure Taktschritte that compose each Satz. The Vordersatz begins with a tonic Stufe in m. 2; the

\(^{61}\) And below this diagram, Schenker lists the erste Liedform from Mozart’s Rondo in A Minor, K. 511. This likely refers only to mm. 1–8. As shown below in example 3.2.10(b) (see p. 209) and table 3.2.1 (see p. 233), Schenker analyzed the entire \( A_1 \) section (mm. 1–30) of the piece as a three-part song from \((a_1–b–a_2)\).

\(^{62}\) At the top-right corner of example 3.2.9(b), Schenker lists this as an analysis of Beethoven’s VI. Sonate, which is an error: op. 24 is Beethoven’s fifth violin sonata.
**EXAMPLE 3.2.9** Dependent two-part form: Beethoven’s Sonata for Piano and Violin in F Major, op. 24/ii, mm. 1–29 (erster Teil)

(A) Schenker’s analysis reconstructed (OC 83/270)
dominant \textit{Stufe} arrives at the end of the first four-measure \textit{Taktgruppe} in m. 5. The second \textit{Taktgruppe} reverses this progression, beginning with a dominant \textit{Stufe} in m. 6, followed by the tonic’s return in m. 9. To obtain this eight-measure \textit{Vordersatz}, I suggest that m. 1 be heard as a \textit{Vorhang}. The \textit{Nachsatz} is similarly divided into two four-measure \textit{Taktgruppen}.

The coda (mm. 18–29), which is my own addition, foreshadows and perhaps parallels the more extensive coda that Schenker hears after the \textit{A}$_2$ section: see the diagram of the entire movement written near the bottom of example 3.2.9(b). This hearing is highly unusual: the first coda (m. 18ff.) modulates to the key of the dominant (F major). This new key is confirmed by a perfect authentic cadence in m. 25, after which a \textit{Rückmodulation} might follow in mm. 25–28, whereby, through the addition of a chordal seventh (E$_5$) in m. 26, the tonicized F-major triad in m. 25 becomes a dominant seventh chord in the primary key. We typically do not expect a coda
to modulate to a new key, but neither does Schenker regard mm. 18–25 as an independent B section. Perhaps he hears mm. 18–29 as all beginning and ultimately ending in the primary key despite the internal modulation to the dominant. In that case, mm. 18–29 might conclude in B-flat major with an imperfect authentic cadence in mm. 28–29 (V7–I). This hearing would explain why Schenker does not interpret mm. 18–29 as an independent B section—at least from the perspective of the tonal layout.

To summarize: this movement is divided into two parts at two hierarchical levels: (1) the large sections that compose the independent (selbstständig) two-part form ($A_1 + A_2$); and (2) the further division of these sections into dependent (unselbständig) two-part forms (Perioden). A more typical hearing might divide the movement into what Lewis Lockwood (2004, 36) describes as “a highly elaborated three-part reprise form with a well-defined coda.” In this case, $A_1$ is set in the primary key (mm. 1–17), $B$ is set in the key of the dominant (mm. 18–28), and $A_2$ returns in the primary key (m. 29ff.), followed by the coda (not shown).

§ 3.2.3. Three-part Form: Brahms’s *Ein deutsches Requiem*, op. 45/ii, and *Begräbnisgesang*, op. 13; Haydn’s String Quartet in C Major, op. 54, no. 2/ii; W. A. Mozart’s Piano Sonata in A Major, K. 331/i; Other Works

As example 3.2.1(b) (see p. 184) makes clear, Schenker’s early conception of three-part from ($a_1–b–a_2$) is derived from two-part form ($a_1–a_2$). To paraphrase: Although a contrasting $b$ section (Mittelstück) creates tension, it is not a true end in itself (a new Gegensatz). Actually, a two-part form is hidden behind a three-part form; therefore, a three-part form risks lapsing into a two-part form if its $b$ section is not developed sufficiently. Indeed, the purpose of three-part form is to

63 For Schenker’s later approach to three-part form, see Kalib (1973, 1:243–50).
balance an underlying binary division \((a_1-a_2)\) with a contrasting element \((b)\). Example 3.2.10(a) describes three-part form as an independent \((selbständig)\) entity. The table at the bottom of the page, labeled \textit{Tonartendisposition}, outlines the disposition of keys. Reading the table from left to right, the \(a_1\) section can either remain in the primary key \((bleibt in der Tonart)\) or modulate \((moduliert)\) to a subordinate key. If \(a_1\) remains in the primary key throughout, there are two options for the \(b\) section: (1) it can remain in the primary key \((bleibt in der Ton[art])\), so that no key change exists anywhere in the three-part form; or (2) it can modulate \((moduliert)\) to a subordinate key (this is more typical). If \(a_1\) does modulate \((moduliert)\), a return-modulation \((rückmoduliert)\) is expected within the \(b\) section. Presumably \(a_2\) is set in the primary key whether \(a_1\) modulates or not.

Fugues best exemplify how Schenker’s conception of three-part form relies primarily on a subordinate key rather than a contrasting theme to establish an independent \(b\) section. A diagram of the fugue from Brahms’s \textit{Variations and Fugue on a Theme by Handel}, op. 24, is shown in example 3.2.11. The braces under this diagram divide the fugue into three sections, which are listed in \textit{Der Tonwille} ([1923–24] 2005b, 98) as mm. 1–25, mm. 25–49, and mm. 49–109.\textsuperscript{64} These sections are differentiated by changes in mode rather than changes in key \textit{per se}: \(a_1\) is set in the key of B-flat major, \(b\) is set in the key of B-flat minor, and \(a_2\) returns to B-flat major.\textsuperscript{65}

Example 3.2.10(b) describes three-part forms that are dependent \((unselbständig)\) entities comprising a section of a full-movement form. Specifically, the key areas listed on the right side of the page describe the tonal layouts for three-part forms occurring within rondos. For example,

\textsuperscript{64} Schenker traces the fugue’s subject entries in example 3.2.11. These entries are labeled 1 through 16, and they are coordinated on a vertical grid corresponding to voices 1 through 4.

\textsuperscript{65} For another example of where a fugue’s three-part form is coordinated with its disposition of keys \((Stufen als Tonarten)\), see Schenker’s analysis of J. S. Bach’s Fugue in C Minor (Schenker [1926] 1996, 2:32–33, fig. 1; see example 4.3.3, p. 332).
EXAMPLE 3.2.10 Notes on three-part forms

(A) Notes on independent three-part forms in Schenker’s handwriting with transcription (OC 83/275; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
Example 3.2.10 continued

(B) Notes on dependent three-part forms in Schenker’s handwriting with transcription (OC 83/281; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

2) Umselfsst. im Dienste [illegible: großen?] Formen.

2. ob.

1. [illegible: die arrangierten?] Tonarten [illegible]

z. B. im Dienste der Rondoform

Mozart, Rondo A\textsuperscript{maj}

C\textsuperscript{m–Es\textsuperscript{dur}} Rückmod.

Beeth: Son. Es\textsuperscript{dur}, Rondo 2. Gegensatz:

A\textsuperscript{m–Am} oder \textsuperscript{fflar–C\textsuperscript{dur}} Rückmod.

A\textsuperscript{m–Am} \textsuperscript{fsl–f\textsuperscript{flar}}

Example 3.2.11 Three-part form: Brahms’s Variations and Fugue on a Theme by Handel, op. 24, fugue (OC 83/57; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

[Subject entries]

[a₁: B-flat major, mm. 1–25] [b: B-flat minor, mm. 25–49] [c₂: B-flat major, mm. 49–109]
consider the first large section (A₁) of Mozart’s Rondo in A Minor, K. 511: a₁ begins and ends in
the primary key; b begins in C major and returns to the primary key through a Rückmodulation;
and a₂ begins and ends in A minor. The second large section (B₂) is similarly divided into three
parts: a₁ begins in the key of F major and modulates to C major; b leads back to F major through a
Rückmodulation; and a₂ begins and ends in F major (see table 3.2.1, p. 233).

Returning to example 3.2.10(a): After listing pieces in three parts at the top of the page—
including Schubert waltzes, two Chopin nocturnes, a Brahms intermezzo, and two Schumann
character pieces—Schenker explores ways that three-part form interacts with various repetition
schemes. Any section might be repeated (Weiderholung der einzelnen Theile). This is illustrated by a
diagram of the G-flat-major section (Ges-dur Theil) from the second movement of Brahms’s
Requiem, op. 45. Example 3.2.12(a) shows a detailed analysis of the entire movement, in which
three-part form operates on at least two levels. At the large level, two sections—one before the
transition (Überleitung) and one after—are each divided into three parts. At the small level, each of
these parts in the first large section is further divided into a three-part form.66

The Ges-dur Theil is highlighted by the dashed rectangle in example 3.2.12(a) and enlarged
in example 3.2.12(b). In the latter example, the text (2. u. 3 Strophe) is coordinated with the
form (a₁–b–a₂) and the key structure (G-flat major–B-flat major–G-flat major). The Arabic
numerals listed at the top correspond to lines of text. The brackets indicate that the a₁ section sets
lines 1 and 2 (designated strophe 2), while the b and a₂ sections together set lines 1 through 6
(designated strophe 3). It is unclear why Schenker lists two strophes here, since all six lines belong
to the same verse (James 5:7). Example 3.2.12(c) reconstructs this analysis in context.

---

66 In the middle of example 3.2.10(a), toward the left side of the page, Schenker calls this
process Spaltung. Here each of the branches in a three-part form divides into a two-part form.
**Example 3.2.12** Brahms, “Denn alles Fleisch, es ist wie Gras,” *Ein deutsches Requiem*, op. 45/ii

(A) Schenker’s diagram of the entire movement (OC 83/324; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

(B) Dependent three-part form: G-flat-major section enlarged (OC 83/324; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
EXAMPLE 3.2.12 CONTINUED

(c) Brahms, “Denn alles Fleisch, es ist wie Gras,” Ein deutsches Requiem, op. 45/ii, mm. 74–123
EXAMPLE 3.2.12 CONTINUED

B-flat major:

G-flat major:

PP
p
The \( a_1 \) section (mm. 75–82) begins on a tonic \( \text{Stufe} \) and ends on a dominant \( \text{Stufe} \) in the (local) primary key of G-flat major. The orchestra repeats these eight measures \( (a_1 \ \text{bis}) \) beginning in m. 83 (the choir joins in m. 87). The \( b \) section (mm. 91–106) is set in the (local) subordinate key of B-flat major, although this key in not confirmed by a cadence until m. 103. The \( a_2 \) section returns in m. 107, again in the (local) primary key.

Returning again to example 3.2.10(a) (see p. 208): Schenker indicates that a repeated section can also be combined with variation (\( \text{Wiederhol. mit. Variat. combiniert} \)), as in the \textit{Adagio} from Haydn’s String Quartet in C Major, op. 54, no. 2. An analysis of this movement that coordinates individual key areas with parts of the form is shown in example 3.2.13(a). In example 3.2.13(b), the first violin introduces the melody in mm. 1–8 \( (a_1) \). The second violin repeats this melody in mm. 9–16 \( (a_1 \ \text{bis}) \), while the first violin plays an elaborate obbligato line.\(^{67}\) As illustrated by example 3.2.13(a), an abrupt modulation to the subordinate key (E-flat major) defines the \( b \) section (mm. 17–24; not shown). This section eventually returns to the dominant of the primary key (C minor), preparing the return of \( a_2 \) in m. 25 (not shown).

The first part of a three-part form can be repeated, although the \( b \rightarrow a_2 \) portion might be repeated instead, as shown in example 3.2.10(a), near the middle of the page. Here the A-flat-major section \( (\text{As-dur Theil}) \) from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2, no. 1/iv, is provided as an example. In the second issue of \textit{Der Tonwille} (Schenker [1921–23] 2004, 80), this movement is considered a sonata form (not shown). Its development section (the \text{As-dur Theil}) is analyzed as a three-part song form that remains in the key of A-flat major throughout: \( a_1 \) (m. 59ff.), \( b \) (m. 79ff.), and \( a_2 \) (m. 87ff.). The diagram \( a_1 \rightarrow b \rightarrow a_2 \) in example 3.2.10(a) does not

\(^{67}\) In example 3.2.13(a), \( a_1 \) and \( a_1 \ \text{bis} \) modulate to the key of G minor, although both sections end with a G-major harmony. Schenker likely hears this as a Picardy third (B\(^\sharp\)).
EXAMPLE 3.2.13 Three-part form: Haydn’s String Quartet in C Major, op. 54, no. 2/ii

(A) Schenker’s diagram of the entire movement (OC 83/276; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{C minor: I} & \quad \text{G minor: I II V f} \\
\end{align*} \]

(B) Sections \(a_1\) and \(a_1\) bis (with variation)
include the fact that this development’s a₁ section (mm. 59–68) is also repeated (mm. 69–78),
although this repeat is written out, with the melody embellished and transposed up an octave.
Indeed, the most common scheme where three-part form interacts with repeats involves the
repetition of both a₁ and b–a₂ (as in rounded binary form, to use modern terminology). Strangely,
Schenker never shows these repetitions in combination (‖ a₁:‖ b–a₂:‖).

There is, however, one analysis of a composition using this form in file 83 of the Oster Collection: the theme from Mozart’s Piano Sonata in A Major, K. 331/i (see example 3.2.14).
Schenker outlines the overall form at the top of the page: a₁ (mm. 1–4 = 5–8), b (mm. 9–12), and
a₂ (mm. 13–18). Below the musical notation, near the bottom of the page (labeled Plan), arrows
indicate that the first half of a₁ (mm. 1–4) corresponds to the beginning of a₂ (mm. 13–16); the
second half of a₁ (mm. 5–8) corresponds to the end of a₂ (mm. 17–18). The three staves near the
middle of the page illustrate the motivic basis for these correspondences. The first stave shows two
melodic motives highlighted by brackets in mm. 1–4. Each motive comprises a descending third
(E₅–D₅–C♯₅, followed by D₅–C♯₅–B₄) shadowed by another stepwise motive a third below (C♯₅–
B₄–A₄ and B₄–A₄–G♯₄ respectively). In mm. 5–8, brackets highlight other similar motives.

The melodic motives in mm. 1–8 are also coordinated with Stufen, as shown by the
Roman numerals above the staff. In mm. 1–2, the first motive (E₅–D₅–C♯₅) is coordinated with a
tonic Stufe (the D₅ is passing); in mm. 3–4, the second motive (D₅–C♯₅–B₄) is coordinated with a
dominant Stufe (the C♯₅ is passing). As a result, this four-measure Vordersatz ends with a half
cadence. Although Schenker does not mention this cadence specifically, perhaps the double bar
line (‖) notated at the end of m. 4 represents this local division. Meanwhile, the two motives
comprising mm. 5–8 correspond to tonic and dominant Stufen. This Nachsatz concludes with a
perfect authentic cadence (also not mentioned specifically by Schenker, but again, notice the double bar line at the end of m. 8).

Schenker’s analysis of the b section, shown on the second stave in example 3.2.14, highlights a motive comprising a stepwise fourth from E5 up to A5; a second motive retraces this
path from A₅ down to E₅. The B₄, which comes from an inner-voice motion (C♯₅–D₃–C♯₅–B₄) occurring below the conceptual upper voice (E₅), perhaps marks the arrival of a half cadence at the end of m. 12 (this division is indicated yet again by a double bar line). The a₂ section (mm. 13–18) begins identically to the a₁ section, but in contrast to the likely half cadence in m. 4 and perfect authentic cadence in m. 8, the cadence expected in m. 16 is evaded (see the exclamation point written above the staff in example 3.2.14). At this point, the melody is redirected upward, while inverting the original descending-third motive into an ascending sixth (C♯₅ up to A₅) and surpassing the ascending fourth that began the b section (E₅–F♯₅–G♯₅–A₅).

Mozart’s theme comes to a close in m. 18.

There are two ways in which the eight-measure a₁ section might be transformed into the six-measure a₂ section. The first way, to which Schenker apparently does not subscribe, hears a₂ as parallel to one of the four-measure units in a₁ (either mm. 1–4 or mm. 5–8), which is extended through a two-measure appendix that “corrects” the evaded cadence in m. 16. On the other hand, Schenker’s arrow notation at the bottom of example 3.2.14 indicates that he hears mm. 5–8 corresponding to mm. 17–18, meaning that a₂ has been shortened by two measures. At the bottom of example 3.2.10(a) (p. 208), Schenker describes this shortening of a₂ relative to a₁ (eventuelle Kürzung des a₂, namentlich bei Geltung des a₁), listing Brahms’s Begräbnisgesang, op. 13, as a more extreme example. A diagram of this piece is shown in example 3.2.15. The three large sections of the form (A₁–B–A₂) correspond to a three-part tonal plan (C minor–C major–C minor). The A₁ and B sections comprise lower-level three-part forms (a₁–b–a₂), but the A₂ section truncates its expected b and a₂ sections, leaving only a₁.
EXAMPLE 3.2.15 Three-part form with truncated $A_2$ section: Brahms’s *Begräbnisgesang*, op. 13 (OC 83/323; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

$A_1$  
(mm. 1–48)  
$[a_1-b-a_2]$  

$B$  
(mm. 49–88)  
$[a_1-b-a_2]$  

$A_2$  
(mm. 89–106)  
$[a_1]$  

§ 3.2.4. Four-part Form: Brahms’s *Schicksalslied*, op. 54, and *Ein deutsches Requiem*, op. 45/i; Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2, no. 1/ii; Other Works

Early notes on four-part form ($a_1-b_1-a_2-b_2$) appear in example 3.2.1(b) (see p. 184). To paraphrase: The contrasting $b$ section becomes an end in itself (*Gegensatz als Selbstzweck*); this is evidenced by its repetition (*Beweis dessen Wiederholung*). Four-part form’s $b$ sections also gain independent status because they are set in a subordinate key. The $b_1$ section is set in a new key throughout (*durchaus neue Tonart*); the $b_2$ section can occur in this new key as well, although $b_2$ usually occurs in the primary key (*auch neue Tonart, die aber dieselbe sein kann, wie bei $b_1$*). At the end of example 3.2.1(b), Schenker emphasizes that four-part form has only one contrasting element.

---

68 For Schenker’s later approach to four-part form, see Kalib (1973, 1:277–78).

69 In Schenker’s early generative theory, motives arise through repetition (§ 2.2); so too at higher levels of form, where entire sections gain their independent status through repetition. The $b$ section in a three-part form is provisional rather than an actual end in itself (*als wirklicher Selbstzweck*) because three-part-form’s $b$ section is not repeated.
(Diese Form weist nur einen Gegensatz auf), perhaps ruling out the four-part schema $a_1-b_1-a_2-c_1$ due to the risk of it being confused with five-part form $(a_1-b_1-a_2-c_1-a_3)$, which has two contrasting elements (Gegensätze).

Example 3.2.16 provides additional notes on four-part form. At the top of the page, a tree diagram shows how two successive binary divisions produce this form. Below this, two types of connection (Verbindung) between $a_1$ and $b_1$ are defined. The first type involves a modulation, as in the opening Adagio from Brahms’s Schicksalslied, op. 54, and the Adagio from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2, no. 1. The second type of connection (or lack thereof) between $a_1$ and $b_1$ involves an immediate change of key (ex abrupto), which occurs in the first movement of Brahms’s Requiem, op. 45. The note at the bottom of example 3.2.16 addresses the connection between $a_2$ and $b_2$ in particular. To paraphrase Schenker’s comments in this example: When a modulation between $a_1$ and $b_1$ is present, the same path must be completed between $a_2$ and $b_2$; however, if $b_2$ is set in the primary key, then there is no reason for a modulation per se. The last sentence in example 3.2.16 suggests that the $b_2$ section might sometimes begin in the key of the subdominant; this ascends by step to the dominant (likely a dominant Stufe in the primary key), presumably leading to the return of the tonic in the primary key.

A detailed analysis of Brahms’s Schicksalslied appears in example 3.2.17. The work is divided into three large sections: (1) the opening Adagio comprises a four-part form preceded by an introduction (Einleitung); (2) the Allegro comprises a three-part form; and (3) the concluding Adagio functions as a coda based on material from the introduction. At the bottom of the diagram, Schenker aligns this three-part form with the text’s three stanzas (Strophen), while at the top of the diagram, the lines (Zeilen) of text for each stanza are coordinated with more local sections.
EXAMPLE 3.2.16 Notes on four-part forms with transcription (OC 83/282; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
EXAMPLE 3.2.17 Form diagram: Brahms’s *Schicksalslied*, op. 54 (OC 83/324; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

Focusing on the first *Adagio* in particular, $A_1$, which begins and ends in E-flat major, sets lines 1–2 of the first strophe. The subordinate key (B-flat major) is established through a *Modulationspartie* (lines 3–4); $B_1$ is also set in this key (lines 5–6). A brief retransition (*Rückleitung*) leads to $A_2$, which sets lines 1–2 of the second stanza and brings with it a return to the primary key. The *Modulationspartie* (lines 3–6) remains in E-flat major (creating a terminological contradiction of sorts), as does $B_2$ (lines 7–9).

A second example of a four-part form that includes a modulation between $a_1$ and $b_1$ is shown in example 3.2.18.\(^70\) This sketch of the *Adagio* from Beethoven’s first piano sonata appears in the second issue of *Der Tonwille* (Schenker [1921–23] 2004, 78). The $A_1$ section (mm. 1–16) is divided into three parts ($a_1$–$b_1$–$a_2$). Measures 1–8 ($a_1$) comprise a *Vordersatz* (mm. 1–4) and a *Nachsatz* (mm. 5–8). Here the brackets above the staff—the same notation that Schenker used to

---

\(^{70}\) The form designations in this example are difficult to find. The designations for large sections of the form are located between the treble-clef staves (e.g., see $A_1$ in m. 1), as are the designations for the *Modulation* (abbreviated *Md.* in m. 16) and *Rückmodulation* (abbreviated *Rmd.* in m. 31). Designations for the small sections of the form are located above the bass-clef staff (e.g., see $a_1$ in m. 1).
EXAMPLE 3.2.18 Four-part form: Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2, no. 1/ii (Schenker [1921–23] 1990, 2:suppl., 3)
indicate motives earlier in his career—highlight the *Urlinie*. The first bracket is open-ended, showing a stepwise descent from A₄ to G₄ (3–2) over the course of the *Vordersatz*; the second bracket is closed, indicating a complete stepwise descent from A₄ to F₄ (3–5–1) over the course of the *Nachsatz*. The b section (mm. 9–12) composes out a dominant *Stufe* that supports B₄ (4) as a neighbor note to A₄ (3). At four measures in length, the a₂ section is truncated, ending in m. 16. The *Modulation* (mm. 16–21) reinterprets the tonic *Stufe* in F major as a subdominant *Stufe* in the subordinate key (C major). Because these measures are set in the subordinate key (see the *Stufengang IV–II–V*), Schenker groups them with the B₁ section (*Modulation und B₁*). The B₁ section begins with a descending stepwise third in m. 22ff. (E₄–D₄–C₄), parallel to the beginning of A₁. A return-modulation (*Rückmodulation*) in m. 30 leads to A₂ and a return of the primary key (here the tonic *Stufe* in C major is reinterpreted as a dominant *Stufe* F major). In m. 48, B₂ begins on a dominant *Stufe* (the surface harmony is in ã-position, with B♭ in the bass), although this off-tonic beginning is understood within the context of a tonic *Stufe* at a deeper level.

A detailed form diagram of the first movement from Brahms’s *Requiem* is shown in example 3.2.19. As noted in example 3.2.16, there is an immediate shift (*ex abrupto*) between A₁ (in F major) and B₁ (in D-flat major). The A₂ and B₂ sections follow a similar tonal plan, although thematically A₂ is written over by material from the introduction (*Einleitung für A₂*). This analysis is remarkable because the form proper does not end in the primary key; instead, the B₂ section ends in the subordinate key (D-flat major). Tonal closure is not achieved until the coda, which Schenker labeled A₃ and then crossed out. This section does not function as part of a hypothetical five-part form (A₁–B₁–A₂–B₂–A₃) because, as asserted in example 3.2.1(d) (see p. 186), five-part

---

71 This notation prefigures interruption (*Unterbrechung*), which asserts an inner-form discontinuity that coincides with an outer-form discontinuity (Schenker [1935] 1979, 36–40). For more on this topic, see P. Smith (1994), Samarotto (2005), Marvin (2011), and Arndt (2012).
EXAMPLE 3.2.19  Form diagram: Brahms’s “Selig sind, die da Lied tragen,” Ein deutsches Requiem, op. 45/i (OC 83/324; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

form has two contrasting elements (Die Form zweier Gegensätze; B and C), whereas four-part form has only one (B). In other words, outer-form considerations have influenced Schenker’s approach here to the extent that tonal closure occurs outside the form proper.

This is the best argument for why we should not equate Schenker’s early conception of four-part form with sonata form without development, since we fully expect the $B_2$ section to be set in the primary key in the latter. Clearly this tonal return is not a requirement. This is radically different from Schenker’s approach in Der freie Satz, where the conclusion of a form proper does coincide with tonal closure (including the descent of the Urlinie to $I$ over the tonic Stufe).

Schenker ([1935] 1979, 141) does not include even one example of four-part form in Der freie Satz where the $B_2$ section is set in a subordinate key because this would seemingly violate tonal coherence. To summarize: His early conception of four-part form is a larger type, of which sonata form without development is one token, whereas his late conception of four-part form is virtually synonymous with sonata form without development (Kalib 1973, 1:277).
§ 3.2.5. Five-part Form (Rondo Form): Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 2, no. 2/iv; W. A. Mozart’s Rondo in A Minor, K. 511; Other Works

Schenker describes five-part form in example 3.2.1(d) (see p. 186). This form incorporates two contrasting elements (Die Form zweier Gegensätze), although example 3.2.20 suggests that a five-part form with only one Gegensatz (a1–b1–a2–b2–a3) may also be possible, as in Chopin’s Polonaise in A-flat Major, op. 53. The second bullet point in example 3.2.1(d) states that five-part form is created through the combination of two three-part forms with an elision, such that a1–b1–a2 combined with a2–c1–a3 results in a1–b1–a2–c1–a3 (Es ist, als wären 2 [three-part] Formen mit einander verbunden); therefore, the a sections always occur in the same key (Daher a1, a2, u. a3 immer dieselbe Tonart aufweisen). The third bullet point states that a seven-part form (a1–b1–a2–c1–a3–b2–a4) can be reduced to an alternative five-part form by omitting a3 and combining c1 and b2 to create a new group (durch Weglassung des a3 u. Zusammenziehung von c1 u. b2 zu neuer Gruppe).

Additional notes appear in example 3.2.21 below, where the construction of individual sections (Ausbau der einzelnen Glieder) is described either as (three-part) song form (Liedform) or group formation (Gruppenbau). Below this, a note states that the A2 section in a five-part form is usually shortened (in der Regel A2 gekürzt); for example, this occurs in Mozart’s Rondo in A Minor, K. 511; Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E-flat Major, op. 7/iv; and Mozart’s Piano Quartet in G Minor, K. 478/iii. Mozart’s piano quartet is also an example of a “seven-part form” reduced to a five-part form though the elision (or suppression) of A3 and the combination of C1 and B2 (Zusammenziehung von C u. B2 durch Ellision von A3)—an example that Schenker would refer to.

72 For Schenker’s later approach to five-part form, see Kalib (1973, 1:278).
73 A note near the bottom of example 3.2.21 states that in instrumental chamber music group formation is usually preferred instead of song forms (Kammermusik mit mehreren Instrum. Bevorzugs Gruppenbau statt Liedformen). At the very bottom of the page, a note states that a modulation may occur between individual sections (Die Mod[u]llation zwischen den einzelnen Gliedern). See § 2.5 for more on group formation (Gruppenbau, Gruppenbildung).
EXAMPLE 3.2.20 An alternative five-part form \((a_1-b_1-a_2-b_2-a_3)\) with transcription (OC 83/136; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

again in *Der freie Satz* ([1935] 1979, 142), where he cautions that the combined \(C_1\) and \(B_2\) sections should not be confused with a development section in a sonata form.

In example 3.2.21, near the middle of the page, an elaborate diagram of the second movement from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 2, no. 2, comprises nine parts: \(A_1-B_1-A_2-C_1-A_3-B_2-A_4-C_2-A_5\). Schenker’s analysis in *Der freie Satz* (1935, fig. 155.2), which was suppressed in all later editions, is shown above in example 3.2.22. The nine-part interpretation of the outer form is aligned with important tonal events, although this attempt is not entirely successful.\(^7^4\) \(A_1\) (mm. 1–8) is aligned with the Kopfton \((3)\), a third-progression that descends from the Kopfton \((F#_1-E_1-D_1)\), and the underlying tonic Stufe. \(B_1\) (mm. 9–12) is aligned with a neighbor

\(^7^4\) Readers may wish to consult a score for the following discussion. In the English translation of *Der freie Satz*, Ernst Oster writes, “Schenker interpreted [Beethoven’s op. 2, no. 2/ii] as being written in a nine-part rondo form, plus coda (mm. 1, 9, 13, 21 [recte: 20], 32, 40, 44, 50, 68). This interpretation is so obviously misconceived that the editor of the second German edition [i.e., Oswald Jonas] omitted the example; and I did not feel that it should be reinstated. It can be assumed from Schenker’s earlier notes on this movement that this analysis might well not have been his final thought about the matter” (Schenker [1935] 1979, 142n18).
EXAMPLE 3.2.21 Notes on rondo forms with transcription (OC 83/288; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
EXAMPLE 3.2.22 Nine-part form (rondo form): Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 2, no. 2/ii (Schenker 1935, fig. 155.2)

Note (G\(\acute{\text{e}}\)) to the Kopfton (F\(\acute{\text{e}}\)) supported by a dominant Stufe. \(A_2\) (mm. 13–19) is aligned with a return to the tonic Stufe and the Kopfton—the latter first in its original register (m. 13), and then transferred up an octave (m. 18). The beginning of \(C_1\) (m. 19ff.) is aligned with an auxiliary cadence (IV–V–I) in the key of F-sharp minor that composes out a deeper-level mediant Stufe arriving in m. 23.\(^75\) The remaining measures of \(C_1\) lead to a dominant Stufe in the primary key that supports a neighbor note (G\(\acute{\text{e}}\)) in m. 31, similar to the end of \(B_1\). \(A_3\) (mm. 32–39) is typeset too far to the left in the sketch: this section should be aligned with the return of the Kopfton and tonic Stufe. \(B_2\) (mm. 40–43) coincides with a dominant Stufe that supports a neighbor note (G\(\acute{\text{e}}\)) to the Kopfton. \(A_4\) (mm. 44–49) and \(A_5\) (mm. 68–80) are both aligned with a return of the Kopfton in a higher register over the tonic Stufe. \(D_1\) (mm. 50–67; \(C_2\) in example 3.2.21), which lies between \(A_4\) and \(A_5\), is characterized by a change in mode from major to minor and the corresponding alteration of the Kopfton from F\# to F\#.

\(^{75}\) Schenker’s graph in example 3.2.22 indicates that \(C_1\) begins in m. 21, but this is likely a mistake. The third-progression (F\#–E\#–D\#) that unfolds over the course of \(A_2\) reaches its conclusion in m. 19; the \(C_2\) section presumably begins in the following measure (m. 20).
Example 3.2.23 illustrates Schenker’s early conformational approach to rondo form if taken to its extreme. Along the left side of this document, seven different rondos are listed, three of which are also included in the section on rondo form in *Der freie Satz*: Mozart’s K. 511, Beethoven’s op. 2, no. 2/iv, and Mozart’s K. 478/iii (Schenker [1935] 1979, 141–45). Along the top of this document, large sections of the form are indicated (A₁, B₁, A₂, etc.), each separated by an optional transition (Übergang). This grid allows for the easy comparison of each movement’s form, including a comparison of the form within each of the large sections.

Table 3.2.1 highlights Schenker’s early analysis of Mozart’s K. 511; example 3.2.24 shows a later analysis from *Der freie Satz* ([1935] 1979, fig. 155.4). The outer form is the same in both cases. In table 3.2.1, A₁ (mm. 1–30) is divided into three parts: a₁ (mm. 1–8) is a Periode comprising a Vordersatz (I–V) and a Nachsatz (I); the b section (mm. 9–21) is set in the key of C major; and a₂ (mm. 23–30) is an embellished version of a₁. A brief retransition on the dominant of A minor occurs in m. 22, which Schenker groups with a₂, since this measure is heard in the primary key. In example 3.2.24, Schenker aligns A₁ with the establishment of the Kopfton (♯) and the tonic Stufe. While lower-level forms are shown below the sketch (a₁–b–a₂), their component parts are not aligned with tonal events at this level of the deep middleground. Returning to table 3.2.1: The B₁ section (mm. 31–64), set in the closely related key of F major, is also divided into a three-part form: a₁ (mm. 31–41) modulates from F major to C major, while b (mm. 42–53) effects a retransition (Rückleitung) from C minor back to F major, preparing for the return of a₂ (mm. 54–64). The first Übergang (mm. 65–80) modulates back to the home key (von F-dur nach A-moll). In example 3.2.24, Schenker aligns B₁ with a submediant Stufe and an upper neighbor (♭6) to the Kopfton (♯).

---

76 Readers may wish to consult a score for the following discussion.
EXAMPLE 3.2.23 Schenker’s conformational approach to five-part rondo forms with transcription (OC 83/294; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
EXAMPLE 3.2.23 CONTINUED

[Diagram showing musical notations and annotations]

C1 Übergang A3 Übergang B2 Übergang [illegible: A4?] A5 Coda

[Detailed notations and annotations]
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**Table 3.2.1** Five-part form (rondo form): W. A. Mozart’s Rondo in A Minor, K. 511 (OC 83/294; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Schenker’s Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$</td>
<td>[1–30]</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B_1$</td>
<td>[31–64]</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Übergang,</td>
<td>[65–80]</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_2$</td>
<td>[80–88]</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1$</td>
<td>[89–112]</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Übergang,</td>
<td>[112–28]</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_3$</td>
<td>[129–60]</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>[160–82]</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXAMPLE 3.2.24 Five-part form (rondo form): W. A. Mozart’s Rondo in A Minor, K. 511 (Schenker 1935, fig. 155.4)

In table 3.2.1, $A_2$ (mm. 80–88) is abbreviated as only one branch ($a_i$) of the three-part form in $A_1$. Likewise, in example 3.2.24, Schenker indicates that this part of the form is cut short ($a_1$–gekürzt), aligning it with a return to the Kopfton (5) and the tonic Stufe. In this sketch, the C section (mm. 89–112) comprises a three-part form set in the contrasting key (or mode) of A major. Schenker’s earlier analysis in table 3.2.1 shows this in detail: $a_1$ (mm. 89–97) modulates to the key of E major; $b$ (Rückleitung) modulates back to the key of A major over the course of mm. 98–103; and $a_2$ (mm. 104–12) begins like $a_1$ but remains in the primary key. The second Übergang effects a change in mode from A major back to the primary key of A minor ($v o n$ A-dur $n a c h$ A-moll). The last part of the form proper ($A_3$, mm. 129–60) is similar to $A_1$, although the melody contains more elaborate diminutions. In example 3.2.24, the Urlinie descends from 5 to 1 over the course of $A_3$, bringing tonal closure. A coda (mm. 160–82) restates motives heard throughout the rondo. In Schenker’s sketch, this coda is likely typeset in the wrong location (too early), since it appears before the descent of the Urlinie is completed.
§ 3.2.6. Conclusion

The sketches in example 3.2.22 (Beethoven, op. 2, no. 2/ii) and example 3.2.24 (Mozart, K. 511) support this dissertation’s main thesis: the schematic forms introduced in Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, 128–45) were not derived from divisions (Glieder) of the Urlinie and the prolongation of Stufen at deep levels of the middleground. As a matter of history, Schenker developed a similar taxonomy of full-movement forms perhaps even before the publication of Harmonielehre in 1906, predating the idea of the Urlinie by ten years or more. Schenker likely considered this a generative approach nonetheless, since the principles of repetition and association, which together create the psychological basis for the lowest level of musical form (the motive), also operate at the highest levels. Despite all of Schenker’s polemics during the first two decades of the twentieth century, in which he argued against the nineteenth-century Formenlehre tradition, his so-called “Outline of a New Theory of Form” (Entwurf einer neuen Formenlehre) was not significantly different from previous approaches (Schenker 1912, vii). Moreover, this traditional approach was at work throughout his entire career, including in Der freie Satz, where numerous sketches are rife with designations representing the formal schemas that he had developed more than twenty years earlier (see table 3.1.1, p. 162).77

Yet, as we saw in Schenker’s changing conception of two- and three-part forms (§ 3.2.2), there was an increasing awareness of the ways in which tonal events might also determine form. In his early Formenlehre, this was especially true of Stufen als Tonarten, or Stufen of the monotonality manifest as key areas (see § 2.5.3). As Schenker’s organic theory of tonal coherence developed in the 1920s and early 1930s, he did not reject schematic forms in practice, even if his polemics leave

---

77 Sketches in Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979) that incorporate the more traditional formal schemas described in this chapter include figures 30, 35.1, 35.2, 39, 40.1, 42.1, 75, 88(a), 154.4, and 155.1, among many others.
us with this impression. Quite the contrary, he sought to rehabilitate these schemas by infusing them with their opposite (Cook 2007, 285): the dynamics of transformational voice leading (Samarotto 2015). He aligned spans of transformational voice leading with pre-existing outer forms in an attempt to accommodate both perspectives, even if this sometimes led to what Oster describes as “obviously misconceived” interpretations.78 Through interruption (Unterbrechung), Schenker even altered his approach to voice leading to accommodate his existing conception of outer form (Samarotto 2005, 9).79 This idea embodies the original meaning of Synthese—the productive interaction and integration of independent musical parameters—and contrasts with Schenker’s later explanation of form, which is often couched in the language of an all-encompassing monism (Lubben 1993, 60n5; Cohn 1992a, 1992b).80

§ 3.3. SIX-PART SONATA FORM (CYCLIC FORM)

Schenker’s early Formenlehre culminates in six-part sonata form, or what he described as cyclic form (cyklische Form) in the first decade of the twentieth century.81 Cyclic form exhibits three-part construction (Dreiteiligkeit) on two levels (see example 3.3.1): (1) the large level with exposition, development, and recapitulation (A₁–B–A₂); and (2) the small level at which the

78 See note 74 on p. 227.
79 This is described more fully in chapter 4.
80 For the origins of Synthese within Kant’s philosophy, see Korsyn (1988, 19–43). Other sources addressing this important concept include Cohn (1992a; 1992b) and Lubben (1993). For an extended discussion of Schenker’s late monism and its relationship to his earlier conception of Synthese, to which my argument here is indebted, see Cook (2007, 281–96).
81 For a summary of Schenker’s approach to sonata form after he had developed the idea of the Urlinie ca. 1921, see Kalib (1973, 1:251–76). My approach in this section is different because I am concerned primarily with Schenker’s approach to sonata form before this discovery. Also, as mentioned in § 1.3.5, Riemann (1889, 2:126) used the term cyklische Form; he used it to describe multi-movement works such as dance suites and sonatas.
EXAMPLE 3.3.1 Schenker’s early conception of six-part sonata form (cyclic form)

\[ A_1 \text{ (erster Teil):} \ \text{die drei ersten Gedankengruppen} \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{(Einleitung)} & a_1 & \text{(Modulationspartie)} \\
I. \text{Gedankengruppe} & b_1 & II. \text{Gedankengruppe} \\
& c_1 & \text{III. Schlußgedanke}
\end{array}
\]

\[ B \text{ (zweiter Teil): Durchführung} \]

\[ A_2 \text{ (dritter Teil): Reprise or Wiederholung} \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
a_2 & \text{(Modulationspartie)} & b_2 \\
I. \text{Gedankengruppe} & II. \text{Gedankengruppe} & c_2 \\
& & \text{(Coda)}
\end{array}
\]

exposition \((a_1-b_1-c_1)\) and recapitulation \((a_2-b_2-c_2)\) both comprise three themes \((\text{Gedanken})\). Despite this apparent recursion, the exposition and recapitulation have three contrasting elements occurring one after the other \((a-b-c)\), whereas the overall form \((A_1-B-A_2)\) has only one contrasting element \((B)\).\(^8^2\) The development section does not count at the small level. This ensures that the six-part structure continues the arithmetic progression established in example 3.1.1(a) (see p. 158), with the number of parts increasing by one from one schema to the next.\(^8^3\)

In the “Niedergang” typescript, Schenker ([1905–6] 2005a, 44) describes the exposition, development, and recapitulation as the \(\text{drei ersten Gedankengruppen, Durchführung, and Reprise} \) (or

---

\(^8^2\) See example 3.2.1(d) (p. 186): In the first bullet point regarding six-part from, Schenker writes, “Die Form zweier Gegensätze, die sogar gleich hintereinander auftreten.” Surprisingly, in Harmonielehre, he claims that the three-part form \(a-b-c\) “is simply unthinkable and . . . probably ruled out forever” (Schenker [1906] 1954, 10; 1906, 12; “eine Form, die in der Musik schlechthin undenkbar und für alle Zeiten wohl ausgeschlossen ist”).

\(^8^3\) Schenker eventually abandoned this six-part conception of sonata form in favor of a three-part conception by the publication of Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, 133–38); see table 3.1.1, p. 162. Perhaps this is due to the principle of the “mysterious number five” \((\text{geheimnisvolle Fünfzahl})\), which somehow limits the number of large sections that make up a full-movement form (Schenker 1906, 51, 268; [1935] 1979, 145; see Clark 1999).
Wiederholung) respectively (see example 3.3.1); or, similar to Marx, he describes these sections in his monograph on Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony (1912, 2) simply as the erster Teil, zweiter Teil, and dritter Teil. Schenker also used a variety of terms to characterize the three parts that make up the exposition and recapitulation, including Gedanke, Gedankengruppe, Thema, and Themengruppe. Contrastingly, keys are used to distinguish the first and second Gedankengruppen, although Schenker’s criterion for determining where the second Gedankengruppe ends and the Schlußgedanke begins is not defined as clearly. Both sections are typically set in the same key; therefore, they might be distinguished based on a change in character (texture, motive, dynamic, and so on). More importantly, Schenker does not rely on cadential articulation to mark the end of the second Gedankengruppe, as we might find in late-eighteenth-century approaches to form (Koch [1782–93] 1983) and more recent approaches (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006; Caplin 1998). In fact, as was discussed in § 3.2.2, the relationship between cadential articulation and the demarcation of large sections in Schenker’s early Formenlehre was ambivalent, which is true of most nineteenth-century Formenlehren as well. Finally, while Schenker recognizes the parts in example 3.3.1 shown in parentheses when they are present in individual works—namely, the introduction (Einleitung), transition (Modulationspartie), and coda—they are not considered essential.84


84 For example, compare example 3.3.1 with Schenker’s diagram of six-part form in example 3.1.1(a) (p. 158): the Modulationspartie is not included as an essential part of the form in the latter. In other words, in contrast to Lobe (1850–67) and Richter (1852), Schenker’s exposition has three parts rather than four (cf. table 1.3.2 on p. 42 and example 3.3.1 above).
sonatas ([1913, 1914, 1915] 2015) in the second decade. The schema in example 3.3.1 is evinced by many of his analyses dating from the 1910s, when he began to use the more traditional term *Sonatenform*. A collection of representative form diagrams published between 1912 and 1921 that model works by Beethoven is shown below in example 3.3.2. In every case, the exposition (*erster Teil*) comprises three *Gedanken* embedded within a larger three-part form.\footnote{See example 1.3.20 (p. 46) for another diagram similar to those found in example 3.3.2.} It is ironic that some of Schenker’s most conformational analyses would culminate with the first published discussion of the *Urlinie* in the explanatory edition of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 101 (Schenker [1921] 2015, 4:8–12).\footnote{See Pastille (1990b, 74–79) for the history of the *Urlinie* in Schenker’s published works.}

Of course, Schenker dismissed previous theories of sonata form near the end of his career, replacing those approaches with one based on an interrupted *Urlinie* and its elaboration:

> Here . . . it is necessary to discard the concepts and terminology of conventional theory. These all involve the “motive” and are therefore most imprecise. It does not matter that so many designations are offered for the prolongation of the primary tone of the fundamental line (“first theme,” “main theme,” “first-theme group,” and such); what matters is that none of these designations answers the essential question, not one explains why the first prolongation takes just this particular course and no other. Conventional theory simply does not know how to read diminutions; it assumes erroneous entities, splitting up those actually present and creating new ones where none exist.\footnote{“Wie . . . ist auch hier zunächst nötig, die Begriffe und Bezeichnungen der üblichen Theorien abzulehnen: hängen sie doch alle mit dem ’Motiv’ zusammen und sind deshalb völlig unbestimmt. Nicht daran also liegt es, daß z.B. für die Auskomponierung des Urlinie-Kopftones so viele Bezeichnungen geboten werden wie: erster Gedanke, Hauptgedanke, Hauptthema, Hauptsatz, Satzgruppe usw., sondern daran, daß diese Bezeichnungen die Wahrheit nicht treffen, daß nicht eine erklärt, weshalb denn die erste Auskomponierung nur solche Wege geht, keine anderen. Das kommt aber daher, daß diese Theorie die Diminution nicht zu lesen versteht, falsche Einheiten hineinliest, vorhandene zerschneidet und neue behauptet” (Schenker 1935, 215–16).} (Schenker [1935] 1979, 133)
**EXAMPLE 3.3.2** Schenker’s analyses of select sonata forms by Beethoven

(A) Beethoven, Symphony no. 9 in D Minor, op. 125/i (Schenker 1912, 2)

(B) Beethoven, Piano Sonata in A-flat Major, op. 110/i (Schenker 1914, 31)
EXAMPLE 3.3.2 CONTINUED

(C) Beethoven, Piano Sonata in C Minor, op. 111/i (Schenker 1916, 32)

(D) Beethoven, Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 101/i (Schenker 1921, 27)
EXAMPLE 3.3.3 “According to the customary theory of sonata form”: Beethoven’s Symphony no. 3 in E-flat Major, op. 55/i (Schenker [1930] 1974, 3:suppl., fig. 3)
But beginning in the late 1910s and continuing well into the 1920s, the Urlinie coexisted with a more traditional conception of sonata form in Schenker’s work, particularly in the analysis of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, from the first issue of Der Tonwille ([1921–23] 2004, 25–33), and in the essay “Vom organischen der Sonatenform,” from Das Meisterwerk in der Musik, vol. 2 ([1926] 1996, 23–30). As late as 1930, Schenker even analyzed the first movement of Beethoven’s Third Symphony according to what he begrudgingly called “the customary theory of sonata form.”

In example 3.3.3 above, the labels for each section are abbreviated between the staves (they have also been added in full above the sketch). The exposition comprises a first and second group connected by a Modulationspartie (a closing group is absent). The development (Durchführung) is subdivided into five parts labeled a through e. The recapitulation (Wiederholung) is followed by a lengthy coda. This interpretation of the form is likely what Schenker would have also heard fifteen years earlier, before the idea of the Urlinie was developed.

In the context of Schenker’s later work, correspondences between the levels of voice leading (inner form) and the disposition of themes (outer form) are implied by example 3.3.3, if not stated directly in its accompanying prose. For instance, the beginning of the first theme corresponds to the establishment of the Kopfton 3 (G5) supported by a tonic Stufe. The beginning of the second theme corresponds to the arrival of 2 (F5) supported by a dominant Stufe, after which the first branch of the Urlinie is interrupted at 2. The Kopfton returns to 3 (G5) to begin the second branch of the Urlinie at the onset of the recapitulation, although first the development section prolongs 4 (A♭5), which functions as a neighbor note to the Kopfton composed-out through a seventh-progression descending to B♭4 (a motion into an inner voice). (This transforms

---

88 “nach der üblichen Lehre der Sonatenform” (Schenker [1930] 1997, 12–13, fig. 3).
the B-flat Stufe from a local tonic to a dominant in the primary key.) Before such correspondences were uncovered, what was Schenker’s understanding of sonata form on its own terms?

The most thorough discussion of sonata form before the 1920s appears in the “Niedergang” typescript ([1905–6] 2005a, 43–60). Schenker describes how cyclic form (or sonata form) is integral to both his early music aesthetics and his understanding of music history. These views, introduced in § 1.2, are summarized as follows: First, there was the productivity of the masters; composers such as Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven all wrote in a variety of forms and genres. Next, the art of composition began to decline: composers after Beethoven did not match the same level of productivity as the earlier masters. This was the result of two related trends: (1) inferior compositional technique, defined primarily as a composer’s inability to develop a motivic chain in an organic, improvisational manner; and (2) the reification of form as a musical domain separate from content. Schenker ([1905–6] 2005a, 69) believed that composers in the second half of the nineteenth century fundamentally misunderstood the organic nature of sonata form in particular, mistaking the exposition for “a potpourri comprising three melodies that seem to have been locked up in cages.” To compensate for their inferior technique, composers relied on extramusical principles to organize their work. This resulted in music based on programs, such as Berlioz’s Symphonie fantastique, or music based on words and narrative, as in Wagner’s music dramas. But Schenker held absolute music in highest regard, with sonata form its paragon. Music’s

---

increasing reliance on language and narrative in the nineteenth century was considered regressive—a conclusion partly aligned with Hanslick’s influential formalist aesthetics.\footnote{See § 1.3.3 and Cook (2007, 48–62).}

Schenker developed a theory of sonata form in the first two decades of the twentieth century to support this larger historical narrative. If he was to do battle with the likes of Berlioz, Liszt, and Wagner—holding them responsible for the decline of European musical culture—then he needed a working theory of absolute music (which is to say, he needed a working theory of sonata form). This theory and the values that it embodies—including the development of motives in an improvisatory manner and the foregoing of any predetermined formal schema or plan—functions like the \textit{Urlinie} in his later work: it provides a basis for criticism.\footnote{See Pastille (1995) for more on Schenker’s conception of music history and the use of his theory for the purpose of making value judgments.}

Only compositions that successfully embody these values are deemed masterworks.

§ 3.3.1. The Three-part Exposition (\textit{erster Teil}): W. A. Mozart’s Piano Quartet in G Minor, K. 478/i, and Piano Trio in G Major, K. 496/ii; Haydn’s String Quartets, op. 33; Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 101/i; Other Works

Gustav Jenner is widely considered Johannes Brahms’s only composition student. Jenner’s ([1905] 2009, 381–423) reminiscences of Brahms, first published in 1903, conclude with a history of sonata form and a reconsideration of its status at the turn of the twentieth century. Jenner claims that sonata from developed primarily in instrumental music by J. S. Bach, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven—followed by a precipitous decline due to Wagner’s negative influence (413–21). This narrative was common at the turn of the twentieth century; it was not unique to Jenner or to Schenker. Indeed, the “Niedergang” typescript glows with Brahms’s aura.
Schenker became acquainted with Brahms in the spring of 1894 (Schenker 1933; Karnes 2005). Through their conversations, perhaps he had the opportunity to learn some of the same lessons that Jenner had, even if Schenker never studied composition with Brahms formally. For example, consider this well-known anecdote where, early one morning in a Leipzig hotel room, Brahms critiques one of Jenner’s compositions:

At the first movement of the trio there was much turning of pages back and forth. With devastating precision Brahms demonstrated to me the lack of logic in the structure; it was as if the whole thing dissolved into its component parts in his hands. With growing horror I saw how loosely and weakly the parts were joined together. I realized that the bond that was supposed to hold them together was less an internal than an external one; it was nothing more than the device of sonata form. The essence of form began to reveal itself to me, and I suddenly realized that it is not enough to have a good idea here and there; that one has not written a sonata when one has merely combined several such ideas through the outward form of the sonata, but that, on the contrary, the sonata form must emerge of necessity from the idea.93 (Jenner [1905] 2009, 385)

External form versus internal logic: Schenker likewise claimed that sonata form was never a mere schema to the master composers. And from an analytical standpoint, Schenker writes, “it is much more profitable to speak about the differences in form among individual three-part cyclic works, rather than referring continually to their most decisive feature, three-part construction, which degrades the form to a schematic plan” (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 45).94 This is particularly true

---

93 “Bei dem ersten Satz des Trios wurde viel hin- und hergeblättert. Mit vernichtender Schärfe wies Brahms mir das Unlogische des Aufbaues nach; es war, als wenn alles unter seinen Händen zerbröckelte und das Ganze in seine einzelnen Teile auseinanderfiel. Mit wachsendem Schrecken sah ich, wie schwach und lose diese zusammenhingen; ich erkannte, dass das Band, das sie zusammenhalten sollte, weniger ein innerliches als ein äusserliches war: es war nichts weiter, als das Schema der Sonatenform. Das Wesen der Form begann sich mir zu ent hüllen, und ich begriff mit einem Male, dass es nicht genügend sei, hier und da einen guten Einfall zu haben; dass man nicht eine Sonate geschrieben hat, wenn man einige solcher Einfälle äusserlich durch die Form der Sonate zusammenhält, sondern dass umgekehrt die Sonatenform mit Notwendigkeit aus dem Gedanken hervorgehen muss” (Jenner 1905, 6).

94 “Ebenso < · > ist es viel nützlicher[,] von den Formunterschieden der einzelnen dreiteiligen cyklischen Werke als immer wieder von der Dreiteiligkeit als von ihrem
of the exposition: although the diagram in example 3.1.1(a) (see p. 158) emphasizes three-part construction, Schenker was more interested in manifold ways that individual compositions realize this schema. In fact, he developed four types of exposition through the study of Haydn’s string quartets, Mozart’s chamber music for piano and strings, and Beethoven’s late piano sonatas.

The placement of the modulation within the exposition, from the primary key to the subordinate key, largely determines which type is at hand. In the “Niedergang” typescript, Schenker explains how this opposition of keys (and their associated themes) is integral to sonata form’s dramatic trajectory, for

> the significance even of a key can only be made sufficiently perceptible to the ear by the contrast of another, just as one does not want to remain with a single theme; rather a development leading from one theme to other, new themes should take place. So the fact that a development takes place—but at its best only by means of a resplendent evolution of key—is made plausible to the ear. In addition, the return to the principal key, from which one had started, attains its rightful sound only if in the meantime one had lingered elsewhere, namely, in a different key.95 (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 46)

This suggests that a new key and a new theme both contribute to the exposition’s sense of development, but Schenker continues:

> From the above account of three-part form [in the exposition], one may be inclined to derive what appears to be a self-evident postulate: that the themes of the second and third groups would have to be entirely new. Nevertheless, the masters did not always hold firmly to such a principle, for often enough we encounter themes from the first group in the second or third. Such a continuity of

motivic material might mislead us into rejecting three-part construction in this particular case. That, however, would be a mistake. For without doubt a change of key has taken place, and this alone provides sufficient grounds for themes that stand upon the foundation of the new key—for despite any similarity to the principal theme, they may still exhibit sufficient differences—to be regarded as entirely independent themes. . . . This applies especially to the closing theme, which, even more often than the second group, is connected thematically to the first and nevertheless, merely on the grounds of the space allotted to it, must indeed be regarded as a third theme.

The criterion of tonality is, in fact, decisive also when the parts of the form flow into one another in such a way that a differentiation between them is simply impossible.96 (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 49)

Using key changes to determine form rather than contrasting themes per se represents a significant departure from the approach of most nineteenth-century theorists. Furthermore, this all-important opposition of keys usually comes to the fore in an exposition within the Modulationspartie. Schenker even advises, “when judging the worth of a composition, always start by looking at the modulation section and only then, secondarily, to see whether the composer understands group construction” (48).97 Perhaps this view betrays Brahms’s influence as well.98

---


98 For more on Brahms’s late approach to sonata form in general and the consequences of first themes in particular, see Notley (2007, 72–106). Schachter (1983) analyzes Brahms’s Second
EXAMPLE 3.3.4 Three ways that the end of the 1. *Gedanke* might relate to the beginning of the *Modulationspartie* (OC 83/83; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

In the “Niedergang” typescript, Schenker outlines four ways that the end of the first group might connect to the beginning of the *Modulationspartie*. The first three match a diagram found in file 83 of the Oster Collection (see example 3.3.4). In what I have labeled type-1, type-2, and type-3 situations, a capital Roman numeral one (I) represents the *erster Gedanke*, or first group. (A fourth situation, discussed below, is mentioned only in the “Niedergang” typescript.) The diagram for a type-1 situation shows that the first theme is divided into a *Vordersatz* ($a_1$) and a *Nachsatz* ($a_2$); the latter is fused with the *Modulationspartie* ($a_2 + Mp.$)\(^9\) Schenker describes this situation as follows:

---

9 Caplin (1998, 255) defines fusion as the “merging of two formal functions within a single unit.” In Schenker’s explanatory edition of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 101, he uses the term *Zusammenziehung*, which John Rothgeb translates as “compression” (Schenker 1921, 27; 2015, 4:22).
The modulation takes its continuation from the consequent phrase of the main theme, whether or not this continuation forms a group. . . . In such cases as these, the consequent phrase by no means loses the character of a consequent as a result of being charged with the modulation. The consequent merely entwines itself with the actual modulation section to form a unity, as it were.\(^{100}\) (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 47)

The first movement of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 101, is provided as an example, “where the first theme is very short and the consequent phrase immediately sets to work on the modulation” (47).\(^{101}\) A diagram of this movement, which was published approximately fifteen years after the “Niedergang” typescript had been written, appears in example 3.3.2(d) (see p. 241). The first theme (I. Gedanke) comprises a Vordersatz (mm. 1–4) and a Nachsatz (m. 5ff.); the latter is fused with the Modulation, as the right-facing brace shows. But this analysis is more radical: the end of the Modulation is fused with the II. Gedanke, creating the effect of one continuous gesture from the first theme through the Modulationspartie to the second theme (discussed below).

Returning to example 3.3.4: A type-2 situation occurs when “the modulation proceeds from the consequent phrase of the second theme belonging to the group, a technique that presupposes group construction in the main theme” (47).\(^{102}\) In this instance, the “main theme” comprises a group that is divided into two parts (labeled 1 and 2); the second part is structured as a type-1 situation. In the “Niedergang” typescript, Schenker writes, “the antecedent phrase of the


\(^{101}\) “wo der erste Gedanke sehr kurz ist und schon der Nachsatz sofort sich mit der Modulation befasst” (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 146).

second theme is reckoned as part of the first group on account of being in the same key, but the consequent must already be called upon for the modulation section” (47).103

Schenker provides the rondo finale from Mozart’s Piano Quartet in G Minor, K. 478, as an example of a type-2 situation (even if this movement is considered a rondo and not a sonata form). Example 3.2.23 (pp. 231–32), Schenker’s comparative analysis of five-part rondos, includes a diagram of the first theme and transition. This diagram is enlarged in example 3.3.5.104 Here the first group (A1) is divided into two sections (labeled 1 and 2).105 The first comprises a Vordersatz (a1; mm. 1–8) and a Nachsatz (a2; mm. 9–16); the second also comprises two parts, as the binary branch shows, but in this case only the first part is labeled (a1; mm. 17–26). I suggest that the second branch be labeled a2 (mm. 27–43), since this passage is similar to the preceding a1. (What looks like “t.” written where a2 should be likely stands for tutti, referring to all three string parts; notes throughout this diagram indicate the instruments playing at any given moment.) Moreover, in the “Niedergang” typescript, Schenker comments that a rest articulates the end of the first theme, which occurs in all four instrumental parts at the end of a2 in m. 43. The subsequent music is again divided into two parts, as indicated by the third binary branch in the diagram (counting from left to right). Schenker comments, “One could, if one likes, call this a third theme, reckoning from the start of the piece” (47).106 The a2 branch of this potential third

---

103 “So dass zwar der Vordersatz des zweiten Gedankens vermöge schon der Identität der Tonart noch ganz zur ersten Gruppe gezählt, jedoch der Nachsatz bereits für die Modulationspartie in Anspruch genommen werden muss” (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 146).

104 Readers may wish to consult a score for the following discussion. The measure numbers in example 3.3.5 are my own attempt to align the events shown with what occurs in the opening of Mozart’s rondo.

105 The indications A1 and Übergang1 appear at the top of Schenker’s complete diagram in example 3.2.23 (p. 231).

EXAMPLE 3.3.5 Form diagram (enlarged): W. A. Mozart’s Piano Quartet in G Minor, K. 478/iii, mm. 1–70 (OC 83/294; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations; see ex. 3.2.23, p. 231)

theme (that is, the third theme within the first group) functions as a transition (Übergang) that modulates to the key of the dominant (D major). Due to this modulation, Schenker divides the third theme internally: the branch for $a_1$ (mm. 44–51) begins to the left of the vertical line that separates $A_1$ from the Übergang, while the modulating $a_2$ (mm. 52–70?) lies entirely to the right of this boundary. In other words, perhaps this line represents a formal boundary that is marked by a key change—although it is difficult to say for sure. A I–V progression in the key of G major is shown to the right of this boundary. Schenker likely drew this grid before he filled it in with analytical notations; perhaps he simply ran out of room to write.

To summarize example 3.3.5: The first group has three components, the last of which comprises a Vordersatz and a Nachsatz; the latter functions as the transition section. This fits well with the type-2 situation. Yet Schenker may have an additional formal relationship in mind. As the arc connecting the second and third binary branches shows, he may have thought that these
large sections also stand in relationship to each other as *Vorder-* and *Nachsatz*, creating a contrasting *Periode* of a higher order.\textsuperscript{107} In this sense, we might understand the opening of Mozart’s rondo as an example of a type-2 situation, where the first group is divided into two large sections (1 and [2 + 3]). The second large section comprises two binary branches (2 + 3); the second of these branches (3) is divided into $a_1$ and $a_2$, with the latter functioning as a transition.

Returning to example 3.3.4: A type-3 situation occurs when “the modulation section is introduced after the conclusion of the principal theme without further ado; and thus it lacks the character of a consequent phrase” \textsuperscript{(47)}.\textsuperscript{108} The example shows a subscript Roman numeral one attached to the designation for the first theme (I), indicating that this close (Abschluss) coincides with the tonic *Stufe* in the primary key. Schenker writes, “the start of the main theme and that of the modulation section want to give the impression of being related to one another as antecedent and consequent phrase,” particularly when both start with the same *Hauptmotiv* (47–48).\textsuperscript{109}

This occurs in Mozart’s Piano Trio in G Major, K. 496/ii, shown in example 3.3.6 (47n27). The I. *Gedanke* begins and ends on a tonic *Stufe* in the primary key (C major). The *Modulationspartie* begins on a submediant *Stufe* (m. 13ff) that is reinterpreted as a supertonic *Stufe* in the subordinate key (G major), leading to a dominant *Stufe* in the new key. The II. *Gedanke* begins in m. 22 on the tonic *Stufe* of the subordinate key. All three sections begin with the same melodic motive. In other words, this is an example of what today is sometimes described as a “monothematic sonata,” whereby the first and second themes are based on the same melodic-

\textsuperscript{107} We saw this in § 2.5.3, in the context of Beethoven’s string quartet, op. 95/i, where the *Seitensatz* and *Schlußsatz* together created a higher-order *Periode*.
\textsuperscript{108} “Vielfach setzt die Modulationspartie nach < · > Abschluss des Hauptgedankens ohne weiteres frei ein. Also ohne Nachsatzcharakter” (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 146).
\textsuperscript{109} “Und zwar wollen sich eben scheinbar der Beginn des Hauptgedankens wie der der Modulationspartie wie Vorder- und Nachsatz beantworten” (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 147).
EXAMPLE 3.3.6 W. A. Mozart, Piano Trio in G Major, K. 496/ii, exposition

motivic material (although alterations are often made in the second theme).\textsuperscript{110} Schenker would surely have rejected this concept because a "theme" is determined by a contrasting key (or \textit{Stufe als Tonart}) and never by surface motives or melodies, whether similar or dissimilar.

The “Niedergang” typescript also describes a fourth way that the end of the first theme might relate to the beginning of the transition, one that is not shown in example 3.3.4. Schenker writes, “The modulation section can also be made up of rhetorical progressions; this procedure rules out a clearly defined two-part construction in the antecedent and consequent

\textsuperscript{110} For more on the so-called monothematic sonata, particularly as it relates to Haydn’s oeuvre, see Brown (1975) and Somafi (1995, 270–74). Also see Caplin (1998, 169) and Hepokoski and Darcy (2006, 135–36).
This “two-part construction” presumably refers to the division of the first theme, as seen in types 1 and 2, where a consequent ($a_2$) is fused with the beginning of the Modulationspartie. Schenker (47n29) lists the first movement of Haydn’s Piano Trio in A-flat Major, Hob. XV:14, as one example (not shown), yet it is not entirely clear how this exposition might conform to the description above. As in a type-3 situation, the first theme ends on a tonic Stufe in the primary key (m. 24), followed by the Modulationspartie, which leads to a pedal point on $B_\#$ in m. 34ff. This dominant pedal prepares for the arrival of the second theme and the subordinate key of E-flat major beginning in m. 41. The Modulationspartie is largely based on two-measure melodic fragments, particularly descending scalar figures. Perhaps this is what is meant by “rhetorical progressions” (rhetorischen Gängen).

Having described the Modulationspartie at length, Schenker ([1905–6] 2005a, 48) continues with a brief description of how this section joins with the beginning of the second theme. He emphasizes the tonal layout, writing, “Often, it is the case that the modulation section finishes on the dominant and the second group begins with the same dominant chord” (48).

---

111 “Es kann aber auch die Modulationspartie aus rhetorischen Gängen bestehen, die eine bestimmte Unterscheidung der Zweiteiligkeit im Vorder- und Nachsatz nicht zulässt” (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 147).
112 Readers may wish to consult a score for the following discussion.
113 Incidentally, this is another example of a monothematic sonata (to use modern terminology), since the second theme is based on melodic-motivic material similar to that found in the first theme.
114 Schenker uses Marx’s term Gang to refer to the loosening of melodic-motivic ideas in the Modulationspartie. In some of his more polemical analyses, Schenker often criticized this concept; for example, see his critique of Marx’s work in the analysis of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2, no. 1 ([1921–23] 2004, 89–92).
primary key is therefore excluded (see my description of Schenker’s type-A exposition and example 3.3.7 below, where the Modulationspartie is absent altogether). However, “the modulation section may finish on a harmony other than the dominant [of the subordinate key], and still other harmonies may be used to open the second group” (48).

Fewer guidelines are provided regarding the nature of the closing group, for “there are in general no binding regulations” (48). At most we can say that the closing theme is syntactically less important that the first theme, which establishes the primary key, and syntactically less important that the second theme, which establishes the subordinate key. Despite privileging the exposition’s tonal layout, Schenker chooses to express the relative importance of its three themes using a rhythmic analogy:

in a higher sense, [the exposition is] comparable to a bar in triple time, where the first element is strong (that is, accentuated), the other two weak (that is, less strongly accented); likewise the strongest emphasis in the three-part construction of a cyclically designed work falls on the first group, whereas the second group and closing theme appear less accentuated. The slighter degree of emphasis is revealed in most cases by the fact that the closing group is customarily kept shorter than the previous sections. It thus takes the form of a kind of narrow outlet, so to speak, for the first and second groups. (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 49)

---

118 “Denn diese ist im höheren Sinne einer dreiteiligen Taktart zu vergleichen[,] und wie in dieser das erste Glied stark (d.i. betont), die beiden Letztten aber schwach (d.i. minder betont), sind, ebenso liegt der stärkste Nachdruck im dreiteiligen Bau eines cyklisch entworfenen Satzes auf der ersten Gruppe, wogegen die zweite Gruppe und der Schlussgedanke weniger betont erscheinen. Der geringere Grad von Nachdruck offenbart sich in dem Schlussgedanken meistenteils nun so, dass er kürzer als die vorhergehenden Teile gehalten zu werden pflegt. Er bildet dann gleichsam eine Art schmalen Abflusses für die erste und zweite Gruppe” (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 148).
This is reminiscent of Riemann’s (1889, 95) rhythmic conception of three-part form in which a *schwer-leicht-schwer* metrical pattern is mapped onto a three-part schema (*A–B–A*; see § 1.3.5). Schenker effectively maps a *schwer-leicht-leicht* metrical pattern onto *a–b–c*.

The method of classifying expositions in the “Niedergang” typescript was perhaps an early template for what became an even more systematic approach that was never published. Schenker developed the latter, now located in file 83 of the Oster Collection, through the careful study of Haydn’s string quartets opp. 20, 33, 42, 50, and 54. Expositions from these works challenge nineteenth-century conceptions of sonata form, particularly the notion that the second theme must contrast with the first. Haydn’s expositions often include a second theme that is based on material similar to that found in the first theme (again, a “monothematic sonata”). Haydn’s expositions have even caused some modern analysts to doubt whether a second theme (in the traditional sense) is present at all.\(^{119}\) This includes expositions where the transition apparently fails to lead to a contrasting theme and devolves into *Fortspinnung* material instead—a “continuous exposition,” in Hepokoski and Darcy’s terminology.\(^{120}\) Certainly these are unique environments for Schenker to test his own approach to sonata form, which considers the exposition’s tonal layout at the expense of its melodic design to the extent that a subordinate key is nearly all that is

\(^{119}\) As noted in Hepokoski and Darcy (2006, 51n1 and n2), these scholars include Larsen (1963, 226–27), Rosen (1980, 100–4), Brown (1986, 295), and Webster (1991, 166, 326).

\(^{120}\) Hepokoski and Darcy (2006, 51) write, “The continuous exposition is identified by its lack of a clearly articulated medial caesura followed by a successfully launched secondary theme. Instead of providing a TR [transition] that leads to a medial caesura and thence to an S [secondary-theme zone], as with the two-part exposition, the continuous exposition, especially in Haydn’s works, usually fills up most of the expositional space with the relentlessly ongoing, expansive spinning-out (*Fortspinnung*) of an initial idea or its immediate consequences.” See Hepokoski (2016) for more on the continuous exposition as it relates to Sonata Theory and Caplin’s (1998) theory of formal functions.
required to establish a second theme.\textsuperscript{121} The following examples illustrate Schenker’s systematic method of classifying sonata-form expositions as one of four types according how the I. \textit{Gedanke}, \textit{Modulationspartie} (if present), and II. \textit{Gedanke} interact with the tonal layout (the location of the primary and subordinate keys).\textsuperscript{122}

Example 3.3.7 outlines the first expositional type (labeled A in the upper-left corner).\textsuperscript{123} String quartets from Haydn’s op. 33 and op. 54 are listed down the right side of the page (these designations all refer to their respective first movements). To indicate that a \textit{Modulationspartie} is lacking in all of these expositions, Schenker writes \textit{ohne Mp.} at the top of the page.\textsuperscript{124} A Roman numeral one (I) at the top-left side stands for the I. \textit{Gedanke}, or first theme. In this column, a diagram of the first theme is given for each movement. In every case, it is divided into two parts, labeled 1 and 2 (see the binary branches), with the second part ending on a dominant \textit{Stufe} in the primary key (indicated 2\textsubscript{V}). It is unclear whether this dominant represents a cadence \textit{per se}, although it is clear that the end of the first theme (or at least the second branch of the first theme) coincides with this \textit{Stufe}.\textsuperscript{125} A Roman numeral two (II) heads the page’s center column, which provides an analysis of the II. \textit{Gedanke} for each exposition. These themes all begin on a tonic \textit{Stufe}\textsuperscript{123}

\textsuperscript{121} This resembles the position of Caplin and Martin (2016, 10), who reject Sonata Theory’s concept of “continuous exposition” in favor of an approach where “the boundary between the transition and the subordinate theme can become blurred.” In particular, their approach is roughly similar to Schenker’s type-B exposition described below, where the end of the \textit{Modulationspartie} and the beginning of the II. \textit{Gedanke} are fused together.

\textsuperscript{122} For a preview and summary of these expositional types, which Schenker labels A through D, see example 3.3.15, pp. 278–79.

\textsuperscript{123} The four types of exposition described in the “Niedergang” typescript are referred to using Arabic numerals (types 1 through 4), whereas the four types described in file 83 of the Oster Collection are referred to using capital letters (types A through D).

\textsuperscript{124} Perhaps the lack of a \textit{Modulationspartie} is what characterizes \textit{Overtüreform}, which appears to be written in the top-right corner of the page.

\textsuperscript{125} In reconstructing the following analyses, I observe prominent cadences and their relationship to the form. Schenker also appears to have observed some of these cadences, but a
EXAMPLE 3.3.7 Type-A expositions from select string quartets by Haydn (OC 83/87; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

strict relationship between cadential articulations and formal boundaries likely did not exist in his early *Formenlehre* to the extent that it did either in eighteenth-century approaches (Koch [1782–93] 1983) or in more recent theories (Caplin 1998; Hepokoski and Darcy 2006).
in their respective subordinate keys. They are also characterized either as new (op. 33, no. 6/i) or as beginning with the same motive as the first theme (op. 33, no. 1/i; Kopf von I. [Gedanke]).

Near the middle of the page, Schenker draws a horizontal line that separates the first four movements listed in example 3.3.7 from the fifth: Haydn’s String Quartet in C Major, op. 20, no. 2/i. The first diagram for this movement conforms to the schema outlined at the top of the page. The I. Gedanke is divided into two parts: the first is characterized as a Fugato; the second ends on a dominant Stufe (2v). A Modulationspartie is lacking altogether. The II. Gedanke begins on a tonic Stufe in the subordinate key (G major). An alternative analysis is provided below this. Here the I. Gedanke leads to a Modulationspartie that remains in the primary key and ends with a dominant Stufe. Schenker writes Mp. ohne Mod.? to the lower-right of this diagram: Is it possible to have a Modulationspartie without a modulation? Recognizing the inherent contradiction, the word Übergang is written near the center of the page below the horizontal line that separates Haydn’s op. 20, no. 2/i, from the other analyses. Perhaps an Übergang in this case is a broader category of transition that does not necessarily modulate, while a Modulationspartie has a narrower meaning that requires a modulation to a subordinate key.126

Haydn’s String Quartet in B Minor, op. 33, no. 1, illustrates the type-A exposition in context (see Schenker’s diagram for this movement in example 3.3.7).127 In example 3.3.8, the I. Gedanke (mm. 1–17) comprises two parts, which I interpret as a Periode of a higher order. While it is unclear exactly where the first part (Vordersatz) ends, the downbeat of m. 11 is the best

---

126 This alternative analysis of Haydn’s op. 20, no. 2/i, is somewhat related to Schenker’s type-C exposition shown in example 3.3.11, p. 269.

127 For this quartet and Haydn’s other quartets in the following examples, I have used the archaic Eulenburg edition. This is the edition that Schenker would most likely have available to him at the time; in fact, all of his personal copies of Haydn’s string quartets in the Oster Collection are from the Eulenburg edition published in Leipzig (although a copy of op. 33 is not extant).
candidate. Schenker would likely observe an authentic cadence here, as the question mark attached to the cadence label suggests, but what formal significance he might attach to this cadence (and other similar cadences) is a bit unclear. Presumably the second part (Nachsatz) begins in m. 11 and ends before the fermata in m. 17 on a dominant Stufe. Notice how this Periode reverses the typical cadential ordering (assuming that mm. 11 and 17 are cadences): a conclusive authentic cadence is followed by an inconclusive half cadence. Furthermore, the Vordersatz and Nachsatz are contrasting rather than parallel to each other thematically, and they are unequal in length (10 measures versus 7 measures respectively). As we saw in § 2.4.4, Schenker’s conception of the Periode does not require any particular thematic resemblance, cadential syntax, or symmetry; it is a simple proposition–response paradigm.

No Modulationspartie exists in this exposition because the music does not depart from the primary key until the onset of the II. Gedanke. In example 3.3.8, this theme begins immediately on a tonic Stufe in the subordinate key of D major (see m. 18). The motive in the first violin is nearly identical to the motive at the beginning of the movement at pitch level despite its harmonization in a different key (D major versus B minor). Schenker indicates this in example 3.3.7, writing Kopf von I. [Gedanke] in the column for the II. Gedanke. I suggest that the downbeat of m. 33 is the best candidate for marking the end of the II. Gedanke and the beginning of the Schlußgedanke. This formal boundary coincides with a change in character and a perfect authentic cadence in the subordinate key embellished by a prominent trill in the first violin—although this cadence is not strictly required, as I described near the beginning of § 3.3. In all of the diagrams in example 3.3.7, there is no mention of the Schlußgedanke, or third theme. From
EXAMPLE 3.3.8 Type-A exposition: Haydn’s String Quartet in B Minor, op. 33, no. 1/i, mm. 1–37

I. Gedanke (mm. 1–17)

Periode: Vorsetz (mm. 1–10)

[Hauptmotiv]

Allegro moderato

B minor: V

D major: I
EXAMPLE 3.3.8 CONTINUED
Schenker’s perspective, perhaps this is because the Schlußgedanke performs no essential “tonal work”: by its onset, the modulation has already occurred.

Example 3.3.9 outlines two versions of the type-B exposition: one in which the I. Gedanke ends on a tonic Stufe and another in which the I. Gedanke ends on a dominant Stufe. The first appears in example 3.3.9(a). In the upper-left corner, a capital Roman numeral one with a subscript Roman numeral one (I₁) indicates that the I. Gedanke ends on a tonic Stufe. All of the first movements from Haydn’s string quartets listed down the right side of the page conform to this schema. Looking at the top of the page from left to right, we find an analysis of Haydn’s String Quartet in D Major, op. 20, no. 4/i. A capital Roman numeral one represents the first theme ending on a tonic Stufe in the primary key (I₁). The I. Gedanke, a Periode, is divided into a₁ (Vordersatz) and a₂ (Nachsatz). A break separates the end of the I. Gedanke from the beginning of the Modulationspartie. The end of the Modulationspartie and the beginning of the II. Gedanke are then fused together (Mp. + II. [Gedanke]) because they are both set in the subordinate key: the Modulationspartie begins on a pivot chord, functioning as VI in D major and II in A major (VI/II). The II. Gedanke, also in A major, begins with a motive resembling the one found at the opening of the first theme (Kopf von I. [Gedanke]). The two expositions listed in example 3.3.9(b) are identical to the situation just described, except that their first themes are harmonically open rather than closed, ending on a dominant Stufe in the primary key (indicated I₄).

The first movement from Haydn’s String Quartet in B-flat Major, op. 33, no. 4, shown above in example 3.3.10, exemplifies a type-B exposition (cf. Schenker’s diagram on the second line in example 3.3.9[a]). The opening measures make up a Gruppe that ends on a tonic Stufe in

128 I interpret the wavy lines written above some first themes in example 3.3.8(a) to represent group construction rather than period construction; for instance, see the diagram of the first theme for Haydn’s op. 33, no. 4/i.
**Example 3.3.9** Type-B expositions from select string quartets by Haydn

(A) Type-B exposition: I. *Gedanke* ends on a tonic *Stufe* (OC 83/88; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

(B) Type-B exposition: I. *Gedanke* ends on a dominant *Stufe* (OC 83/89; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
EXAMPLE 3.3.10 Type-B exposition: Haydn’s String Quartet in B-flat Major, op. 33, no. 4/i, mm. 1–31

I. Gedanke (mm. 1–12)
Gruppe
[Hauptmotive]

II. Gedanke (mm. 17–25)
Kopf von I. Gedanke
EXAMPLE 3.3.10 CONTINUED

m. 12. The Modulationspartie begins in m. 13 on a pivot chord functioning as III\(^4\) in the primary key (B-flat major) and VI\(^4\) in the subordinate key (F major). The Modulationspartie progresses by falling fifths (VI\(^4\)–II–V), ending on a dominant Stufe in m. 17. The II. Gedanke enters in the subordinate key with a motive that is related to the beginning of the first theme (Kopf von I. [Gedanke]). Example 3.3.9(b) does not show where the II. Gedanke ends and the Schlüsslegedanke begins, or even whether a closing theme is present, but we might reasonably infer that the II. Gedanke comes to a close in mm. 25–26 given the perfect authentic cadence and the first violin’s characteristic trill. Presumably a Schlüsslegedanke would follow in mm. 26–31.

Example 3.3.11 outlines the type-C exposition. As shown at the top of the page from left to right, here the end of the I. Gedanke and the beginning of the Modulationspartie are fused together (I. [Gedanke] + Mp.). The diagram for the first movement of Haydn’s String Quartet in
E-flat Major, op. 50, no. 3, shows that the first theme is structured as a *Gruppe* (per the wavy line) that is fused with the *Modulationspartie*. The *Modulationspartie* begins on a tonic *Stufe* in the primary key (E-flat major), although it eventually modulates, ending on a dominant *Stufe* in the subordinate key (B-flat major). The second theme then enters on a tonic *Stufe* in the new key.

In example 3.3.11, the diagram for the first movement of Haydn’s String Quartet in G Major, op. 33, no. 5, illustrates a related schema. The I. *Gedanke* compromises two parts (*a*₁ and *a*₂), making it a *Periode* rather than a *Gruppe*. The wavy line leading from the end of *a*₂ through to the end of the *Modulationspartie* suggests that they are fused together. The II. *Gedanke* begins with new motivic material on a tonic *Stufe* in the subordinate key (D major).

Example 3.3.12 shows this analysis in context. After what I suggest is a short *Vorhang* (mm. 1–2), the I. *Gedanke* is divided into two parts (a *Periode* of a higher order): I suggest that the *Vordersatz* ends in m. 23 on a dominant *Stufe* (a half cadence), after which the *Nachsatz* begins in m. 25, due in part to the melodic parallelism with the beginning of the *Vordersatz*. As the wavy line above the score in m. 26ff. suggests, the *Nachsatz* eventually gives way to the *Modulationspartie*, blurring the boundary between them. It is unclear exactly where the *Nachsatz* gives way to the *Modulationspartie*; the latter’s placement in m. 35 is only an approximation (of course, that is the nature of boundary blurring).¹²⁹ The *Modulationspartie* clearly ends before the fermata in in m. 48 on a dominant *Stufe* in the subordinate key (D major). The II. *Gedanke* enters with a new melodic idea in the first violin over a tonic pedal in the new key (mm. 49–52). I suggest that the II. *Gedanke* ends and the *Schlußgedanke* begins on the downbeat of m. 89. The first violin signals a cadence, with its trill in the previous measure; a perfect authentic cadence in the subordinate key arrives on the downbeat of m. 89, while a change in character and dynamic

¹²⁹ I borrow the concept of boundary blurring from Caplin and Martin (2006, 10).
EXAMPLE 3.3.11 Type-C expositions from select string quartets by Haydn (OC 83/90; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
EXAMPLE 3.3.12 Type-C exposition: Haydn’s String Quartet in G Major, op. 33, no. 5/i, mm. 1–95
EXAMPLE 3.3.12 CONTINUED

---

Modulationspartie

---

II. Gedanke (mm. 49–89?)

D major: V
Example 3.3.12 continued

III. Schlussgedanke (mm. 89–95?)
EXAMPLE 3.3.13 Type-D expositions from select string quartets by Haydn (OC 83/91; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

follows. As an alternative to this analysis, mm. 89–95 might be heard simply as a coda rather than a Schlußgedanke.130

The type-D exposition, shown in example 3.3.13, incorporates two blurred boundaries. This is seen most clearly in the second diagram from the top: the first movement of Haydn’s Quartet in E-flat Major, op. 33, no. 2. A long wavy line shows that the boundary between the end of the I. Gedanke and the beginning of the Modulationspartie is blurred ($a_2 + Mp.$). This line continues through the Modulationspartie, where at some point a dominant Stufe in the subordinate key arrives. Yet the line continues even further, blurring the boundary between the end of the Modulationspartie and the beginning of the II. Gedanke.

Example 3.3.14 shows this analysis in greater detail. The I. Gedanke comprises a Vordersatz ($a_1$), perhaps ending with a half cadence in m. 8, and a Nachsatz ($a_2$) that at some point fuses to

---

130 For instance, we saw in example 3.3.3 (p. 242) that a Schlußgedanke was not present in Schenker’s analysis of Beethoven’s Third Symphony, first movement.
EXAMPLE 3.3.14 Type-D exposition: Haydn’s String Quartet in E-flat Major, op. 33, no. 2/i, mm. 1–32

I. Gedanke (m. 1ff.)

Period: Vordersatz (mm. 1–8)

Allegro moderato, cantabile

Violin I

Violin II

Viola

Violoncello

Nachsatz (m. 9ff.)

Modulationspartie

B-flat major: V
Example 3.3.14 continued
become the *Modulationspartie*. The wavy line written above the staff beginning in m. 9 indicates this fusion (or boundary blurring). A pedal on the dominant *Stufe* in the subordinate key (B-flat major) arrives in m. 15 and lasts until m. 19. In a type-C exposition, we might expect a break between the end of the *Modulationspartie* and the beginning of the II. *Gedanke*, but this boundary is also blurred, making it difficult to determine the precise moment where the II. *Gedanke* begins. Presumably the II. *Gedanke* ends in m. 28, where a trill in the first violin signals the oncoming perfect authentic cadence in the subordinate key. The *Schlußgedanke*, or perhaps a short coda, follows in mm. 29–32.131

On the other hand, the diagram at the top of example 3.3.13—Haydn’s String Quartet in F-sharp Minor, op. 50, no. 4/i—shows a tonal layout that is similar to a type-C exposition; namely, the *Modulationspartie* begins in the primary key and modulates to end on a dominant *Stufe* in the subordinate key. The arc in this diagram suggests that the boundary between the end of the *Modulationspartie* and the beginning of the II. *Gedanke* is blurred somewhat due to the lengthy standing on the dominant and caesura fill in the subordinate key of A major (mm. 21–26; not shown). However, the wavy line in Schenker’s diagram is also much shorter than the one used for Haydn's op. 33, no. 2. In both diagrams, the boundary between the end of the I. *Gedanke* and the beginning of the *Modulationspartie* is blurred, but the arc in the diagram for Haydn’s F-sharp-minor quartet suggests that the boundary between the end of the *Modulationspartie* and the beginning of the II. *Gedanke* is blurred to a lesser degree. Perhaps there are two versions of the

131 Hepokoski and Darcy (2006, 54–57, ex. 4.1) analyze this as a “continuous exposition,” whereas Caplin and Martin (2016, 18–23, ex. 7) analyze it as two-part. According to Caplin and Martin, the transition beginning in m. 13 is retrospectively heard as Subordinate Theme 1. As a consequence, the standing on the dominant in mm. 15–18, “which initially is heard as ending the transition, is *reinterpreted retrospectively* as occurring *internal to* a subordinate theme” (22; emphasis in original).
type-D exposition: one in which the boundary between the end of the Modulationspartie and the beginning of the II. Gedanke is blurred only somewhat, which might be confused with a type-C exposition if this is relegated to the equivalent of a caesura fill, and another version in which this boundary is blurred unequivocally.

Example 3.3.15 summarizes types A through D while adhering to the terms and symbols used in Schenker’s own diagrams. The four types of exposition have been ordered from the most sectional to the most continuous: The type-A exposition in example 3.3.15(a) has a clear break between the I. Gedanke, which ends on a dominant Stufe in the primary key, and the II. Gedanke, which begins on a tonic Stufe in the subordinate key. A Modulationspartie is omitted altogether because the subordinate key does not arrive until the onset of the II. Gedanke. The type-B exposition in example 3.3.15(b) has a clear break between the end of the I. Gedanke and the beginning of the Modulationspartie, while the Modulationspartie and II. Gedanke are grouped together based on their shared subordinate key. The type-C exposition in example 3.3.15(c) presents a similar situation, except that that I. Gedanke and Modulationspartie are grouped together based on their shared primary key, even if the Modulationspartie eventually modulates to end on a dominant Stufe in the subordinate key. This prepares for the entrance of the II. Gedanke on a tonic Stufe, also in the subordinate key. The type-D exposition in example 3.3.15(d) blurs the

132 The tonal layout of the type-A exposition is closely related to Robert Winter’s (1989) “bifocal close,” which he describes as having the following features: “1) a diatonic first group that reaches a half cadence on the dominant, 2) the articulation of this half cadence by a prominent rest immediately after, 3) the continuation and immediate tonicization in the second group of the local dominant harmony of the half cadence, and 4) a parallel structure in the recapitulation in which the half cadence now functions as a local dominant to the second group in the tonic” (278). This is also apparently similar to Hepokoski and Darcy’s I:HC medial caesura (2006, 25, 25n3).

133 This situation is similar to Hepokoski and Darcy’s V:HC medial caesura (2006, 25).
EXAMPLE 3.3.15 Schenker’s four types of sonata-form exposition arranged from the most sectional to the most continuous

(A) Type-A exposition: *Modulationspartie* absent (OC 83/87)

In the primary key: \[ a_1 \rightarrow a_2 \text{ Ends on } aV \text{ Stufe} \]

I. *Gedanke*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the subordinate key:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. <em>Gedanke</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begins on a I Stufe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Type-B exposition: *Modulationspartie* fused with the II. *Gedanke* (OC 83/88 and 89)

In the primary key: \[ a_1 \rightarrow a_2 \text{ Ends on a I or V Stufe} \]

I. *Gedanke*  
\[ \sim \sim \sim = \text{Gruppe} \]  
or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the subordinate key:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Mp.</em> + II. <em>Gedanke</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begins on a I or VI Stufe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) Type-C exposition: The I. *Gedanke* fused with the *Modulationspartie* (OC 83/90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Begins in the primary key:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. <em>Gedanke</em> + <em>Mp.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ends on a V Stufe in the subordinate key</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the subordinate key:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. <em>Gedanke</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begins on a I or V Stufe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXAMPLE 3.3.15 CONTINUED

(D) Type-D exposition: The end of the I. Gedanke and the beginning of the II. Gedanke fused with the Modulationspartie (OC 83/91)

In the primary key: In the subordinate key:

\[ a_1 \rightarrow a_2 \]

I. Gedanke + Mp. \[ \text{V Stufe in} \]
II. Gedanke

the subordinate key

boundary between the end of the I. Gedanke and the beginning of the Modulationspartie, and the boundary between the end of the Modulationspartie and the beginning of the II. Gedanke.

Three of these types resemble those already described in the “Niedergang” typescript; correspondences are shown in table 3.3.1. The type-A exposition found in the Oster Collection has no correspondent with the types in the “Niedergang” typescript because the latter all describe cases where a Modulationspartie is present. Schenker’s type-B exposition is closely related to the type-3 exposition: the Modulationspartie is separate from the end of the I. Gedanke in both cases (cf. example 3.3.15[b] above and example 3.3.4 on p. 249). The type-C exposition is related to types 1 and 2: the end of the I. Gedanke is fused with the beginning of the Modulationspartie in all three cases (again, cf. example 3.3.15[c] and example 3.3.4). Schenker’s type-D exposition might be somewhat related to the type-4 exposition described in the “Niedergang” typescript. The latter is “made up of rhetorical progressions.”\textsuperscript{134} Perhaps this is how Schenker first conceived of boundary

\textsuperscript{134} Although complicating matters in this regard, Schenker’s example—Mozart’s K. 496/ii (example 3.3.6, p. 254)—is not a type-D exposition. See note 111 (p. 255) for Schenker’s original German.
Table 3.3.1 A comparison of the expositional types in the “Niedergang” typescript (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 47–48) and the Oster Collection (file 83, items 87–91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oster Collection</th>
<th>“Niedergang” typescript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See example 3.3.15, pp. 278–79</td>
<td>See example 3.3.4, p. 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>No correspondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>Type 3 and perhaps type 4?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>Types 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type D</td>
<td>Perhaps type 4? (doubtful)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

blurring in this situation, although the type-B exposition is perhaps more comparable if this occurs primarily at the end of the Modulationspartie and the beginning of the II. Gedanke.

In example 3.3.2 (pp. 240–41), we saw Schenker’s many published diagrams of sonata forms by Beethoven dating from the second decade of the twentieth century. These analyses all seem rather ad hoc; they do not seem to reflect Schenker’s systematic method of classification outlined in the Oster Collection (at least not explicitly). Nonetheless, we can better understand these analyses by applying Schenker’s latter approach. For instance, the analysis of Beethoven’s op. 111/i is similar to a type-C exposition (see example 3.3.2[c]): the Modulationspartie begins in the primary key and modulates to the subordinate key (Schenker [1916] 2015, 3:41–43). However, the Modulationspartie ends on a chromatically altered subdominant Stufe instead of the expected dominant Stufe, while the II. Gedanke continues on a dominant Stufe (mm. 49–50; not shown). From a tonal perspective, this blurs the boundary between these two sections, making

---

135 One might also apply Schenker’s method of classifying expositions outlined in the Oster Collection to his later analyses, such as the sketch of the first movement from Beethoven’s Third Symphony in example 3.3.3 (p. 242). This analysis closely resembles a type-B exposition: a foreground sketch (Schenker [1930] 1997, 14–15, fig. 6; not shown) reveals that the tonic Stufe in the primary key (E-flat major) at the end of the I. Gedanke is reinterpreted as a subdominant Stufe in the subordinate key (B-flat major). As a result, a local change in key coincides with the beginning of the Modulationspartie.
this closer to a type-B exposition—again, notwithstanding the fact that the Modulationspartie begins in the primary key. Given both aspects of the tonal layout, perhaps we might even consider this in dialogue with a type-D exposition.

Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 101/i, shown in example 3.3.2(d) (p. 241), clearly conforms to a type-D exposition. This analysis, reconstructed in example 3.3.16, reveals the fundamental principles underlying his conception of the exposition, including the definitive role played by the tonal layout (Schenker [1921] 2015, 4:21–28). Together mm. 1–4 function as a Vordersatz (perhaps ending with a half cadence); the Nachsatz is then fused with the Modulationspartie beginning in m. 5. This matches the description in the “Niedergang” typescript ([1905–6] 2005a, 47) and conforms to the type-1 schema in example 3.3.4 (p. 249). But in the explanatory edition of op. 101, Schenker observes that we also find this technique in Beethoven’s early sonatas, including the Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2, no. 1/i. He continues:

What in op. 101 far exceeds this daring feat of the early work, however, is the circumstance that here the consequent, having embarked on the modulation, simultaneously also yields the head of the second theme, so that the latter—exactly as a product of the consequent character—shares the motif with the first theme. Now it would amount to a misjudgment of the nature of sonata form if one were to espy a contradiction in such a procedure, for the point of emphasis in that form is above all the modulation between the first and second theme—that is, the opposition of the keys, not that of the thematic aspect; for this reason, the second theme can under certain circumstances be related to the first, or may even be identical to it, so long as it occupies the territory of an opposing key. . . . In this sense Beethoven’s technique in the First Part [exposition] of our sonata movement can be understood as a most extreme compression [Zusammenziehung] of no fewer than three formal components: a consequent of the first theme, the modulation, and the second theme. This is possible, as stated, because the second theme of a sonata movement need by no means exhibit a new motif.136 (Schenker [1921] 2015, 4:21–22).

---

136 “Was aber in op. 101 noch weit über diese Kühlheit des Jugendwerkes hinausgeht, ist der Umstand, daß hier der in Modulation geratene Nachsatz in einem auch den Kopf des 2. Ged. abgibt, so daß der letztere, was sich eben aus dem Nachsatzcharakter ergibt, das Motiv mit dem 1. Ged. gemeinsam hat. Nun hieße es aber das Wesen der Sonatenform verkennen, wenn man in
In example 3.3.16, the wavy line above the staff in mm. 5–6 highlights the fusion of the I. Gedanke with the Modulationspartie. The Nachsatz begins with a progression in the primary key (A major) that resembles a deceptive cadence (V–VI). The submediant Stufe is reinterpreted as a supertonic Stufe in the subordinate key of E major (VI/II). A Stufengang in this new key leads to a tonic Stufe on the downbeat of m. 8 (II–V–I). Presumably the Modulationspartie begins with the pivot chord at the fermata in m. 6, but it is unclear where the II. Gedanke begins. Schenker observes that the primary melodic motive and the tonic Stufe in the subordinate key coincide for the first time in m. 8 and concludes that the II. Gedanke must be established by this point. The first attempt to effect a cadence in the II. Gedanke occurs m. 16, although it is unsuccessful (I–II–V–VI, thus a deceptive cadence). A second attempt occurs in the subsequent measures: the dominant Stufe in m. 19 does not resolve until the downbeat of m. 25 (effectively II–VII–I over the course of mm. 18–25, thus an authentic cadence). The Schlüßgedanke follows in mm. 25–34.
EXAMPLE 3.3.16 Type-D exposition: Beethoven's Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 101/i (Schenker 1921, 27–29; 2015, 4:21–28)

I. Gedanke (m. 1ff.)

Motiv (cf. mm. 5–6, 7, and 8)

Allegretto, ma non troppo

Modulationspartie ---- II. Gedanke (to m. 24)

A major: V

E major: II V I IV II V7

III. Schlußgedanke (mm. 25–34)
§ 3.3.2. The Development (zweiter Teil): Beethoven’s Symphony no. 9 in D Minor, op. 125/i, and Late Piano Sonatas (op. 101/i, op. 109/i, and op. 110/i)

By the standards of most nineteenth-century Formenlehren, Schenker’s early conception of the development (Durchführung, zweiter Teil) was rather traditional. This section’s three primary tasks are described in the “Niedergang” typescript (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 50–51). The most important task is “to create the necessary tension between the first and third sections, by analogy with the middle section, b, of an a₁–b–a₂ song form” (50; see example 3.1.1, p. 158).137 (By the first and third sections, Schenker means the exposition and recapitulation respectively.) The second task is to develop thematic material from the exposition. Since the Durchführung is heard only once, “everything must be offered in such a way that it indeed becomes clear in its own terms, without the aid of repetition” (50).138 We find “numerous and rapid parallelisms in this section, and above all the technique of returning to themes and thematic elements from the first part, their development and clarification” (50).139 Schenker cautions that the term Durchführung can be misleading; composers sometimes “introduce entirely new themes, rather than develop the old material still further” (50).140 The third task is to signal the oncoming recapitulation. “In other words,” Schenker writes, “in the final phase of the development, the recapitulation must, so to

138 “Da sie aber . . . durch sich selbst sich zu erläutern hat, so muß alles aufgeboten werden, damit sie eben aus sich selbst hinaus, ohne Beihilfe einer Wiederholung klar werde” (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 150).
speak, already hang in the air” (51). Yet he seemingly refuses to describe what this might entail:

The means that the masters used to convey this can in no way be reduced to artistic concepts that can be technically defined: they are mainly of a psychological nature and are based on an almost divinatory gift—on the secure feeling that this or that device will work its intended effect upon the listener. (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 51)

Where musical technique ends a vague psychology begins. For example, a description of the tonal forces at work in the Durchführung is absent: there is no mention of the local modulations that usually accompany the motivic transformations, nor is there any mention of how the Durchführung might facilitate a retransition from the subordinate key established in the exposition to the primary key in the recapitulation. Marx, by comparison, describes both features.

Schenker’s analyses of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony and late piano sonatas, all published in the 1910s, conform to the conception of the Durchführung described in the “Niedergang” typescript—although additional details do emerge. In the first movement of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, the development is divided into four subsections (Abschnitte) preceded by a transition (Überleitung; see example 3.3.2[a], p. 240). Table 3.3.2 reconstructs this analysis (Schenker [1912] 1992, 89–90). The Überleitung (mm. 169–79) has two functions: (1) introduce what follows (this introduction is based on motivic material from the opening measures; see example 1.3.1, p. 10); and (2) modulate twice via pivot chord—first from B-flat major to D minor (I/V), then from D minor to G minor (I/V). The four remaining subdivisions (Abschnitte) develop material from

---

143 For Marx’s conception of the Durchführung, see Burnham (1997, 96–100, 146–51).
**Table 3.3.2** An analysis of the Durchführung from Beethoven’s Symphony no. 9 in D Minor, op. 125/i (Schenker [1912] 1992, 89–97)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsections</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Motivic Material</th>
<th>Keys Observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Überleitung</td>
<td>160–79</td>
<td><em>Einleitung</em>, mm. 1–16</td>
<td>B-flat → D minor → G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Abschnitt</td>
<td>180–97</td>
<td>I. Gedanke, mm. 17–18, 19</td>
<td>G minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Gedanke</td>
<td>17–18, 19</td>
<td><em>See example 3.3.17(a)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Abschnitt</td>
<td>198–217</td>
<td>I. Gedanke, mm. 17–18, 19</td>
<td>G minor → C minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Abschnitt</td>
<td>218–74</td>
<td>I. Gedanke, mm. 19–20</td>
<td>C minor → G minor → B-flat major → D minor → A minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Abschnitt</td>
<td>275–300</td>
<td>II. Gedanke, mm. 80–83</td>
<td>A minor → F major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Gedanke</td>
<td>17–20</td>
<td><em>See example 3.3.17(b)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example 3.3.17** Motivic ideas from Beethoven’s Symphony no. 9 in D Minor, op. 125/i

(A) I. Gedanke, mm. 17–20

(B) II. Gedanke, mm. 80–83

the exposition (see example 3.3.17 above)—namely, the first four measures of the I. Gedanke (mm. 17–20) and the first four measures of the II. Gedanke (mm. 80–83). Schenker observes that, as a result, the themes in the development occur in the same order that they were presented in the exposition, writing,
As in so many other works, Beethoven has chosen . . . that technique of working-out which adheres strictly to the order of the themes, and within them to the order of the bars. Thus appearing in the first two subdivisions are bars 1–2 and, at first independently, bar 3 of the first theme; in the third subdivision bars 3–4 of the same first theme; and finally in the fourth subdivision bars 1–4 of the second theme. (Schenker [1912] 1992, 89).

And while Schenker makes note of the modulations that occur within each subsection, it is not clear how these modulations coalesce into some larger tonal framework (91–97).

On the other hand, this was not a problem that needed solving—at least not ca. 1912. In Harmonielehre, Schenker writes,

The lack of a definite main diatonic system [Hauptdiatonie] for whose sake we are to assume chromatically simulated keys is found more often in the so-called development parts of cyclic compositions. Such a lack may even be considered the main criterion of such parts, and it certainly would run counter to the author’s attention if we busied ourselves trying to construct here, artificially and arbitrarily, a possibly continuous diatonic system. Since there is no interest of any particular diatonic system to defend, the only correct thing to do is to accept all keys as real, i.e., to take the modulations to be definite.145 (Schenker [1906] 1954, 299; emphasis added to match original)

144 “Wie in so manchem anderen Werk . . . Beethoven jene Technik der Verarbeitung gewählt, die sich streng an die Reihe der Gedanken und innerhalb derselben wieder an die Reihe der Takte hält. So erscheinen in den ersten beiden Abschnitten Takt 1–2 und, davon zunächst unabhängig, Takt 3 des ersten Gedankens, im 3. Abschnitt Takt 3–4 ebenfalls des ersten Gedankens und endlich im 4. Abschnitt die Takte 1–4 des zweiten Gedankens” (Schenker 1912, 75). This is similar to Hepokoski and Darcy’s concept of rotation, which they define as “those [structures] that extend through musical space by recycling one or more times—with appropriate alterations and adjustments—a referential thematic pattern established as an ordered succession at the piece’s outset” (2006, 611). This is also related to Koch’s ([1782–93] 1983) Anlage.

145 “Ein solcher Mangel an einer bestimmten Hauptdiatonie, zu deren Gunsten chromatische Scheintonarten sonst angenommen werden müssten, tritt am häufigsten in den sogenannten Durchführungspartien der zyklischen Werke hervor. Ja, jener Mangel ist sogar als das wesentliche Merkmal solcher Abschnitte zu bezeichnen, so daß es sicher der Absicht des Autors zuwiderlaufen würde, wenn wir uns hier eigens abmühen wollten, eine womöglich kontinuierliche Diatonie künstlich und willkürlich zu konstruieren. Hier ist es daher einzig richtig, und zwar nur eben weil das Interesse einer Diatonie wegfällt, alle Tonarten für wirklich, d.h. die Modulationen für definitiv zu nehmen” (Schenker 1906, 397).
In the case of the development from the first movement from Beethoven’s Ninth, the first Abschnitt remains in the key of G minor throughout. The second Abschnitt modulates to the key of C minor. The third Abschnitt is much longer than the others: beginning “in the manner of a double fugue,” it modulates through three different keys while on its way from C minor to A minor (see table 3.3.2 above).\(^{146}\) The fourth Abschnitt modulates from A minor to F major, but the tonal motion that stitches the seam between the end of the development and the beginning of the recapitulation (mm. 300–1) is never mentioned, including possibly hearing a dominant Stufe in the primary key (D minor) in the measures leading up to the recapitulation. Instead, this tonal retransition is left to the recapitulation through the Stufengang I\(^{13}\)→IV\(^{7}\)→[V]→I\(^{13}\), which navigates its way from a major tonic Stufe in the key of D minor—a product of chromaticism rather than mixture because this tonicizes the following subdominant Stufe—back to its original minor form.

Motivic transformations and local modulations are also the focus of Schenker’s analyses of the developments from Beethoven’s late piano sonatas. Some of these development sections deviate from a strict ordering of the themes as they occur in their respective expositions. For example, while the development from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E Major, op. 109/i, begins with an idea belonging to the first theme, soon two new motives are introduced and persist throughout the rest of this section (Schenker [1913] 2015, 1:26–31). In contrast, the development from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A-flat Major, op. 110/i, is based on only one idea from the first theme (Schenker [1914] 2015, 2:45–47).

The development from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 101/i, is also based on motivic material from the first theme (Schenker [1921] 2015, 4:35–38). In example 3.3.18(a),

\(^{146}\) “Die Verarbeitung der Takte 3 und 4 geschieht zunächst nach Art einer Doppelfuge” (Schenker 1912, 81; emphasis original).
Schenker observes that the movement’s opening motive (mm. 1–2) returns at the beginning of the development (mm. 35–36).\(^{147}\) The melodic motive in mm. 35–36 is repeated in mm. 38–39—notwithstanding the intensification of $E_\sharp$ in m. 35 to $E_{\flat}$ in m. 38—and again a step higher in mm. 41–42. In mm. 43–45, the upper voice repeats only the second half of the motive: the descending third. This interval becomes progressively larger: first as the descending fourths in mm. 46–47, and then as a descending fifth in mm. 48–49. (The descending fifth is also accompanied by rhythmic augmentation: the dotted quarter notes in mm. 42–47 become half notes in mm. 48–49.) Schenker relates the descending melodic line in mm. 50–51 to the second half of the first theme (cf. example 3.3.16, mm. 3–4, on p. 283), in effect retracing the motivic content of mm. 1–4 over the course of the entire development.

Contrary to the approach described in Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, the analysis of the development’s tonal trajectory in op. 101 gains significantly greater diatonic unity (Diatonie). Example 3.3.18(b) illustrates what he describes as the “logic and daring” (Logik und Kühnheit) of the overall harmonic framework. While the development begins in the subordinate key (E major; mm. 35–37), mm. 38–43 are heard locally in the key of F-sharp minor (V–I) and prospectively in the primary key (A major). This reinterprets the local $F_\#$ tonic $Stufe$ in mm. 41–43 as a submediant $Stufe$ (I/VI). At a deep level, this submediant $Stufe$ progresses by falling fifths (VI–II–V–I) during the development and leading into the recapitulation. In example 3.3.18(b), the recapitulation begins on a dominant $Stufe$ in m. 55. Schenker is able to hear beyond what otherwise might be interpreted as local key changes—F-sharp minor in m. 41, D major in m. 46, B minor in m. 48, and C-sharp minor in m. 53—and integrate this larger harmonic motion into a single $Stufengang$ that points toward the return of the primary key in the recapitulation. Indeed,\(^{147}\) Example 3.3.18(a) begins where example 3.3.16 left off.
EXAMPLE 3.3.18 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 101/i, development

(A) Sketch, mm. 35–55 (Schenker 1921, 32, fig. 17)

(B) Harmonic framework, mm. 41–55 (Schenker 1921, 33, fig. 19)

the recapitulation “hangs in the air,” just as the underlying Stufengang ventures across a formal division that might otherwise separate the end of the development from the beginning of the recapitulation for its completion.148 Descriptions of large-scale tonal coherence in sonata-form expositions had existed already (Schenker [1906] 1954 246–49; see § 2.5.3), but until 1921,

148 Schenker writes $V zu I$ at the end of example 3.3.18(b). Compare this with his later conception of sonata form, where interruption closes off the voice leading between the end of the development and the beginning of the recapitulation, thus fully recognizing a formal division.
similar coherence had not yet been described in development sections. This was due to the many changes in key that are typically found in the development—modulations that Schenker considered “real,” as we saw in Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony (table 3.3.2, p. 286).

§ 3.3.3. The Recapitulation (dritter Teil): Beethoven’s Symphony no. 9 in D Minor, op. 125/i, Piano Sonata in F Major, op. 10, no. 2/i, and Late Piano Sonatas (op. 101/i and op. 111/i); W. A. Mozart’s Piano Sonata in D Major, K. 311/i; Other Works

Of sonata form’s three main sections, Schenker’s early conception of the recapitulation (dritter Teil, Reprise, or Wiederholung) is the most under-theorized. This is to be expected since, as Charles Rosen (1988, 284) writes, “Theorists of the eighteenth century and later have traditionally paid less attention to the recapitulation than to other sections of the sonata—giving, in the eighteenth century, the impression that the composer was free to do much as he liked, and, in the nineteenth, that the repetition of the opening material was a cut-and-dried affair.” In the “Niedergang” typescript, Schenker simply claims that “the task of the recapitulation is to repeat the content of the first section in full” ([1905–6] 2005a, 51). But he qualifies this claim, for the principle of diversity and variety applies here, too. This explains why the masters liked to reproduce the content of the first part [exposition] with all sorts of delays, variations, expansions, and contractions; every caprice is appropriate, diversity alone is reason enough for these changes. To look for deeper reasons is entirely futile; for how could one find a reason that was even deeper than the most artistic and natural requirement of variety and diversity? (Schenker [1905–6] 2005a, 51).


Schenker seems unable to theorise what occurs in the recapitulation beyond vague notions of repetition and variation. In all of the diagrams in example 3.3.2 (pp. 240–41), the parts that make up each recapitulation are never outlined in the same detail as the parts that make up each exposition. More importantly, in the “Niedergang” typescript, any mention of the recapitulation’s expected tonal adjustments relative to what occurred in the exposition is absent. From the first issue of *Der Tonwille* ([1921–23] 2004) to *Der freie Satz* ([1935] 1979), this is characteristic of Schenker’s later work as well. Often voice-leading sketches leave off at the end of the development (Marvin 2012–13, 224–26, exx. 4 and 5).\(^{151}\) In these sketches, Schenker simply writes *und so weiter* (*u.s.w.*) for the recapitulation. We saw this already in example 3.3.18(a): the sketch of the development from Beethoven’s op. 101/i.

Because Schenker’s early *Formenlehre* offers few criteria for what defines a recapitulation, we might compare his published analyses of sonata forms by Beethoven dating from the 1910s to criteria proposed more recently. In particular, we might investigate how Schenker’s analyses conform to James Webster’s (n.d., § 3/iii) concept of the double return, or the idea that a recapitulation proper requires the return of the first theme in the primary key.\(^{152}\) We might also

---


\(^{152}\) Webster (n.d., § 1/i) states, “The second part of a sonata-form movement is longer than the first; it comprises two sections, the development and the recapitulation. The central structural event, distinguishing sonata form from all others that begin with an exposition, is the simultaneous return of the main theme and the tonic key in the middle of the second part. Neither a simple restatement of the main theme alone, nor a simple return to the tonic alone, has the intense impact of this simultaneous return.” Although it is true that together a return of the tonic key and main theme creates an immense impact, whether these are both necessary conditions for a recapitulation in a sonata-form movement perhaps remains an open question; see chapter 1 in Hoyt (1999).
consider how the various tonal adjustments made typically in the recapitulation are described—particularly the ways that the Modulationspartie and II. Gedanke are handled, and whether these sections are stated in the primary key or some other key. But we also must be cautious: few documents regarding the recapitulation are extant in the Oster Collection, and the analyses published in the 1910s might risk telling us more about what occurs in Beethoven’s late sonata forms than Schenker’s more general conception of the recapitulation.

Schenker’s analysis of the recapitulation from the first movement of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony largely adheres to the idea of the double return ([1912] 1992, 105–36). The beginning of the recapitulation (m. 301ff.) is similar to the movement’s introduction, “since, as we know, Beethoven treats the Introduction as an organic component of the principal theme” (105; see example 3.3.2[a], p. 240).153 Other than observing that the primary key returns, there is no mention of the recapitulation providing any large-scale tonal resolution.154 The tonal modifications made in the Modulationspartie largely go unmentioned, although Schenker does describe how, “[i]n order to preserve the major quality of the corresponding [second] theme in the First Part, the second theme here begins likewise in major, thus in D major” (111).155 This is a common procedure in the recapitulation for minor-mode sonata forms that allows the second theme to be restated in the global tonic while still maintaining the major-mode quality from the exposition, since there the second theme is usually stated in the key of the relative major.

153 “Die Reprise beginnt mit Takt 301, da, wie wir wissen, Beethoven die Einleitung als organischen Bestandteil des Hauptthemas behandelt” (Schenker 1912, 95).
154 Again, the famous D-major harmony in (square) position that begins the recapitulation tonicizes a subdominant Stufe, all in the key of D minor (the entire Stufengang is I → IV → V → I).
155 “Der zweite Gedanke beginnt, um den Durchcharakter des korrespondierenden Gedankens im ersten Teile beizubehalten, ebenfalls in Dur, hier also in D-dur” (Schenker 1912, 102).
In Schenker’s ([1921] 2015, 4:41) analysis of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 101/i, the recapitulation begins in m. 55ff. over a dominant Stufe in the primary key. This off-tonic return is similar to the opening of the first theme (see example 3.3.16, p. 283), which also began over a dominant Stufe in mm. 1–2 (although the recapitulation changes mode from A major to A minor). The reprise conforms to the idea of the double return, but, complicating matters somewhat, the primary key does not return at the onset of the recapitulation per se, since Schenker also heard the development in this key (see example 3.3.18[b], p. 290). A more restrictive version of the double return might require that the recapitulation begin on a tonic Stufe in the primary key, but Schenker does not adhere to this idea.

In the recapitulation, the first theme is shortened, “so that as early as bar 58 we have arrived at the point where formerly the amalgamation of consequent phrase and second theme (see bars 7ff.) had already occurred,” but “[f]rom here on . . . the Reprise takes its normal course” (41; see example 3.3.16, mm. 5–8, on p. 283). There is no mention of the tonal adjustments that occur, including the restatement of the II. Gedanke in the primary key. Presumably this is considered a matter of due course.

---

156 A somewhat related situation occurs in the recapitulation from Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 57/i. Schenker’s graph in Der frei Satz ([1935] 1979, fig. 154.4) shows the recapitulation beginning with the primary theme heard over a dominant Stufe in m. 135, although a Ĵ-chord is initially heard over this dominant pedal, resulting in a local F-minor harmony.

157 Schenker’s conception of key incorporates mixture, so that we might more accurately refer to the key of A major/minor; see Rothstein (2001, 214) and Schenker ([1906] 1954, 87, ex. 68). The distinction between D major and D minor in the recapitulation of the Ninth Symphony presents a different situation: the major tonic harmony (I\(^5\)) is understood as the result of a chromatic alteration (tonicization) rather than mixture.

158 “so daß wir bei T. 58 schon gleich dort angelangt sind, wo sich im ersten Teile bereits der Nachsatz mit dem 2. Gedanken mischte (s. T. 7ff.). Von hier aber nimmt die Reprise ihren regelmäßigen Fortgang” (Schenker 1921, 34).
On the other hand, the tonal adjustments made in the recapitulation from the first movement of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in C Minor, op. 111, are described at length (Schenker [1915] 2015, 3:60–69). The Modulationspartie (m. 100ff.) moves through four different keys: F minor, B-flat minor, D-flat minor, ultimately returning to the primary key of C minor. This is “a detour that is needed to provide full justification to the repetition of the modulating section within the framework of the Reprise” (60). The II. Gedanke (m. 116ff.) begins in what at first seems like the key of C major. But as example 3.3.19 illustrates, this C-major harmony is ultimately reinterpreted as a dominant Stufe in the key of the subdominant (F minor) in m. 124ff. An authentic cadence in the primary key is finally achieved in in m. 135, perhaps marking the end of the second theme and the beginning of the closing theme.159

The recapitulations in these sonatas all begin with material from their respective first themes set in their respective primary keys, even if, as we saw in op. 101/i, a recapitulation might begin on a Stufe other than the tonic. Yet Schenker did not require a return of the first theme at the beginning of the recapitulation in all cases. See example 3.3.20: Schenker’s form diagram from the Oster Collection of Mozart’s Piano Sonata in D Major, K. 311/i. The themes in this recapitulation occur in a different order than they are presented in the exposition; namely, the recapitulation (clearly labeled Rp. for Reprise) begins with the II. Gedanke, followed by the III. Gedanke and the I. Gedanke.160

From these analyses we can surmise a less restrictive version of the double return. Schenker’s conception of the recapitulation (1) begins on a Stufe (not necessarily the tonic) heard

---

159 For a second theme that makes a more radical swerve toward the subdominant in the recapitulation, see Schenker’s description of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A-flat Major, op. 110/i (Schenker [1914] 2015, 2:50–52).

160 Webster, by comparison, might not consider this a true sonata from for this reason.
**Example 3.3.19** A harmonic reinterpretation within the II. *Gedanke*: Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in C Minor, op. 111/i, recapitulation, mm. 122–23 (Schenker 1915, 47, fig. 62)

![Example 3.3.19](image)

**Example 3.3.20** Form diagram: Mozart’s Piano Sonata in D Major, K. 311/i (OC 83/120; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

![Example 3.3.20](image)

in the primary key, either prospectively or retrospectively; and (2) begins with thematic material heard in the exposition, although this does not have to be the first theme. These criteria are similar to Schenker’s position in *Der freie Satz* ([1935] 1979, 137–38), although for somewhat different reasons:
Since the principle of division necessitates the closure of the fundamental line and the bass arpeggiation, a return to the main key is understood for the recapitulation. When the main tonality is thus secured, it is also possible to take some liberty in restating the content of the exposition.\(^{161}\) (Schenker [1935] 1979, 137; emphasis mine)

Schenker goes on to describe how, for example, in the first movement of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Major, op. 10, no. 2, the recapitulation begins with what seems to be a tonic harmony in the key of D major—but, in retrospect, this is properly understood as a submediant Stufe on its way to the tonic in the primary key of F major (VI\(^{-1}\)–II–V–I). (Notice that both the D-major and F-major harmonies are able to support the Kopfton A [§].) Years earlier Schenker recognized a similar off-tonic beginning in the recapitulation from the first movement of Beethoven’s Violin Sonata in A Minor, op. 47, writing, “at the beginning of the Reprise, where at first, in place of the principal key, A minor, the key of the subdominant, D minor, appears, in fact to give the impression that it was itself the intended one; but as early as the consequent of the first theme D minor gives way to the principal key” (Schenker [1914] 2015, 2:52n23).\(^{162}\) In either case, whether before Schenker had discovered the idea of the Urlinie (op. 47/i) or after (op. 10, no. 2/i), the language is the same: the recapitulation is understood primarily as a return to the Haupttonart. When the primary key is apparently displaced by some other key, the latter is retrospectively understood as a composed-out Stufe (or Stufe als Tonart) that is part of a larger harmonic progression that points toward the primary key’s tonic Stufe. In other words,

\(^{161}\) “Mit der Notwendigkeit, gemäß dem Gesetz der Gliederung den Urlinie-Zug und die Baßbrechung abzuschließen, ist im Wiederholungsteil die Rückkehr der Haupttonart vorgezeichnet. Wenn solcherart die Haupttonart gesichert ist, wird es auch möglich, sich verschiedenen Freiheiten in der Wiederverwendung des Hauptteilinhaltes hinzugeben” (Schenker 1935, 222).

\(^{162}\) “zu Beginn der Reprise, wo statt der Haupttonart A moll vorerst die Tonart der Unter-Dominante, D moll, erscheint, und zwar um den Eindruck zu erwecken, als wäre gerade sie die intendierte; schon aber im Nachsatz des 1. Gedankens weicht D moll der Haupttonart” (Schenker 1914, 41).
recapitulations can begin with an auxiliary cadence; the beginning of the recapitulation does not have to coincide with the resumption of the Kopfton supported by a tonic Stufe in the primary key. And regarding the return of thematic material from the exposition, in Der freie Satz Schenker writes, “Even a reordering of the original sequence of the material is possible in the recapitulation, since the fundamental line and the bass arpeggiation ultimately restore the balance” (138). We saw this reordering earlier in Mozart’s K. 311/i (example 3.3.20). Now that the Urlinie and the Bassbrechung together guarantee coherence, an even greater freedom of form is made possible. As chapter 4 will show, this view betrays Schenker’s earlier concept of synthesis rather than the monism that characterizes so much else in Der freie Satz.

\[\text{163} \text{ Schenker never explicitly claimed that the beginning of the recapitulation must coincide with the resumption of the Kopfton supported by a tonic Stufe in the primary key in the foreground, although he might have arrived at this position with respect to the middleground had he lived longer. For example, compare his voice-leading sketches of Mozart’s Piano Sonata in C major, K. 545/i, in the fourth issue of } \text{Der Tonwille} \text{ (1921–23) 2004, 157} \text{ and } \text{Der freie Satz} \text{ ([1935] 1979, fig. 47.1). Schenker first heard the recapitulation beginning in m. 42ff. in the key of the subdominant (F major); the local F-major tonic, which coincides with the return of the first theme, is then reinterpreted as a subdominant Stufe in the primary key (C major). In Schenker’s later sketch, the recapitulation apparently coincides with the arrival of the Kopfton (3) over the tonic Stufe in C major in m. 53 rather than with the entrance of the first theme in m. 42, which according to this analysis, occurs within the development (Kalib 1973, 1:254, 273–76; Snyder 1991, 57ff.).} \]

\[\text{164} \text{ “Auch Umstellungen sind in der Reprise zulässig, da zum Schluß Urlinie und Brechung das Gleichgewicht doch wieder herstellen” (Schenker 1935, 222).} \]

\[\text{165} \text{ See note 80 (p. 236) for more on synthesis versus monism in Schenker’s work.} \]
CHAPTER 4
TOWARD AN ORGANIC APPROACH TO FORM

The whole modern conception of the world is founded on the illusion that the so-called laws of nature are the explanations of natural phenomena.

Thus people today stop at the laws of nature, treating them as something inviolable, just as God and Fate were treated in past ages.

—Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Logisch-Philosophische Abhandlung* (1921)

§ 4.1. INTRODUCTION

In 1921 Schenker described the *Urlinie* in print for the first time—although soon after developing this idea, his conception of musical form remained largely unchanged.¹ His approach in the early 1920s was one of accommodation: a nascent theory of organic voice leading operated alongside the more traditional *Formenlehre* described in chapter 3. By the following decade, however, the *Urlinie* had become the basis for a causal theory—which is to say, an organic theory—of musical coherence.² Near the end of his career, Schenker came to believe that the *Urlinie*, through the background’s dynamic transformation into the foreground, generated all aspects of a composition, including its form.

² For the integral relationship between causality and organicism in Schenker’s thought and its roots in Kant’s philosophy, see Korsyn (1988, 21–22). Also see appendix 3.
In the early issues of *Der Tonwille* ([1921–23] 2004), Schenker would often present a voice-leading sketch and demarcate large sections of the form according to key areas (*Stufen als Tonarten*) and thematic resemblances rather than melodic factors based on the *Urlinie*. Melodic factors were, however, correlated with more local formal articulations, usually at the level of the *Taktgruppe* (four to eight measures). For example, an incomplete stepwise melodic descent unfolding over the course of a *Vordersatz* might be answered and completed in the *Nachsatz*. The first melodic descent ends on $\bar{2}$ over a dominant *Stufe*, while the second descent ends on $\bar{1}$ over a tonic *Stufe*.3

The relationship between melodic descent (incomplete, then complete) and the *Periode* schema anticipates the concept of interruption (*Unterbrechung*), particularly when the *Nachsatz* repeats the same thematic idea heard in the *Vordersatz* (Marvin 2011). Through interruption, Schenker was able to relate voice leading and formal articulation more directly and on a much larger scale (Samarotto 2005). As a result, form was redefined primarily according to divisions (*Glieder*) of the *Urlinie* and its replicates at multiple levels. The question, then, is to what extent was Schenker’s conformational approach to form still operating covertly, even here (C. Smith 1996, 193–95)?

The schematic forms purportedly derived from articulations of the *Urlinie* and composed-out *Stufen* existed long before the idea of the *Urlinie* was developed, as we saw in chapter 3. This accords with Nicholas Cook’s (2007, 285) claim that the approach to form expressed in *Der freie Satz* represents “the rehabilitation of certain aspects of what Schenker saw as ‘false theory,’” or

---

3 We saw this in the first eight measures of example 3.2.18 (p. 223): Schenker’s sketch of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2, no. 1/ii, from the second issue of *Der Tonwille* ([1921–23] 1990, 2:suppl., 3).
what I described as the *Formenlehre* tradition in chapter 1. Beginning in the mid-1920s, Schenker reimagined form, which is inherently discontinuous, in the terms of its opposite: the continuity of voice leading. Bloom’s (1973, 14, 49–73) revisionist ratio of completion through antithesis (tessera) captures Schenker’s final response to the “paradox” posed by the generative and conformational approaches inherited from the nineteenth century.4

As we saw in chapter 2, Schenker’s early generative theory was based on two long-established ideas: *motivische Arbeit* and *Stufentheorie*. Melody and harmony converged in *Harmonielehre* ([1906] 1954, 20), where new motivic variants required new harmonies (and *vice versa*). As a result, melody (*qua* motives) was connected with the logic of the *Stufengang* at local levels to some extent, even if the precise nature of this relationship was unclear. Later, in chapter 3, we saw how Schenker’s early conformational approach to form was influenced by Marx’s taxonomy of increasingly complex full-movement forms—an idea that was perpetuated by later theorists, such as Riemann and Krehl. Both generative and conformational approaches coexisted in Schenker’s analyses dating from the 1910s, including those of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony and late piano sonatas.

Yet, as we saw near the end of chapter 1, a theoretical impasse emerged in Schenker’s “Geist” essay ([1895] 2007, 328) and persisted well into the twentieth century: in order for music to be truly organic, what causal mechanism would animate it from the inside out (Korsyn 1988, 44–56; Cook 2007, 65, 70)? And if a masterwork’s form results from its content’s organic growth

---

4 Mark Evan Bonds writes, “Definitions of musical form almost inevitably call attention to the paradox by which a single term can be applied with equal justification to two fundamentally different concepts: form as an aggregate of features that many unrelated works have in common, and form as an element of that which makes an individual work unique. . . . this paradox is useful, for it reminds us that no single perspective . . . is sufficient by itself” (1991, 13).
and development, how might we trace a connected path from the smallest motive to an entire movement in sonata form? (Ironically, this was the same problem that the nineteenth-century *Formenlehre* tradition, which Schenker apparently rejected, had attempted to solve.) Put even more strongly, how might we unify the generative and conformational approaches by demonstrating that the latter is merely a byproduct of the former?\(^5\) According to this view, forms are what Cook characterizes as “epiphenomena, simply the outcomes of deeper processes” (2007, 285). Of course, Schenker had long valued content over form—a belief that predates the *Urlinie*, or the idea that music is generated from background to foreground.

This chapter outlines how Schenker attempted to solve these difficulties in the early to mid-1920s. In § 4.2, I show how his generative approach to form based on *motivische Arbeit* and *Stufentheorie*, when combined with the concept of melodic fluency (*fließender Gesang*), gave rise to the *Urlinie* (Pastille 1990b, 71–73). Through this idea, Schenker was able to organize a work into well-defined layers of voice leading (*Schichten*) arranged logically, although he was still left with a generative approach on one hand and a conformational approach resembling a more traditional *Formenlehre* on the other. Again, if the masterworks are to be truly organic, animated by some causal mechanism, he needed a way to unify these approaches.

I show in § 4.3 how this desire for unity contrasts with the aesthetics of August Halm, Schenker’s contemporary and frequent correspondent. Halm, in *Von zwei Kulturen der Musik* ([1913] 2008), divided music into two cultures: (1) the fugue, which embodies melodic development and formal continuity; and (2) the sonata, which embodies harmonic and thematic contrast. In a direct yet covert response to Halm, Schenker synthesized these ideals into what I

\(^5\) Charles Smith (1996) claims quite the opposite—namely, that the outer form should determine aspects of the middleground and background voice leading through analysis.
call a *monoculture of organicism* by juxtaposing two essays in *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*, vol. 2 ([1926] 1996, 23–54): one on the organic nature of fugue, the other on the organic nature of sonata form. Halm combined these cultures into what he regarded as a grand synthesis of musical forces in Bruckner’s symphonies (Halm 1913, 253–54).

In this chapter, I also argue that Schenker’s desire to identify music’s origins through a causal mechanism was motivated by his deeply held Jewish faith, particularly his monotheistic religious beliefs. But as he was striving toward a more unified approach based on the background’s transformation into the foreground, perhaps another force was also at work: that of form or grouping. Indeed, form exerts its own force, a force that also influences voice leading: their relationship is reciprocal rather than unidirectional (Brody 2015). In fact, as a matter of history, Schenker’s traditional *Formenlehre* may have guided him from the surface to the depths of the *Ursatz* (C. Smith 1996).

Some of the theoretical ideas in this chapter originated through conversations with Frank Samarotto. These ideas include the dichotomy between the continuity of counterpoint and the discontinuity of form, the importance of fugue for understanding Schenker’s work in the 1920s, and the idea that form largely determines interruption rather than vice versa (Samarotto 2005). The philosophical ideas presented in this chapter—particularly as they relate to causality, organicism, synthesis, and monism—are indebted to the last chapter of Nicholas Cook’s *The Schenker Project* (2007), as well as to Cohn (1992a, 1992b), Lubben (1993), and Korsyn (1988). My aim is to show how these ideas, both theoretical and philosophical, together inform Schenker’s late *Formenlehre*, while doing so in the context of his earlier work.

---

6 In addition to these religious beliefs, we should also include the influence of Goethe on Schenker’s thought; see Pastille (1990a).
§ 4.2. FROM SYNTHESIS TO MONISM: THE MOTIVE REDEFINED

Music is the living motion of tones in the space given in Nature.

—Heinrich Schenker, “Der Kunst der Improvisation” (1925)

Schenker found a solution to the problem of musical causality through the Urlinie. A complete history of this concept is beyond the scope of this dissertation, but consider two theoretical constructs from his early work that likely coalesced into this idea: (1) motives express harmonies; and (2) melodies move predominantly by step.7 The first idea can be traced back to Harmonielehre ([1906] 1954, 20). The second idea, what Schenker called melodic fluency (fließender Gesang), can be traced back to Kontrapunkt, book I ([1910] 1987, 94–100; see Pastille 1990b, 71–73). In other words, the Urlinie is a melodically fluent motive propelled forward in time by the resolution of dissonance via passing tones as it composes-out harmonic space (i.e., the intervals provided by Nature through the consonant triad, which is generated by the overtone series).8 Or, as Cook writes, the “development of the Urlinie concept resulted in a redefinition of the motive” (2007, 256).9 Schenker’s challenge in the 1920s was to investigate the extent to which the Urlinie might control progressively longer spans of music.

7 See Pastille (1990b) for a history of the Urlinie and Ursatz in Schenker’s publications. Neumeyer (1987, 276–79) also briefly outlines a history of the Urlinie, particularly as this history relates to melodic contour. An Urlinie could either ascend or descend according to Schenker’s early conception, but later it was limited to descending lines, likely due to the sense of closure that melodic descent engenders. See Burnham (1995, 90–98) for a discussion of the Urlinie as it relates to Stufen and surface-level motives in Schenker’s analysis of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony from Der Tonwille ([1921–23] 2004, 25–33; [1923–24] 2005b, 8–30).

8 For a history of Schenker’s changing conception of the motive, see Cadwallader and Pastille (1992); also see Cadwallader (1988).

9 In this regard, see Cohn (1992b, 152–53).

The following examples, both preludes by J. S. Bach, illustrate how the *Urlinie* evolved from a local motivic idea to a melodic force that determines the course of an entire composition. See example 4.2.1: a sketch of J. S. Bach’s Prelude in E-flat Minor, published in the first issue of *Der Tonwille* (Schenker [1921–23] 2004, 34).\(^{10}\) The notes belonging to each instance of the *Urlinie* are grouped together through brackets above the treble-clef staff—the same notation that was used to identify motives in *Harmonielehre*. Schenker writes,

> It is immediately evident here that the *Urlinie* has the form of what is in essence a three-note motive, whose reproductive urge . . . gives birth to countless repetitions. Granted, such a motive, since it has just three notes, is in itself nothing more than the elaboration [*Auskomponierung*] of any given space of a third, and its repetition is also, in itself, nothing more than a repetition; but here, how differently does each execution of the motive take shape, and how differently does each repetition appear! How suddenly the chords change in quantity and harmonic meaning in order to bring forth that three-note succession and, especially, how multifarious is the manner in which the repetitions are interwoven with one another.\(^{11}\) (Schenker [1921–23] 2004, 34)

The *Urlinien* in example 4.2.1, like the motives in *Harmonielehre* ([1906] 1954, 4–7, 20), are subject to repetition and express an underlying harmony (or, as in the above quotation, the space of a third as contextualized by some underlying harmony). Many instances of the *Urlinie* occur throughout this prelude, for it is a relatively local phenomenon that spans only a few measures.

---

\(^{10}\) See Lubben (1993, 61–62) for additional commentary on this prelude, including the inconsistences in Schenker’s sketch.

\(^{11}\) “Hier fällt zunächst auf, daß schon die Urlinie die Form eines im Grunde dreitönigen Motivs hat, dessen Fortpflanzungstrieb . . . zahllose Wiederholung gebiert. Wohl ist an sich ein solches Motiv, weil eben dreitönig, bloß Auskomponierung eines beliebigen Terzraumes, an sich ist auch dessen Wiederholung nichts weiter als eben nur eine Wiederholung, aber hier, wie immer anders gestaltet sich die Gewinnung des Motivs und wie immer anders erscheint die Wiederholung! Wie wechseln, um jene dreitönige Folge hervorzubringen, allzumal die Klänge an Zahl und Stufenbedeutung, namentlich aber wie mannigfaltig ist die Art, in der die Wiederholungen aneinandergeknüpft erscheinen” (Schenker [1921–23] 1990, 1:38).
Yet Schenker also reveals conceptions of the *Urlinie* through this analysis that we usually associate with his later work. He describes the melodic motion G₅♯–F₅♯–E₅♯ (mm. 4–6) in the terms of what amounts to an obligatory register; in fact, he is often interested in the play of registers in this analysis (35).¹² And he implies a tone, D♭₆ in m. 16, to guarantee a complete third-progression in mm. 16–19 ([D♭₆]–C♭₆–B♭₅). These ideas, both involving aspects of melodic fluency, were certainly not part of his earlier conception of the motive.

Few clues in this sketch reveal how Schenker might have heard this prelude’s form, although his commentary suggests that it is divided into two large sections, plus a coda. The first section (mm. 1–16) modulates from the key of E-flat minor to the key of B-flat minor through a pivot chord in m. 10 (I/IV). Schenker does not observe a cadence *per se* in m. 16, writing only,

“[w]ith the tonic at the beginning of bar 16, the first section of the piece has come to a close; there now follows the return through A-flat minor to the principal key of E-flat minor” (35). The motion away from the primary key in the first part of the prelude (mm. 1–16), followed by a return to the primary key (*Rückleitung*) in the second part (mm. 16–37), resembles the tonal layout of Schenker’s type-5 two-part form, shown in example 4.2.2. Whether he would also hear the thematic relationship between these two parts as \(a_1-a_2\) is unknown, but perhaps he might, given the possible resemblances between the *Urlinien* in m. 1ff. and m. 16ff. Regardless, the form in this case is defined primarily by the key areas: first as a modulation away from the primary key, and then as a return to the primary key.

An exception to this idea involves what occurs near the end of the prelude. After the deceptive cadence in mm. 28–29 (V–IV), Schenker notices that a linear descent from \(E_5\) in m. 29 to \(E_4\) in m. 37 brings the prelude to a close, with a coda following in mm. 37–40 (37). Despite a nascent connection between melodic descent and formal closure, the motion down by step from \(E_5\) beginning in m. 29 is not an octave-progression *per se*, for in keeping with his motivic conception of the *Urlinie*, Schenker subdivides this descent into three overlapping thirds, plus a step: \(E_5\)–\(D_5\)–\(C_5\) (mm. 29–31), \(C_5\)–\(B_5\)–\(A_4\) (mm. 31–32), \(A_5\)–\(G_4\)–\(F_4\) (mm. 32–36), and \(E_4\) on the downbeat of m. 37. Likewise, what might later be heard as a sixth-progression from \(E_4\) down to \(G_3\), spanning the coda, is instead divided into two thirds, plus a step: \(E_4\)–\(D_4\)–\(C_4\) (mm. 37–38), \(C_4\)–\(B_4\)–\(A_3\) (m. 39), and \(G_3\) arriving on the downbeat of m. 40. Again, while Schenker might hear this long-range linear motion, a predominantly motivic conception of the *Urlinie*

\[313 \text{“Mit der Tonika zu Beginn des T. 16 ist der erste Teil zu Ende gegangen; nun folgt . . . die Rückleitung über As-Moll zur Haupttonart Es-Moll” (Schenker [1921–23] 1990, 1:40).} \]
EXAMPLE 4.2.2 Schenker’s five types of two-part form (see example 3.2.2[b], p. 189)

inhibits him from showing it in the sketch. How might one integrate the smaller details (motives) with the larger linear motions, all while preserving the identity of the former?

An analysis of J. S. Bach’s Little Prelude no. 5 in D Minor, published only two years later, appears to have solved this problem. In example 4.2.3, Bach’s prelude is presented in successive layers from simple to complex; or, as Schenker describes, this sketch “shows the gradual growth of the voice-leading prolongations, all pre-determined in the womb of the Urlinie” ([1921–23] 2004, 180). Here the Urlinie spans the entire prelude (see level a). In this sense, we might think of the prelude as a one-part form, although Schenker never says as much in his commentary.

---

14 For additional commentary on example 4.2.3, see Lubben (1993, 63–66) and Pastille (1990b, 79–80).
16 Perhaps level a anticipates Schenker’s concept of the Ursatz. However, level a represents only the counterpoint between outer voices, whereas the Ursatz is a more harmonically oriented framework that also incorporates Stufen (Lubben 1993, 66).
EXAMPLE 4.2.3 Voice-leading sketch: J. S. Bach’s Little Prelude no. 5 in D Minor, BWV 926 (Schenker [1921–23] 1990, 5:8, fig. 1)

The first note of the *Urlinie* (*Kopfton*) is retained throughout the course of an octave-progression from F₅ to F₄ in mm. 7–39 (see the upper slur at level b). This descending line embeds third-progressions, which have a motivic function, on two additional levels: (1) the descending third-progression, E₅–D₅–C♯₅, highlighted by the dashed slur at level d; and (2) the more local third-progressions shown by the slurs at level f in m. 9ff. (E₅–D₅–C₅, D₅–C₄–B♯₄, etc.). The latter grow from the notes comprising the fifth-progression from E₅ to A₄, an interval belonging to the dominant harmony (see the downward-facing slur at level d, mm. 9–21).

By comparing the sketches in examples 4.2.1 and 4.2.3, we see how Schenker’s conception of the *Urlinie* (and linear progressions in general) changed in a short time, from a
local organizing force integrating motives and harmony to a global organizing force integrating an entire composition through successive layers of diminution. In example 4.2.1, the motives (qua Urlinien) generate the nascent octave-progression from E₅ beginning in m. 29, whereas in example 4.2.3, the linear descent from F₅ beginning in m. 7 generates the motives as an outgrowth of a single Urlinie. By the fifth issue of Der Tonwille, published in 1923, the Urlinie had truly become a causal mechanism.

§ 4.2.2. Discontinuous Melodies and Forms: Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2, no. 1/ii; Schubert’s Impromptu in G[-flat] Major, op. 90, no. 3

Let us also compare analyses from early and late issues of Der Tonwille that deal with pieces exhibiting more discontinuous melodies and forms. Again, consider the sketch of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2, no. 1/ii, from the second issue of Der Tonwille ([1921–23] 2004, 78), shown in example 4.2.4. Traditional thematic resemblances and key areas define this four-part form: F major for A₁ (mm. 1–16), C major for the Modulation and B₁ (mm. 16–30), and a Rückmodulation (m. 31) to F major for A₂ (mm. 32–47) and B₂ (mm. 48–61).¹⁷ The Urlinie, shown on the topmost treble-clef staff, is coordinated with local levels of the form but it is not in control of the entire movement.

For example, Schenker divides the A₁ section (mm. 1–16) into a three-part song form: a₁ (mm. 1–8), b (mm. 9–12), and a₂ (mm. 13–16). This schema is correlated with the Urlinie: a₁ achieves a complete descent, from A₄ (♯) to F₄ (♯), although this motion is divided into two

¹⁷ In a four-part form, the B₂ section typically remains in the primary key rather than modulate to a contrasting key.
EXAMPLE 4.2.4 Voice-leading sketch: Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Minor, op. 2, no. 1/ii (Schenker [1921–23] 1990, 2:suppl., 3)
EXAMPLE 4.2.5 Voice-leading sketch: Schubert’s Impromptu in G-flat Major, op. 90, no. 3 (Schenker [1923-24] 1990, 10:15, fig. 1)
branches. The first branch, correlated with the Vordersatz (mm. 1–4), is incomplete: it reaches only as far as G₄ (♯2), which is supported by a dominant Stufe in m. 4. The second branch, correlated with the Nachsatz (mm. 5–8), is complete: it resumes by re-establishing A₄ (♯3) and then descending by step to F₄ (♭1). This Periode ends with an authentic cadence in m. 16. For the b section, a dominant Stufe supports a neighbor note (B♭₄, ♯4), while at the beginning of the a₂ section, this neighbor note resolves to A₄ (♯3). The a₂ section creates a greater sense of closure, descending by step from A₄ (♯3) to F₄ (♭1). Although not explicitly shown in the sketch, Schenker’s prose description of mm. 1–16 suggests that the a₁ section is correlated with A₄ (♯3) in the Urlinie over a tonic Stufe; the b section is correlated with a neighbor note (B♭₄, ♯4), supported by a dominant Stufe; and the a₂ section returns to A₄ (♯3), descending by step to F₄ (♭1). No single Urlinie unifies the entire movement in an analogous way.

By comparison, see example 4.2.5 above: a sketch of Schubert’s Impromptu in G[-flat] Major, op. 90, no. 3, from the last issue of Der Tonwille ([1923–24] 1990, 10:15, fig. 1). At level a, the ♯3–(♯4)–♯3 neighbor motion in the Urlinie that was previously correlated with a local three-part form is now correlated with a three-part form that makes up an entire movement: a₁ (mm. 1–48), b (mm. 49–108), and a₂ (m. 109ff.). Schenker writes,

What is also special about the path of the Urlinie in the a₁-section is that it lacks the neighbor note ♯4 that usually appears in such cases [that is, in the context of a local three-part form]. But the master’s intuition is also aware of this, for the middle section (bars 49–108) sets out precisely to achieve the neighbor note C₅. Since ♯4 (C₅) did not come about through ♯3–♯4–♯3, it should at least appear as a neighboring elevation [Überhöhung] of ♯3. Harmonic degrees of the principal key serve the

---

18 During the nineteenth century, Schubert’s impromptu was published in the key of G major rather than the original key of G-flat major. To avoid confusion, I describe the G-major version of the piece, following Schenker’s sketch.

It is significant that only one key is shown at level $a$: it is primarily the $\dot{3}–(\dot{4})–\dot{3}$ neighbor motion in the *Urlinie*, along with its accompanying harmonic support (I–VI–II–V–I), that generates the large three-part form.

Yet key changes also support hearing a three-part form, as shown at level $b$: the $a_1$ section is set in G major (mm. 1–48), the $b$ section is set in E minor (mm. 49–108), and the $a_2$ section (m. 109ff.) returns to G major through a pivot-chord modulation in m. 101 ($I^\text{IV}/VI^\text{IV}$). This leads to a contradiction: although Schenker’s commentary suggests that the three-part form is derived primarily from the $\dot{3}–(\dot{4})–\dot{3}$ neighbor motion in the *Urlinie*, he also correlates the three-part form with the disposition of keys (G major–E minor–G major) in the sketch. But the E-minor submediant *Stufe* at level $a$, which is expressed as a key at level $b$, does not support the neighbor note C$^5$ ($\dot{4}$). Rather, the supertonic and dominant *Stufen* support this note late in the $b$ section at m. 105ff.—*Stufen* that are heard locally in the key of G major. In other words, Schenker cannot derive the $b$ section from both changes in key (G major to E minor and back) and the neighbor note (C$^5$, or $\dot{4}$) *at the same level*. The form-defining *Stufen* as keys (I–VI–I) do not resemble the more syntactic *Stufengang* I–(II–V)–I that might otherwise support the $\dot{3}–(\dot{4})–\dot{3}$ neighbor motion.

Instead, the submediant *Stufe* supports a continuous B$^4$ ($\dot{3}$) in the *Urlinie*, as the sketch shows.\(^{20}\)

---

\(^{19}\) “Das Besondere am Urlinie-Gang im a$_1$-Teil ist außerdem, daß er der Nebennote $\dot{4}$ entbehrt, die sonst in solchen Fällen erscheint. Auch davon aber hatte des Meisters Gefühl Kunde, denn eigens auf die Gewinnung der Nebennote c$^7$ geht dann der Mittelteil T. 49–108 aus: wenn die $\dot{4}$ (c$^7$) nicht schon durch $\dot{3} \dot{4} \dot{3}$ zustande kommt, so sollte sie zumindest als Nebennoten-Überhöhung der $\dot{3}$ erscheinen. Dem Nebennotenbau im b-Teil dienen Stufen der Haupttonart: VI–II–V–I, s. T. 49, 105, 107 und 109” (Schenker [1923–24] 1990, 10:14).

\(^{20}\) On this basis, the $b$ section of compositions in three-part form with $\dot{3}$ as the *Kopfton* should modulate to the subdominant. The motion $\dot{3}–(\dot{4})–\dot{3}$ would be supported by the I–(IV)–I
As Charles Smith has observed, there are two kinds of three-part form derived through a neighbor configuration, “those in which the upper voice moves to a neighbor of the primary note for the middle section (the neighbor type); and those in which the primary note remains in effect into the middle section (the common-tone type)” (1996, 252; emphasis original). This is an important distinction. In Schubert’s impromptu, if the Urlinie had begun on 5, Schenker could logically maintain both the underlying I–(VI)–I Stufen as keys and the neighbor motion 5–(6)–5.

In example 4.2.5, a similar configuration is shown locally within the b section, from mm. 49–93 (see level b). Hearing this section in the key of E minor, the 5–(6)–5 (B₃–[C₃]–B₄) neighbor motion is coordinated with a modulation, shown at level e, from E minor to C major and back. This situation does not present the same problem that we encountered over the course of the entire impromptu. Yet, in both cases, two approaches to musical form are at work in the same analysis: one based on key areas, the other based on articulations of the Urlinie.
§ 4.2.3. Toward a More Unified Approach

The phenomenon of form in the foreground can be described in an almost physical-mechanical sense as an energy transformation—a transformation of the forces which flow from the background to the foreground through the structural levels.

—Heinrich Schenker, *Der freie Satz* (1935)

As Schenker developed his organic theory of voice leading in the 1920s, more musical features were subsumed by the controlling force of the *Urlinie*—and later, the *Ursatz*. As Joseph Lubben writes,

One of Schenker’s chief analytic concerns at the time of *Tonwille* was the elucidation of what he called *Synthese*, the means by which all manner of musical strategies and structures were ingeniously woven together into a complex musical fabric. Because Schenker privileged *Synthese* in *Tonwille*, these analyses exhibit less of the restrictive tendency—characteristic of later Schenker—to subordinate all parameters to the composing-out of the *Ursatz*. (Lubben 1993, 60)

Lubben is careful, however, to distinguish between two kinds of synthesis in *Der Tonwille*:

The first was used primarily in discussions that were not part of an analysis of a specific piece. In these contexts, Schenker usually treated *Synthese* as a consequence of the ubiquitous guiding light of the *Urlinie*. . . . This meaning of *Synthese* is essentially the same one that he uses throughout his later works. . . . The second meaning of *Synthese* dispenses with the guiding hand of the *Urlinie* or *Ursatz*. In the context of specific analyses, Schenker would often use the term even when his discussion made it perfectly clear that he did not consider the *Ursatz* or *Urlinie* to be exerting total control over the situation. (Lubben 1993, 60n5)

Schenker’s theoretical development can be viewed as a progressive evolution from an approach where “he did not consider the *Ursatz* or *Urlinie* to be exerting total control over the situation” to an approach where nearly all of a composition’s musical features are viewed as “a consequence of
the ubiquitous guiding light of the *Urlinie.*”21 The early stages of this evolution were illustrated through my comparison of the sketches from *Der Tonwille* above. To distinguish between these two conceptions of musical coherence, I will use the term *synthesis* to characterize an approach where all aspects of a work are not necessarily generated from the *Urlinie* or the *Ursatz.*22 Conversely, I will use the term *monism* to characterize an approach where Schenker does derive (or at least claim to derive) all aspects of a composition from the *Urlinie* or the *Ursatz* in a specifically causal fashion (rather than merely in a logical fashion) from background to foreground.23 As Cook (2007, 291) observes, “It is basically the latter meaning [i.e., monism] which is carried over into *Der freie Satz.*”

In *Der freie Satz,* Schenker attempted to derive rhythm and form from the controlling force of the *Urlinie.* And before then, even the dynamics of a work in performance were correlated with various levels of voice leading, although he soon abandoned this idea.24 As Richard Cohn argues,

> After Schenker “saw through to the *Ursatz*,” the notions of conflict and congruence between autonomous forces began to disappear from Schenker’s work.

---

21 Cook (2007, 255–65, 290–1), to whom my discussion here is indebted, provides the most comprehensive description of how Schenker’s theoretical development evolved in this way.  
22 For an extended discussion of *Synthese* in Schenker’s thought, particularly as it relates to Kant’s philosophy, see Korsyn (1988, 19–43). Cohn (1992b) suggests that even when Schenker’s late approach made an appeal toward monism, his analyses contained relationships that were not strictly derived through the levels of voice leading from background to foreground; instead, some analytical relationships continued to be based on *associations,* as in a more traditional conception of motivic relationships.  
23 I borrow the term *monism* to describe Schenker’s late theory from Cohn (1992a, 8), who borrows it from Pastille (1985, 33).  
24 Regarding rhythm and form, see Schenker ([1935] 1979, 118–45). Regarding dynamics, see Schenker’s analysis of the Prelude from J. S. Bach’s Partita no. 3 in E Major for solo violin, BWV 1006, in *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik,* vol. 1 ([1925] 1994, 46, fig. 2). And see Burkhart (1983) for an introduction to Schenker’s thoughts on how the interpretation of voice-leading levels (*Schichten*) might influence musical performance.
Schenker crowned the *Ursatz* as the sole source of all compositional unity, and all other compositional parameters lost their autonomy as independently functioning modes of organization. (Cohn 1992b, 153)

Cook (2007, 285–89) uses this tendency toward monism to characterize Schenker’s late approach to form in particular. As we saw briefly in chapter 3, Schenker sought to derive the forms that belonged to his more traditional *Formenlehre* from aspects of the background and middleground voice leading. In the early issues of *Der Tonwille*, this preexisting *Formenlehre* and a burgeoning conception of the *Urlinie* coexisted. Schenker’s analyses usually were not in a state of internal conflict—at least where form is concerned—because his methodology did not yet presuppose an all-encompassing unity of inner and outer form.25

The purpose of the chapter on form in *Der freie Satz* ([1935] 1979, 128–45) was to demonstrate how this previous model of correlation between voice leading and more traditional outer forms was, in fact, proof of causation. But there is also a sense in which, as a matter of historical development, Schenker’s pre-existing *Formenlehre* helped him to uncover longer spans of music that were under the controlling influence of the *Urlinie*. In example 4.2.4 (see p. 311), Schenker discovered how a local three-part form (a₁–b–a₂) was correlated with a 3–(4)–3 neighbor motion in mm. 1–16. This might have prompted him to investigate how a neighbor motion unfolds similarly over a three-part form making up an entire movement, thus motivating him to look for signs of the *Urlinie* operating at the deepest levels. Charles Smith makes a related argument in his article “Musical Form and Fundamental Structure: An Investigation of Schenker’s *Formenlehre*” (1996). Indeed, in the early 1920s, Schenker likely also adhered to one of Smith’s assumptions underlying his own conception of form—namely, “that the traditional forms are

25 Admittedly, Schenker’s analyses were sometimes inconsistent during this time with respect to voice leading and harmony; see Lubben (1993) and Cook (2007, 291–93).
trustworthy guides to large-scale shape” (1996, 194; emphasis original). (By large-scale shape, I take Smith to include all of a composition’s voice-leading levels as derived from the Ursatz.) Smith also finds traces of this formal approach in Der freie Satz, wondering why, “after going to such pains to construct a particularist mechanism,” does Schenker “then revert to conventional formal plans” (193)? Perhaps the relationship between voice leading and form is reciprocal: as a matter of generative theory, as a matter of historical development, and as a matter of analysis.

§ 4.3. Halm’s Two Cultures, Schenker’s Monoculture

Belief in the causal nexus is superstition.

—Ludwig Wittgenstein, Logisch-Philosophische Abhandlung (1921)

Near the end of chapter 3, I described how Gustav Jenner’s reminiscences of Brahms conclude by reevaluating the status of sonata form at the turn of the twentieth century. Jenner’s argument is similar to Schenker’s in the “Niedergang” typescript, claiming, “Brahms’s very arrival is a living protest against Wagner’s statements, and his compositions prove that their creator considered false the tenet that since Beethoven the sonata has no intrinsic value” ([2005] 2009, 414). Contra Wagner’s music dramas, Jenner establishes two sets of principles derived from absolute music: the fugue exemplifies one set, the sonata the other. In a passage that Schenker could have written himself during the first decade of the twentieth century, Jenner continues,

26 “Brahms’ ganze Erscheinung ist ein lebendiger Protest gegen jene Wagnerschen Sätze, und seine Werke beweisen, dass ihr Schöpfer jene Ansicht, die Sonate habe nach Beethoven keine Berechtigung mehr, für falsch hielt” (Jenner 1905, 64).
The principles of the sonata do not provide a rigid scheme, but rather an idea that originated in the dualism of thematic content. It is therefore a dramatic idea. . . .

[On the other hand, t]here is a musical form that evolved purely from the essence of music, just as the sonata did, and has a lot in common with it yet is entirely different: the fugue. . . . The fugue, however, is more one-dimensional than the sonata. Since the primary elements of music are movement, music can be expressed according to two principles—one, juxtaposition, and the other, succession: thus there is polyphonic and homophonic music. Though within a fugue the latter principle is given ample space to unfold its inexhaustible richness, the core of the dramatic idea that determines its form lies in the simultaneity of contrasting theme and counterpoint: the principle of counterpoint. By comparison, the Haydn sonata initially emphasized the homophonic principle; the dramatic main focus was anchored in the succession of contrasting themes.27

(Jenner [2005] 2009, 415–16; emphasis added to match the original)

Thus, the sonata is characterized by a succession of contrasting themes and homophony, whereas the fugue is one-dimensional and the result of polyphony (the principle of counterpoint). In the following decade, August Halm (1913) would solidify this dichotomy in Von zwei Kulturen der Music (1913) by establishing “two cultures of music.”28 As Halm describes, “Fugal form is the form of unity and sonata form is the form of opposition. The former is principally concerned with


Halm claims that J. S. Bach’s fugues represent the first culture, whereas Beethoven’s sonata forms represent the second:

[Beethoven] does not compose themes; he composes entire movements, or entire sonatas. Bach composes themes; he orders the events within the theme, dispenses the energy, and organizes its energy into a viable thematic body.30 (Halm [1913] 2008, 99–100)

Underlying this dichotomy, musical form is conceived as the product of two forces that affect the tonal layout of a composition—one centrifugal, the other centripetal:

This centrifugal tendency [to change keys] is paired (as a corollary and corrective) with the centripetal tendency, the need to remain in one tonality. These contrasting elements [the centrifugal and centripetal tendencies], when regulated and organized, experience their synthesis in musical form, especially in the fugue and the sonata form, as these have as their law the temporary domination of the other keys but at the same time the [primary domination and final right] of the main tonality.31 (Halm [1913] 2008, 46)

Having identified these competing forces, Halm describes the difference between the way that keys are deployed in the fugue and the sonata—a difference that resembles Ratner’s (1980, 51) solar and polar tonalities.32

---

29 “Die Fugenform ist die Form der Einheitlichkeit, die Sonatenform diejenige der Gegensätzlichkeit; die erstere hat es grundsätzlich mit einem Thema zu tun, die letztere mit mehreren oder vielen” (Halm 1913, 7).

30 “Er [Beethoven] komponiert nicht Themen, sondern einen ganzen Satz, eine ganze Sonate. Bach komponiert Themen, ordnet ein Geschehen innerhalb des Themas, disponiert über Kräfte, organisiert Kräfte zu einem lebensfähigen thematischen Körper” (Halm 1913, 77). This dichotomy might also be mapped onto eighteenth-century conceptions of invention and disposition, as I described at the beginning of § 1.3.

31 “Dieser zentrifugalen Tendenz gesellt sich, als Korrelat und auch Korrektiv, die zentripetale bei, nämlich das Bedürfnis, in einer Tonart zu verharren. Beide Gegensätze, geregelt und organisiert, erleben ihre Synthese in der Form, hauptsächlich der Fugen- und der Sonatenform, als welche das vorübergehende Herrschen anderer Tonarten ebenso wie das Vorherrschen und schliessliche endgültige Recht einer Haupttonart zum Gesetz haben” (Halm 1913, xxv).

32 For Ratner’s definitions of solar and polar tonality, see chapter 1, p. 11, note 36.
In the sonata form, the second theme group is in a key that is a fifth or third away from the original key, and, according to rule, the main key is reserved for the recapitulation. On the other hand, the development section [of the sonata form] has great and truly unrestricted harmonic freedom, and as the sonata form became more expansive and broadened in content, the rule that demands each group be dominated by a single key was no longer strictly kept. The sonata is capable of a greater richness of harmonic activity, in practice, but the fugue has the harmonically richer schema: it touches a greater selection of keys in its basic plan.\(^3\) (Halm [1913] 2008, 56)

Halm continues, critiquing Bach’s use of modulation to articulate a fugue’s form:

When Bach introduces a new thematic group, often it happens that we do not notice it. [For example:] After a group [Durchführung] in F major, we do hear that another follows in D minor, but we do not notice anything—no purposeful escalation, no excitement, no tremor heralds an important event, a decisive deed. A listener who is unable to recognize the keys will rarely notice that something happened . . . [Bach’s] fugue has contrapuntal mastery, but lacks formal mastery. It is formally correct, but nothing more.\(^4\) (Halm [1913] 2008, 57)

From this discussion, we might conclude that Beethoven’s sonatas apparently “corrected” this lack of “formal mastery,” whereby the oppositions of key and theme are mutually reinforcing.

Halm’s dichotomy carries with it the idea that the fugue and the sonata operate according to different principles, but in the 1920s, Schenker sought to demonstrate how these genres

\(^3\) “Die letztere [sonata form] hat für die Gruppe des zweiten Themas eine quint- oder terzverwandte Tonart vorgesehen, die Wiederkehr ist der Regel nach für die Haupttonart reserviert. Dagegen ist dort für die Gruppe der Durchführung grosse und eigentlich unbeschränkte Freiheit gelassen; ausserdem ist die Herrschaft einer bestimmten Tonart innerhalb einer Gruppe mit deren grösserer Ausdehnung, mit der weiteren Entfaltung ihres Inhalts nicht mehr strenge Regel. Die Sonate lässt also praktisch den grösseren Reichtum an harmonischem Geschehen zu; die Fuge dagegen hat das harmonisch reichere Schema; sie trifft die grössere Auswahl durch ihre grundsätzliche Anordnung” (Halm 1913, 12).

\(^4\) “Wenn Bach eine neue Gruppe eröffnet, so geschieht das häufig, ohne dass man es merkt; man hört wohl, dass nach einer Durchführung in F-dur eine andere in D-moll kommt—aber man spürt nichts davon; keine entschlossene Steigerung, keine Erregung, kein Zittern kündigt ein wichtiges Geschehnis, eine entscheidende Tat an; wer nicht die Tonarten selbst hört, wird selten etwas davon merken, dass hier etwas Besonderes los ist . . . Die Fuge, die er schafft, hat kontrapunktische, aber nicht formale Meisterschaft; sie ist formal richtig, aber nicht mehr” (Halm 1913, 13).
belonged to a single musical culture: a culture of organicism. As a result, Halm’s two cultures were synthesized into a monoculture based on the generative force of the Urlinie.

Halm and Schenker knew each other’s work and maintained a vigorous correspondence from ca. 1916 to 1927—the crucial years when Schenker was developing his theory of organic coherence. And while their correspondence was usually cordial, we learn Schenker’s true feelings regarding Von zwei Kulturen der Music (1913) in a diary entry from March 19, 1914:

Reading Halm’s book! What peculiar paths do the imagination and pen of a man take who “in obscure impulses” seeks a way to the purely musical but sadly is unable to find it. An absolutely grotesque mixture of technical material and the most far-flung aesthetics. Time and again the purely musical breaks down, and the writer’s imagination so often resorts to feelings, philosophizings, in short it interjects surrogates that cast an inadequate light even on the technical aspect. (Bent, Bretherton, and Drabkin 2014, 257)

Near the beginning of chapter 1, I claimed that Schenker was usually writing against someone, even when this is not explicitly mentioned in the text (Cook 1989, 416–17). Since Schenker had read Von zwei Kulturen der Music, regarded it as lacking in understanding regarding music’s intrinsic technical features (the “purely musical”), and corresponded with Halm in the 1920s about related aesthetic issues, the two essays juxtaposed in the second volume of Das Meisterwerk in der Musik (Schenker [1926] 1996, 23–54)—one on the organic nature of fugue, the other on the organic nature of sonata form—should be read as a direct response and corrective.

---

35 Schenker’s correspondence with Halm may be found at Schenker Documents Online; available from http://www.schenkerdocumentsonline.org/search/?kw=halm&fq=correspondence&fq2=&lang=all; Internet. Also see Bent, Bretherton, and Drabkin (2014, 256–93).

36 The original German for this diary entry is not available on Schenker Documents Online as of August 16, 2016. By referring to “obscure impulses,” Schenker is reacting to Halm’s energeticist approach to music; see Rothfarb (2002, 927–30, 936–39).
In fact, some of Schenker’s most succinct descriptions of his organic theory of voice-leading coherence in the 1920s unfold through his correspondence with Halm. In one letter, dated in early April of 1924, Schenker describes his approach:

I mean that art of figuration alone which is built on the narrowest shoulders of a few primal intervals, thus that powerful foreground (romping about in chords, scale-steps, keys), which, arising from the middle and background, is *all in all itself figure* before the primal intervals—not, therefore, the figures in the foreground but rather the whole as—figure! . . . Figure is then synthesis, so that whole, synthesis, *organicism*, *figure* are *synonyms*! Just as human beings, animals, plants are figurations that arise from the smallest seed, so are pieces by geniuses figurations of a few intervals. . . . All religious feeling, all philosophy and science, urges towards the briefest formulation of the world, and a similar religious tendency allows me to hear a piece of music as “figuration” of a kernel. That, therefore, is the “art of figuration” of our masters, that is music, that alone is also *improvisation!*  

background and foundation, corporeality at the expense of spirituality.\textsuperscript{38} (Bent, Bretherton, and Drabkin 2014, 289)

This was a fundamental misunderstanding. To restate Schenker’s position while incorporating Halm’s terms, the corporeal foreground can be understood only through the spiritual background. Not two cultures but one. Not vague energetic notions of musical force but the force of the \textit{Urlinie}, which composes-out the tonal spaces given by Nature through the consonant triad as derived from the overtone series. This view anticipates Schenker’s later descriptions of the background in quasi-religious terms. For example, near the beginning of \textit{Der freie Satz}, he presents three aphorisms:

All that is organic, every relatedness belongs to God and remains His gift, even when man creates the work and perceives that it is organic.

The whole of the foreground, which men call chaos, God derives from His cosmos, the background. The eternal harmony of His eternal Being is grounded in this relationship.

The astronomer knows that every system is part of a higher system; the highest system of all is God himself, God the creator.\textsuperscript{39} (Schenker [1935] 1979, xxiii).

---

\textsuperscript{38} “‘Vordergrundmusik’—ein guter Ausdruck, den ich, je nach Befund, wohl auch für meine Musik akzeptieren würde mit \textsuperscript{viel} Bescheidenheit sowohl als mit \textsuperscript{etwas} Stolz, d.h.: ich glaube schon lang, daß das Vordergründliche oder Oberfläch \textsuperscript{lieh} über dem Hinter- \textsuperscript{u.}

Sigmund Freud, in his book *Moses and Monotheism* (1939), thought that the belief in an unseen God increases one’s capacity for abstract thought (Geistigkeit)—the kind of abstract thought that is required to enter Schenker’s spiritual world of the *Ursatz*. Freud writes,

> Among the precepts of Mosaic religion is one that has more significance than is at first obvious. It is the prohibition against making an image of God, which means the compulsion to worship an invisible God. I surmise that in this point Moses surpassed the Aton religion in strictness. Perhaps he meant to be consistent; his God was to have neither a name nor a countenance. The prohibition was perhaps a fresh precaution against magic malpractices. If this prohibition was accepted, however, it was bound to exercise a profound influence. For it signified subordinating sense perception to an abstract idea; it was a triumph of spirituality [Geistigkeit] over the senses [Sinnlichkeit]; more precisely, an instinctual renunciation accompanied by its psychologically necessary consequences.40 (Freud 1939, 144)

This triumph of intellectuality over sensuality resonates deeply with Schenker’s burgeoning conception of the *Ursatz* in the 1920s: an abstract schema that would eventually lead him to a musical theory resembling aspects of Jewish monotheism.41 Schenker stated this plainly in a letter to Oswald Jonas dated August 2, 1934:

> Now a world of materials stands open to you; the very musical creation appears new to us, young, and there we can but marvel, yea rejoice beyond our capability: we feel like the writer of the Bible, who uttered the first astonishment over God's creation. If only help were at our disposal! Publishers cannot be patrons; the rich,

---


who could be, are more impressed so to speak by a "foreground lot" than by our "background lot" which touches the genius, God, and transcendental things. . . .

Fundamentally our project [Sache] is one of present-day Jewry as race and religious community. There was a time when the peoples learned from the Jews: contemplate God, write poetry; why should the Jews not on the contrary learn music from the other peoples and propagate it through the ages, since the other peoples have probably abandoned it for good? That way the Jew would join to his religious monotheism the belief in one musical Ursache [prime cause]!42

Example 4.3.1 suggests that Schenker, near the end of his life, drew a direct correspondence between the Ursatz and God, between the first layer of diminution (1. Schicht) and Adam and Eve, and, as an analogous correspondence would suggest, between subsequent layers of diminution and the later generations of the Old Testament.43

As Nicholas Cook observes, “The principle that aesthetic ideas function as a surrogate for religion helps to explain much that is otherwise perplexing about the tone of Schenker’s polemics” (2007, 207). We find such a polemical expression in Der freie Satz (1935), where Schenker compares himself to Moses (although this passage was censored in all later editions):


43 We saw a similar idea expressed in example 2.4.1 (p. 108), where, in Harmonielehre (1906, 26), an analogy is drawn between generations of the Bach family and the generation of triads within a key.
EXAMPLE 4.3.1 From Schenker’s aphorisms: Liebe, Ursatz, Gott, dated January 1, 1932 (JC 21/5, p. 281; from the holdings of Special Collections & University Archives, UCR Library, University of California, Riverside; used with the kind permission of Irene Schreier Scott)

By confessing, both in its creation and in its finished state, only one prime cause [eine Ursache] in the background, a work is arranged monotheistically. In that case, so-called heathens are those who, whether creative or re-creative, consider only the foreground of the work and lose themselves in its particulars, while confessors of a true divinity are those who worship the background. In the artwork, too, the one prime cause remains immutable in the background, and deviating toward the cravings of the foreground heathens is a sin against the spirit of monotheism. Shall I therefore proclaim my monotheistic doctrine of art from a Mount Sinai and thereby seek to win confessors of it? Am I to perform a miracle?44 (Snarrenberg 1997, 154; emphasis original; quoted in Cook 2007, 260)

Form, too, must logically be the product of one prime cause—music’s Divine Creator. Yet Schenker struggled to integrate his organic theory of voice leading with the traditional Formenlehre developed in the 1910s, particularly in Das Meisterwerk in der Musik, vol. 2 ([1926] 1996).


The analysis of J. S. Bach’s Fugue in C Minor, from Das Meisterwerk in der Musik, vol. 2 ([1926] 1996, 31–54), demonstrates how a three-part form might grow from the Urlinie, the Stufen supporting the notes of the Urlinie, and the realization of these Stufen as keys in the foreground (Stufen als Tonarten). (This fugue is shown in example 4.3.2, which may be referred to throughout the following discussion.) Contrary to Halm’s views, Schenker relies on opposing keys to demarcate parts of the form. Regarding the voice-leading sketch shown in example 4.3.3, Schenker comments, “Here we see two Ș–Ă descents [of the Urlinie] within the C-minor triad, concluded by the octave-progression Ș–Î; this reflects the fugue’s three-part structure” (32).45 The first descent progresses by step from Ș (G5) in m. 3 to Î (C5) in m. 9.46 Below the sketch, three foreground keys are shown in mm. 1–9: C minor, G minor, back to C minor. These keys are loosely coordinated with the subject (Führer) in the middle voice (m. 1ff.), the answer (Gefährte) in the upper voice (m. 3ff.), and the subject’s return (F[ührer]) in the bass voice (m. 7ff.).

These keys are also understood as Stufen operating within the monotonality (Tonalität), resulting in the progression I–V–I.47 Schenker abbreviates this progression using a single tonic Stufe, which functions as an imaginary pedal (see the Roman numerals labeled Kürzer). The stepwise descent of the Urlinie from Ș to Î unfolds in the horizontal (melodic) dimension what

45 “Wir sehen hier im Mollklang C einen zweimaligen Ablauf von Ș–Î, abgeschlossen durch den Oktavzug Ș–Î, was somit auf eine dreiteilige Gliederung der Fuge hinweist” (Schenker [1926] 1974, 2:58).
46 The motion from Î (C₃) up to Ș (G₃) in mm. 1–3 is what Schenker later describes as an initial arpeggiation (Schenker [1935] 1979, 46–47).
47 The bass arpeggiation (I–V–I) is described as the “sacred triangle” (heilige Dreieck) in Der freie Satz. Schenker writes, “every triad, whether it belongs to middleground or foreground, strives for its own triangle” ([1935] 1979, 15; “Im übertragenen Sinne strebt jeder Einzelklang zu seinem eigenen Dreieck, ob er nun dem Mittel- oder Vordergrund angehöre” [1935, 37]).
EXAMPLE 4.3.2 J. S. Bach, Fugue no. 2 in C Minor, The Well-Tempered Clavier, book I, BWV 847
might otherwise be conceptualized as an interval in the vertical (harmonic) dimension: the mutual
reinforcement of harmony and melody thus defines the first part of this fugue. However,
Schenker conceives of this section’s formal close primarily in the terms of the Urlinie, writing, “In
bar 9 the Urlinie arrives at Ă; this also signals the end of the first part of the fugue, the so-called
exposition” (39).48 As a motion into an inner voice, this descent is only preliminary: the scale
degrees representing the notes of the Urlinie above the sketch in mm. 1–9 are placed in
parentheses, while Ș (G5) is retained in the upper voice (see the dashed slur connecting G5 in m. 3
to G5 in m. 9).49

The fugue’s second part (mm. 9–20) is marked by modulations away from the tonic, first
to E-flat major, and then to G minor. At a deeper level, these keys are understood as Stufen
belonging to the monotonality (III and V respectively). This section’s formal close is again defined
by the descending Urlinie, which moves by step from Ș (G5), retained from the previous section,
to Ė (C5) in m. 20. The scale degrees representing the notes of the Urlinie above the staff are not
shown in parentheses, for this descent represents a more definitive close. Schenker writes, “The Ė
in bar 20 does in fact conclude the Urlinie progression, and the subject enters in the treble at the
new entry in C minor, which begins the last part of the fugue” (41).50

---

48 “In T. 9 ist die Urlinie bei Ė angelangt, siehe [example 4.3.3], und damit ist auch der
erste Teil der Fuge, die sogenannte Exposition, zu Ende gegangen” (Schenker [1926] 1974, 2:71).
49 Schenker would describe this motion into an inner voice as a linear progression of the
first order in Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, 43–44). Notice that the Kopfton (Ș) is present in the
sketch from the very beginning of the piece at an even deeper level, in which the initial
arpeggiation is heard as rhythmic displacement (or delay); see Rothstein’s (1981, 87–100) “rule of
arpeggiation” and “rule of the initiating tone.”
50 “In T. 20 geht mit der Ė der Urlinie-Zug wirklich zuende und der Führer setzt bei der
Oberstimme mit dem neuen Einsatz in C ein, der den letzten Teil der Fuge eröffnet” (Schenker
The close in m. 20 is more definitive than the close in m. 9 because the former coincides with a descent of the *Urlinie* (from ♭ to ♦) and a return to the tonic *Stufe* at the deepest level after an initial departure (*Kürzer*: I–III–V–I). Although the first *Urlinie* descent in mm. 1–9 composes out the underlying tonic *Stufe*, there is no departure from that *Stufe* at the deepest level, and therefore, no real sense of closure upon its “return” (in fact, at this level, the tonic *Stufe* had never left). Schenker also likely hears the descent from ♭ (G₅) beginning in m. 9 as more definitive because the deep-level mediant and dominant *Stufen* in the following measures provide additional consonant support, resulting in a 5–8–5–8 linear intervallic pattern between the outer voices (this pattern is obscured somewhat by the foreground detail shown in the sketch). At the deepest level, over the course of mm. 9–20, ♭ (G₅) is supported by the tonic *Stufe* (an interval of a fifth), ♦ (F₅) is passing, ♠ (E♭₅) is supported by the mediant *Stufe* in m. 11ff. (an interval of an octave), ♦ (D₅) is supported by the dominant *Stufe* in m. 16 (an interval of a fifth), and ♦ (C₅) is supported by the tonic *Stufe* arriving in m. 20 (an interval of an octave)—although the tonic *Stufe* in m. 20 does not appear in root position on the music’s surface until m. 22. Nonetheless, in Schenker’s analysis, the goal-directed motion of both *Urlinie* and *Stufengang* converge to create formal closure in m. 20.

The fugue’s third section (mm. 20–29) is harmonically static at the deepest level. Set in the key of C minor in the foreground, this section composes-out only the tonic *Stufe* (see below the sketch at m. 20ff.). Although the melody completes an octave-progression from ♠ (C₅) in m. 20 down to ♦ (C₄) in m. 29, this descent is less structurally significant, as indicated by the scale degrees above the staff placed in parentheses. After the octave-progression’s resolution to ♦ (C₄) in m. 29, the fugue’s last two measures function as a coda.
To summarize: In this analysis, Schenker attempts to integrate his previous conception of fugue as a three-part form based on contrasting keys with his newly developed conception of the *Urlinie* as a melodic idea unfolding over the course of an entire composition. Each section is demarcated by deep-level *Stufen* manifest as foreground keys: the first section (mm. 1–9) is based on the tonic *Stufe* alone, the second section (mm. 9–20) is based on mediant and dominant *Stufen*, and the third section is again based on the tonic *Stufe*. The three main linear progressions in the upper voice comport with this three-part tonal layout. Schenker writes,

> The briefest formulation of events, I–III–V–I, expresses the composing-out of the C-minor triad: a motion to the dominant (V), the triad’s divider, followed by a return to the tonic root. The unified composing-out guarantees the organic life of the fugue and even reinforces, in the background tonality, the particular feature of the three-part structure which has already been mentioned, namely, that the third part of the fugue simply functions as an emphatic conformation of the reiterated I. (Schenker [1926] 1996, 32)

But Schenker seems to overlook a problem with this analysis. Despite the apparent agreement of voice leading, harmony, and form, hearing this fugue’s definitive close at the beginning of the third section (m. 20) is deeply unsatisfying. According to Schenker’s analysis, the piece effectively “ends” two thirds of the way through. Moreover, m. 20 initiates a sequence of falling fifths in

---

51 Compare Schenker’s three-part conception of this fugue to example 3.2.11 (p. 209), an earlier diagram from the Oster Collection. There the three-part disposition of keys (B-flat major–B-flat minor–B-flat major) in the fugue from Brahms’s *Variations and Fugue on a Theme by Handel*, op. 24, is coordinated with a three-part form \((a_1–b–a_2)\).

52 “Das auf die kürzest Formel gebrachte Ergebnis I–III–V–I drückt die Auskomponierung des Mollklanges C aus, die sich zum Quintklang (V) als dem Teiler des Klanges bewegt, hierauf zum Grundton zurücksinkt. Diese Einheit in der Auskomponierung verbürgt das organische Leben der Fuge und hebt sogar, im Hintergrund der Tonalität, die Besonderheit der erwähnten drei Teile auf, namentlich der dritte Teil der Fuge bedeutet nur eine nachdrückliche Bestätigung der wiedererreichten I. Stufe” (Schenker [1926] 1974, 2:59).

53 I thank Frank Samarotto, who first pointed out to me that the *Urlinie* descends much too early in example 4.3.3.
the bass—namely, the *Stufenkreis* I–(IV–VII–III–VI–II–V–I–V)–I shown in example 4.3.3. This harmonic motion suggests that we are still in the midst of a *continuation*.

To better capture this sense of continuation, we might, for example, hear an octave-progression from $\hat{2}$ ($D_5$), implied on the second half of m. 16, down to $\hat{2}$ ($D_4$) over V, arriving just before m. 29, which would compose-out a deep-level dominant *Stufe*. The tonic *Stufe* that Schenker implies in m. 20—which he connects to the tonic *Stufe* on the downbeat of m. 22—would be heard merely as consonant support for a passing tone in the upper voice ($C_5$, or $\hat{1}$).

Schenker’s search for uniform agreement among the descent of the *Urlinie*, the motion of the *Stufengang* toward the tonic, and a pre-existing conception of the fugue as having three parts demarcated by key areas (*Stufen als Tonarten*) leads him to hear a definitive close in m. 20 that seems much too soon—yet, ironically, this close is also overdetermined given his approach. To coordinate the *Urlinie* with foreground keys and a three-part form, Schenker overlooks—or, to put matters less generously, he willfully ignores—important surface features, such as the harmonic sequence beginning in m. 20. What is gained in terms of theoretical consistency is lost in terms of our ability to capture fully what occurs in this composition, particularly as it relates to matters of large-scale closure.

§ 4.3.2. “On Organicism in Sonata Form”: Haydn’s Piano Sonata in G Minor, Hob. XVI:44/i; Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Major, op. 10, no. 2/i

Schenker demonstrates the organic nature of sonata form through the analysis of sonatas by Haydn and Beethoven in *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*, vol. 2 ([1926] 1996, 23–30).

Consequently, he implies that the same continuity of melody (*Urlinie*) and voice leading that was
present in Bach’s fugue is also at work in Beethoven’s sonata: Halm’s two cultures become one.

Yet, as Schenker sought greater theoretical (and even ideological) unity, his analyses risked greater internal contradictions. These contradictions result when his earlier conception of sonata form, which was based primarily on key areas, collides with his newfound conception of the *Urlinie* as a melodic idea spanning an entire work. But as these analyses show, the coordination of more traditional key areas and formal divisions do not always coincide with articulations of the *Urlinie* (*Glieder*), its first-order linear progressions, and their supporting *Stufen*.

A sketch of Haydn’s Piano Sonata in G Minor, Hob. XVI:44/i, is shown below in example 4.3.4(a). As William Rothstein (2001, 215) observes, the *Stufengang* at level *a* (labeled *Tonalität*)—namely, the first bass arpeggiation I–[III]–V–I—contradicts the foreground keys at level *b* (labeled *Stufen als Tonarten*). Rothstein writes,

> a closer inspection reveals that this series of keys is G minor–B-flat major–G minor, and that there is no corresponding progression I–III–I at the deeper level. The deeper-level progression is I–III–V–I, but the V in question is never a “key”; it is the active dominant of G minor at the end of the movement’s development section. As is not infrequently the case, what Schenker says and what Schenker does are somewhat at odds here. (Rothstein 2001, 215)

This contradiction between foreground keys (G minor–B-flat minor–G minor) and deep-level *Stufen* derived from the bass arpeggiation (I–V–I) is made intelligible if we consider the possibility

54 This coordination, or lack thereof, is similar to what Peter Smith (2005) calls “dimensional counterpoint.” Dimensional counterpoint involves the interaction of thematic design, key scheme, and tonal structure, although it can include other aspects of a composition. Smith writes, “Thematic design refers to patterns of melodic ideas organized into phrases, phrase groups, and so forth up to the largest sections of a piece. Key scheme indicates the succession of harmonic areas that are tonicized across the main sections of the form. Tonal structure encapsulates contrapuntal and harmonic relationships revealed in Schenkerian analysis” (31). Smith observes that, while “traditional discussions of form often conflate key scheme and large-scale harmonic progression, these dimensions are not necessarily coextensive” (31). This is an important distinction for us to keep in mind.
**Example 4.3.4** Voice-leading sketches: Haydn’s Piano Sonata in G Minor, Hob. XVI:44/i

(A) A sketch of the entire movement (Schenker [1926] 1974, 2:46, fig. 1)

(B) A more detailed sketch of the exposition: I. *Gedanke* (mm. 1–4), *Modulationspartie* (mm. 5–12), and II. *Gedanke* (mm. 13–20) (Schenker [1926] 1974, 2:47, *Anhang* III)

that two entirely different theories are operating in this sketch. Level $a$ shows a deep middleground based on Schenker’s organic theory of transformational voice leading, in which harmonies are composed-out through linear progressions. In contrast, level $b$ incorporates an earlier approach to sonata form based on analysis by key (Schachter [1986] 1999b). In fact, the labels for the traditional parts of the outer form and the labels for the foreground keys are both
reserved for level b.\(^{55}\) This analysis represents Schenker’s type-B exposition, shown in
example 4.3.5(b), where the *Modulationspartie* begins in the subordinate key and is therefore
grouped with the beginning of the II. *Gedanke*. In this case, Haydn’s sonata modulates via a pivot
chord in m. 5—namely, the tonic *Stufe* in the key of G minor becomes the submediant *Stufe* in
the key of B-flat major (I/VI).\(^{56}\) Example 4.3.4(a) is not a fully integrated or even coherent
analysis; rather, it uses *two different methodologies*, one laid over the other, with the hope that the
ways they align will become apparent.

While Schenker’s conception of the type-B exposition binds the *Modulationspartie* with the
II. *Gedanke* based on a common subordinate key, his description of the foreground voice leading
in example 4.3.4(b) suggests that the I. *Gedanke* and *Modulationspartie* are bound together instead
through a single arpeggiation (*erste Brechung*) unfolding in mm. 1–12 (D\(_5\)–G\(_5\)–B\(_\#5\)–D\(_6\)):

we finally realize, to our great astonishment, that the entire contents of bars 1–12 have amounted to an ascending register transfer D\(_5\)–D\(_6\) which establishes D\(_5\) as 5, not G\(_3\); and that, furthermore, this single register transfer evidently joins together the parts of the form that the theorists designate separately as the antecedent of the first subject, consequent, and transition!\(^{57}\) (Schenker [1926] 1996, 24)

---

\(^{55}\) In example 4.3.4(a), the more detailed sketch (level b) should include a tonic *Stufe* that coincides with the bass voice’s G\(_3\) at m. 52 (cf. the tonic Roman numeral shown in the sketch at level a directly above).

\(^{56}\) Again, see example 4.3.5(b), where the *Modulationspartie* in a type-B exposition might begin on either a tonic or submediant *Stufe* in the subordinate key. The analysis of Haydn’s G-minor piano sonata conforms to the latter situation. Also see Schenker’s reading of Haydn’s op. 33, no. 4/i, shown on p. 265 in example 3.3.9(a). In m. 13 of this analysis, which I reconstruct in example 3.3.10 (pp. 266–67), Schenker hears a III\(^\#\) chord in B-flat major reinterpreted as VI\(^\#\) in F major to begin the *Modulationspartie*.

\(^{57}\) “zum größten Erstaunen erkennt man endlich hier, obwohl c\(^3\) nicht einmal ausdrücklich ausgesprochen wird, daß aller Inhalt von T. 1–12 nur die Höherlegung d\(^3\)–d\(^5\) gewesen, die nicht g\(^2\) meint, sondern d\(^2\) in die Rechte einer 5 einsetzt, daß ferner die eine Höherlegung ihren großen Bogen nun offenbar über alle Formteile schlägt, die von der Theorie mit Vordersatz des 1. Gedankens, Nachsatz und Modulation bezeichnet sind!” (Schenker [1926] 1974, 2:47).
**Example 4.3.5** Schenker’s four types of sonata-form exposition arranged from the most sectional to the most continuous

(A) Type-A exposition: *Modulationspartie* absent (OC 83/87)

(B) Type-B exposition: *Modulationspartie* fused with the II. *Gedanke* (OC 83/88 and 89)

(C) Type-C exposition: The I. *Gedanke* fused with the *Modulationspartie* (OC 83/90)
**EXAMPLE 4.3.5 CONTINUED**

(D) Type-D exposition: The end of the I. *Gedanke* and the beginning of the II. *Gedanke* fused with the *Modulationspartie* (OC 83/91)

Moreover, the II. *Gedanke* coincides with a second arpeggiation (*zweite Brechung*) in mm. 12–17, from F₃ in m. 12 to B♭₅ in m. 13, and then retracing this path by stepwise motion and exceeding it up to D₆ in m. 17 (a sixth-progression). The second arpeggiation is F₃–B♭₅–D₆. As a result, the first arpeggiation of the G-minor triad spanning the I. *Gedanke* and *Modulationspartie* (mm. 1–12) is answered by the second arpeggiation of the B-flat-major triad spanning the II. *Gedanke* (mm. 13–20). Rather than an opposing theme, as in Halm’s conception of sonata form *qua* disposition, the second theme is heard as a continuation of the first, as Halm might expect to find in Bach’s fugues *qua* invention. In Schenker’s analysis, these arpeggiations have gained a quasi-motivic function that provides unity between what might traditionally be considered opposing formal sections.

Schenker describes this kind of long-range coherence, where spans of generative voice leading cut across traditional formal boundaries, as follows:

---

58 Notice in example 4.3.4(b) that the D₆ in m. 8 is given a small notehead and no ♯ indication, while the D₆ in m. 17 is given a large notehead and a ♯ indication. The D₆ in m. 17 is the ultimate goal of the ascending motion in the upper voice, yet in the sketches shown in example 4.3.4(a) (levels a and b), the emphasis on D₆ in m. 17 disappears altogether.
It is not enough merely to read off the changes of key from the foreground, as the theorists do; it is also of the utmost importance to know what forces motivate these changes and guarantee the unity of the whole. Haydn, of course, did not know any theories of form as we know them; the new animation that he created was the product of his lively imagination. The Urlinie and bass arpeggiation ruled over him with an instinctive power, and from them he developed an ingenious capacity for creating tension across the whole of a work, as an entity. But who among the theorists can give us so much as a hint of such a path towards unity?\(^{59}\)

(Schenker [1926] 1996, 24)

This “capacity for creating tension” is very different, however, from a one-to-one correspondence between parts of the form and articulations of the Urlinie and deep-level Stufen.

As we saw in example 4.3.4(a), at level \(b\), the key of G minor defines the I. Gedanke (mm. 1–4), while the key of B-flat major binds together the Modulationspartie and II. Gedanke. The first arpeggiation in example 4.3.4(b), from D\(_5\) as the pick-up to m. 1 to D\(_6\) in m. 8, ventures beyond the boundary that is created by the key change in m. 5. As the G-minor triad is still being arpeggiated (D\(_5\)–G\(_5\)–B\(_{b5}\)–D\(_6\)), the music modulates to the key of B-flat major (m. 5ff.).

Admittedly, the B\(_{b5}\)–D\(_6\) interval in this arpeggiation is common to both the G-minor triad and the B-flat-major triad, as Schenker’s pivot-chord modulation in m. 5 (I/VI) suggests. There is no real contradiction here, yet there is also a sense in which a trace of the G-minor harmony from the I. Gedanke (mm. 1–4) is carried forward into the Modulationspartie (mm. 5–12). The second arpeggiation, from F\(_5\) (the pick-up to m. 13) to D\(_6\) (m. 17), unifies the II. Gedanke, but this gesture simultaneously distinguishes the II. Gedanke from the Modulationspartie—sections that were

---

initially grouped together based on their shared key (B-flat major). This is not a unity of inner and outer form through rigid alignment (monism); rather, it is a unity created by dovetailing aspects of inner and outer form through various overlaps (synthesis). This dovetailing, according to Schenker, is produced by an improvisatory impulse originating from within the composer’s imagination:

without understanding motives in this sense, the scope and sweep of improvisation, which alone creates organic coherence in sonata form, would never be achieved. For this reason, too, there can never be a tradition of sonata form; for how could one arise if general consciousness, like the general instinct, has been blind to its chief characteristic, the improvisatory impulse, which gives coherence to the parts of the form by means of linear progressions? (Schenker [1926] 1996, 30)

In effect, Schenker regards the misalignment of inner and outer form as organic synthesis.

This dovetailing features prominently in the analysis of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Major, op. 10, no. 2/i, from the same essay in Das Meisterwerk in der Musik, vol. 2 ([1926] 1996, 23–30). But in this case, the misalignment of inner and outer form becomes so extreme that any relationship between Schenker’s more traditional conception of sonata form based on key areas and his new approach to organic voice leading based on the Urlinie and the composing-out of harmonies within a single diatonic framework (Tonalität) seems to fall apart. The voice-leading

---

60 Throughout this chapter, inner form is understood as the “tonal dynamic of a work—its large-scale harmonic and linear layout,” while outer form is understood as the “thematic aspect of a piece, as well as its layout into periods and phrases” (Rothstein [1989] 2007, 104). To clarify these terms in the present context, the foreground key areas properly belong to the outer form, whereas the deep-level Stufen belong to the inner form.

sketch of the exposition is shown in example 4.3.6. Schenker prefaces this analysis by again attacking the so-called theorists:

Here, too, the theorists have up to now made use of their customary names for the content. In this way however they are merely describing, externally and superficially, the condition of that which has become [Zustand des Gewordenen]; they clearly betray their lack of understanding of the law of the particular process of becoming [Gesetz des besonderen Werdens], which is the only thing that matters even when one is conceptualizing form in a general way.62 (Schenker [1926] 1996, 25)

This “process of becoming” is the motion from background to foreground, or what Cook describes as “axial causality” (2007, 70–71). But if we retrace the analysis presented in example 4.3.6 along this path—from level a in the background to level h in the middleground (and even beyond to level k in the foreground)—it is difficult to understand how Schenker’s formal analysis at level h might meaningfully derive from the levels of voice leading.

Consider the outer form at level h. Key areas (Stufen als Tonarten) are not shown at any level in example 4.3.6, thus concealing possible conflicts between key areas and deep-level Stufen. The lack of clearly indicated key areas also obscures whether level h is indicative of Schenker’s type-B or type-C exposition—it largely depends on where he would place the modulation, either at the beginning of the Modulationspartie (type-B) or near the end (type-C). If this exposition were read as a type-C exposition (see above, example 4.3.5[c]), the end of the I. Gedanke would be combined with the beginning of the Modulationspartie based on the shared key of F major (cf. example 4.3.6, level h, up to m. 18), although the Modulationspartie would typically end on a

EXAMPLE 4.3.6 Voice-leading sketch: Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in F Major, op. 10, no. 2/i, exposition, mm. 1–55 (Schenker [1926] 1974, 2:49, Anhang IV)
dominant Stufe in the subordinate key. In Beethoven’s sonata, the subordinate key eventfully turns out to be C major—the key of the dominant, as we might expect—although the Modulationspartie ends on an E-major harmony, or what we might understand as a local dominant in A minor (a key that never materializes). Not until m. 19 does the II. Gedanke begin in the subordinate key (C major), lasting until m. 55, at which point the Schlussgedanke begins in the same key.63

Furthermore, if this exposition were heard as a type-C exposition, consider how the disposition of keys—F major for the I. Gedanke and the beginning of the Modulationspartie, C major for the II. Gedanke and the Schlussgedanke—interacts with the Urlinie and deep-level Stufen at levels a through g. At level a, the entire exposition, until the beginning of the Schlussgedanke beginning in m. 55, is bound together through a descent of the Urlinie from F₅ (ĉ) to C₅ (Ć). This linear motion is similar to the dovetailing that we saw in the sketch of Haydn’s G-minor sonata (example 4.3.4, p. 338), where the upward arpeggiations bound formal sections together. But also notice what happens at level b with respect to the key areas. The underlying diatonic Stufengang—described in the sketch as the Tonalität, or what we might regard as the monotonality—shows a tonic Stufe at the beginning of the I. Gedanke progressing to a supertonic Stufe in the middle of the II. Gedanke (cf. level h, m. 31). In a major-mode sonata exposition, we might typically expect the supertonic Stufe to arrive near the end of the Modulationspartie. Also, notice that the deep-level dominant Stufe does not arrive until near the end of the II. Gedanke (cf. level h, m. 49).

63 In example 4.3.6, Schenker lists the II. Gedanke beginning in m. 21, but this is likely a mistake (recte: m. 19). For an alternative analysis of this exposition, where the secondary-theme group is understood as a “trimodular block,” see Hepokoski and Darcy (2006, 175). Caplin (1998, 115–17, 117n57) hears the second theme (mm. 19–55) as divided by an internal half cadence in the subordinate key (see Schenker’s supertonic Stufe in example 4.3.6, m. 31, levels b and h).
Moreover, compare levels $d$ and $e$ with level $h$. At level $d$, the upper voice effects a motion into an inner voice from $F_5$ to $B_4$ (1. Quintzug), which “binds together the first-subject antecedent and consequent, the transition, and the first part of the second group” ([1926] 1996, 25–26).\textsuperscript{64} At level $e$, the $E_5$ in the upper voice, which is passing between $F_5$ and $D_5$, is made consonant through the $C_4$ shown in the bass. This leaping passing tone (Kons. Dg.) is the basis for the onset of the II. Gedanke, shown at level $h$ in m. 21.\textsuperscript{65} Therefore, the II. Gedanke begins within the composing-out of the deep-level tonic Stufe, but paradoxically, also in the key of the dominant. Specifically, see level $b$, where the F-major tonic triad is prolonged in mm. 1–29 through a 5–6 exchange before the supertonic Stufe arrives in m. 31 (cf. level $h$ for measure numbers). This is an extreme example of dovetailing: (1) the dominant Stufe that defines the beginning of the II. Gedanke is wholly subsumed within the composing-out of the tonic Stufe; (2) the deep-level supertonic Stufe, which one might typically expect to find near the end of the Modulationspartie in a type-C exposition, does not arrive until the middle of the II. Gedanke (see level $h$, m. 31); and (3) the deep-level dominant Stufe that one might typically expect to find near the beginning of the II. Gedanke does not arrive until the very end of that section (see level $h$, m. 49). Moreover, the first Quintzug, from $F_5$ to $B_4$ (see level $d$), binds together the first theme, transition, and the beginning of the second theme. The second Quintzug, also from $F_5$ to $B_4$ (see level $f$), only


\textsuperscript{65} Cadwallader and Gagné (2011, 206n8) define a leaping passing tone (springenden Durchgang) as “a tone that leaps in a lower voice to support a literal, stepwise passing tone in an upper voice.” See Schenker’s description of this phenomenon in the second book of Kontrapunkt ([1922] 2001, 182).
provides coherence for the second half of the second theme (*Nachsatz*). In neither case does a first-order linear progression directly correlate to a traditional part of the outer form.66

Although Schenker claimed that previous theorists did not understand “the law of the particular process of becoming,” in what meaningful sense can the analysis of the outer form at level *h* in example 4.3.6 be derived through the transformational levels of voice leading from background to foreground ([1926] 1996, 25)? The parts of the outer form seem to exist in spite of the improvisatory melodic gestures—and certainly it does not appear that the parts of the outer form relate to these gestures in any causal (or even logical) way. In 1926, Schenker is exploring how aspects of his more traditional *Formenlehre* interact with his organic theory of voice-leading coherence, but he has not yet defined the former wholly in the terms of the latter. Form still exerts its own force in this analysis—a force that exists outside the transformation from background to foreground.

---

§ 4.3.3. The Myth of Axial Causality: Interruption as a Special Case in Chopin’s Nocturne in E-flat Major, op. 9, no. 2

Given conflicts between outer forms, key areas, and spans of generative voice leading, Schenker needed a way to integrate these compositional features more directly and at levels closer to the *Ursatz*. In other words, Schenker needed a way to integrate the discontinuity of form (exemplified by the sonata) with the continuity of counterpoint and voice leading (exemplified by...
the fugue). This was likely the motivation for why he developed the concept of interruption (Unterbrechung). As William Rothstein writes,

Prior to the appearance of Unterbrechung in Schenker’s analytical arsenal, it is plausible to claim that Schenker’s graphs have something Baroque about them. With the partial exception of foreground graphs, they are pictures of unidirectional, forward-moving voice leading, seemingly unaffected by rhetorical pauses, thematic and textural contrasts, and all the rest of what makes the Classical style so distinctive in comparison to the late Baroque. They therefore lend themselves especially well to figuration preludes and other pieces in which a relative uniformity of texture and figure throws most of the burden of musical shaping onto harmony, voice leading, and subtle (as opposed to dramatic) effects of rhythm. (Rothstein 2001, 213)

And as Frank Samarotto observes,

Schenker did not need a concept of interruption to show voice-leading coherence; indeed, it does not follow naturally from the species model. It is precisely because he wished to recognize formal design that interruption was added, demonstrating that his approach recognized form much more than has been acknowledged (and often in very subtle ways). (Samarotto 2005, 9)

If interruption does not arise naturally from the continuity of voice leading, how might it originate along the pathway from background to foreground? In what sense can interruption develop from the deepest levels of the middleground, which does not yet know the particularities of a composition’s surface-level grouping and thematic design? Or, as Samarotto seems to imply, is interruption imposed onto the deep middleground from the foreground, perhaps reversing the causal flow of musical forces? Earlier, I suggested that Schenker’s growing awareness of how a

---

neighbor motion in the *Urlinie* (e.g., 3–4–3) is coextensive with a three-part form (a1–b–a2) at a local level might have led him to uncover deeper levels of voice leading in an analogous way.

Moreover, as we saw in chapter 3, the formal types described in the last chapter of *Der freie Satz* ([1935] 1979, 128–45) predate the idea of the *Urlinie* altogether. In this sense, perhaps the outer forms became a guide to discovering the inner form (C. Smith 1996). Might interruption originate in a similar way—not only as a matter of history but also as a matter of generative theory? Given Schenker’s pre-existing conception of the *Periode* schema, might the formal division between a *Vordersatz* and a *Nachsatz* in the foreground also be projected into the deepest levels of voice leading (rather than *vice versa*)?

In example 4.3.7, taken from the second volume of *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik* ([1926] 1996, 4, fig. 5), the *Periode* schema is directly related to the *Urlinie* and the *Stufengang*. The *Vordersatz* (VS) includes a preliminarily descent from the *Kopfton* 5 (G5) down to 2 (D5)—a motion into an inner voice that Schenker likely understands as a fourth-progression. The *Nachsatz* includes a complete stepwise descent of the *Urlinie* from the *Kopfton* down to 1 (C5) However, there is no formal division between the end of the *Vordersatz* and the beginning of the *Nachsatz* as reflected by either the voice leading or the *Stufengang*. The dashed tie in the upper voice shows a continuous retention of the *Kopfton*; in the bass voice, the dominant *Stufe* (G4) near the end of the *Vordersatz* is slurred across the potential formal boundary to the C4 at the beginning of the *Nachsatz*. Similarly, a dashed tie across this boundary connects the tonic *Stufen* in the bass at the beginning of the *Vordersatz* and the *Nachsatz*. Schenker’s conception of the two-part *Periode* does not yet recognize a similar articulation of the voice leading and *Stufengang*. Instead, he focuses on the unity and cohesiveness of the *Periode* as an example of what I have described as dovetailing,
EXAMPLE 4.3.7 The *Periode* schema before interruption (Schenker [1926] 1974, 2:16, fig. 5)

writing, “The carrying forward of the first primary note over all linear progressions up to and including that of the *Urlinie* itself, which brings the 1 at the end, signifies tension throughout all parts of the form, hence cohesiveness, synthesis of the whole” (Schenker [1926] 1996, 4).

As described in § 2.4.4, Schenker’s early conception of the *Periode* did not require any particular thematic design or cadential syntax; rather, the *Periode* was conceptualized as a simple proposition–response paradigm. But within the context of interruption, especially given the two parallel branches of the *Urlinie* (the first incomplete, the second complete), his conception of the *Periode* is usually more limited. It is subject to what William Marvin calls the reprise constraint:

A harmonic and thematic reprise on the musical surface is necessary in order to invoke interruption as a Schenkerian transformation. Without such a reprise, the form and voice leading are uninterrupted. (Marvin 2011, ex. 6)

This is a way of stating that, from a generative perspective, interruption only takes place at deeper levels with the knowledge of what occurs (or will occur) in the foreground. As Cook argues,

There is something impossible about this monist compulsion [in Schenker’s later work], a point at which it begins ineluctably to unravel. In terms of logic, there is a basic contradiction within Schenkerian theory as embodied in *Der freie Satz*. It is a matter of principle that features of surface “design”—motives, themes, taxonomic forms, and the rest—can only be properly apprehended on the basis of the fundamental structure (that is what they are designs of, so to speak), yet in

68 “Das Forttragen des ersten Kopftones über die Auskomponierungszüge bis zu dem letzten *Urlinie-Zug*, der die 1 bringt, bedeutet Spannung über alle Formteile hinweg, also den Zusammenhang, die Synthese des Ganzen” (Schenker 1926) 1974, 2:16).
practice, as Smith [1996] pointed out, it is only on the basis of such features that you can decide what the fundamental structure is. (Cook 2007, 294)

What motivates interruption to occur—a dramatic rupture of otherwise continuous deep-middleground voice leading—when these more foreground events have not yet to come into existence? For example, after an interruption, the second branch of the *Urlinie* (or its replicate at a more foreground level) might unknowingly reestablish the *Kopfton* in a context other than the original thematic material, thus violating Marvin’s reprise constraint. It is as if causes in the background and middleground have already foreseen their effects in the foreground.

In *Der freie Satz*, Schenker claims exactly that, writing, “The inner law of origin accompanies all development and is ultimately part of the present” ([1935] 1979, 3). According to this view, the *Ursatz* is never a generic prototype, for each Ursatz, as an origin, already contains within it a unique destiny: every detail manifest on the surface of a particular composition. But to say that foreground events originate in the background is also to beg the question, for it is never in doubt that a composition will ultimately manifest in one particular way. Cook describes this as “retrospective prophecy, the deeply conservative pattern of thought by which you explain empirical phenomena through positing ideal (external, immutable) entities that correspond to them, and then deriving the former from the latter, the actual from the ideal” (301). Instead, we might reimagine the generative aspects of Schenker’s theory to resemble how they developed historically and analytically. In this sense, of course the foreground influences our conception of the background, and of course the form influences our conception of the content: in practice, it

---

69 For example, compare this with the “tonal return section” often noted (since Mary Hunter [1982]) in Mozart’s arias, such as “Dove sono,” from act 3 of *Le nozze di Figaro*, K. 492. This section is not a thematic recapitulation *per se* but instead replaces it.

70 “Das innere Gesetz des Ursprungs geht dann mit aller späteren Entwicklung einher und ist zuletzt in jeder Gegenwart mitenthalten” (Schenker 1935, 13).
could not be any other way (C. Smith 1996; Rothgeb 1971). In this sense, perhaps axial causality is something of a myth: a story that Schenker tells to make sense of events, but only after they have occurred. In other words, what Schenker ([1926] 1996, 25) calls “the law of the particular process of becoming” (Gesetz des besonderen Werdens) can be understood only under “the condition of that which has become” (Zustand des Gewordenen).

Schenker eventually recognized formal divisions more fully and at deeper levels of voice leading, as Samarotto notes above. For example, consider how various analyses of Chopin’s Nocturne in E-flat Major, op. 9, no. 2, changed over time. Schenker’s sketch from Das Meisterwerk in der Musik, vol. 2 ([1926] 1996), is shown in example 4.3.8(a). The form (a₁–b–a₂) is related to two continuous yet three-part tonal gestures. The first gesture occurs melodically: the neighbor motion ³(2)–³ in the Urlinie is correlated with the beginning of the a₁, b, and a₂ sections respectively. The second gesture occurs harmonically: the bass arpeggiation (I–V–I) is similarly correlated with the three parts of the form. Although the inner form articulates three formal sections, it is still not inherently discontinuous at this level.

In Harmonielehre ([1906] 1954, 10–11), Schenker describes how a three-part form (a₁–b–a₂) “can be reduced ideally to the two-part form, a₁ : a₂, on which it is originally founded.” In this case, he is describing more conventional thematic relationships based on repetition and association—namely, that the two-part schema a₁–a₂ somehow exists prior to or is more


72 “Kann aber in der Musik die dreiteilige Form nun einmal nicht anders lauten als a₁ : b : a₂, so hat man hinter ihr offenbar doch nur die zweiteilige, nämlich a₁ : a₂ als die ursprüngliche und grundlegende Form zu erkennen” (Schenker 1906, 12). Schenker also hints at the idea that the b section in a three-part form is at a lower level than the a₁ and a₂ sections bookending it in the footnote at the bottom of example 3.2.2(a), p. 188.
EXAMPLE 4.3.8 Voice-leading sketches: Chopin’s Nocturne in E-flat Major, op. 9, no. 2

(A) From *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*, vol. 2 (Schenker [1926] 1974, 2:17, fig. 8)

(B) From the Oster Collection, date unknown (OC 32/35; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
EXAMPLE 4.3.8 CONTINUED

(c) Transcription of the above (OC 32/35)

(D) From Der freie Satz (Schenker 1935, fig. 84)
fundamental than \( a_1-b-a_2 \). That Chopin’s nocturne can ultimately be reduced to two parts in relation to its \textit{voice leading} is a more profound idea, which Schenker explores in the sketch shown in example 4.3.8(b), followed by my transcription in example 4.3.8(c). Example 4.3.8(b) appears in Schenker’s hand and is found among various other Chopin analyses located in file 32 of the Oster Collection dating from the mid-1920s to the early 1930s. The topmost staff shows an \textit{Ursatz} with an undivided \textit{Urlinie} that descends from \( \tilde{3} \) (G\(_5\)) as the \textit{Kopfton}. At the first level, the \textit{Urlinie} is divided into two branches: the first incomplete, descending only to \( \tilde{2} \) (F\(_5\)); the second complete, descending by step from the \textit{Kopfton} down to \( \tilde{1} \) (E\(_\#5\)). The first \( \tilde{2} \) is supported by a dominant \textit{Stufe}—a leaping passing tone, or what Schenker labels as a \textit{Teiler} (Tl).\footnote{For a history of the divider (\textit{Teiler}), see Cadwallader and Gagné (2016).} From this two-part structure at the first level emerges a three-part structure \((a_1-b-a_2)\) at the second and third levels.

To generate a more fully developed \textit{b} section, the dividing dominant is composed-out, and \( \tilde{2} \) in the \textit{Urlinie} is prolonged through the fifth-progression from F\(_5\) to B\(_\#4\) (a motion into an inner voice), shown most clearly at the third level. It is difficult to date this sketch, but notice that the interruption sign (\( || \)) is nowhere to be found. Therefore, the sketch likely dates sometime between 1926 and 1930—that is, after the sketch in 4.3.8(a), which shows an uninterrupted \( \tilde{3}-(\tilde{2})-\tilde{3} \) lower-neighbor motion in the \textit{Urlinie}, and before the third volume of \textit{Das Meisterwerk in der Musik} ([1930] 1997), when the interruption symbol was first used.

Schenker’s sketch of this nocturne from \textit{Der freie Satz} ([1935] 1979, fig. 84) is shown in example 4.3.8(d). This sketch is nearly identical to the second level shown in example 4.3.8(b), except the interruption sign is placed at the end of the \textit{B} section. The three-part from \( A_1-B-A_2 \) is divided into two parts (\( A_1-B \) and \( A_2 \)), which, if we recall from \textit{Harmonielehre}, perhaps more...
closely resembles Schenker’s original conception of three-part form as derived from two-part form. Through the concept of interruption, Schenker is able to more fully integrate his previous ideas regarding traditional two- and three-part forms with spans of organic voice leading and harmonic composing-out at the deepest levels. It is in this sense that we might understand how a pre-existing Formenlehre contributed to his understanding of inner form. As Schenker’s theory of transformational voice leading developed, it was modified to recognize aspects of the outer form. Then, through what Cook describes as “retrospective prophecy,” Schenker claims that the inner form had, in fact, generated these aspects of the outer form all along. This sleight of hand deftly conceals forces that emanate from form in the foreground—forces that might also affect the voice leading at deeper levels. We might even question whether Schenker’s causal (organic) theory of musical coherence, where forces seems to move from background to foreground in only one direction, is still plausible.⁷⁴

⁷⁴ My discussion of how we might reimagine the relationship between background and foreground in Schenker’s late theory is indebted to Cohn (1992b) and Cook (2007, 269–306).
Goethe in *Metamorphose der Pflanzen*, suggests that all plants are variations on a theme. What is the theme? Goethe says “They all point to a hidden law.” But you wouldn’t ask: What is the law? That they point is all there is to it.

Darwin made a hypothesis to account for this. But you might treat it quite differently. You might say what is satisfactory in Darwin is not the hypothesis, but the putting the facts in a system—helping us to overlook them.

You may ask: What is in common to all music from Palestrina to Brahms? And one might answer: They start from tonic, go to dominant, & return to tonic.

—Ludwig Wittgenstein, Cambridge Lecture 6a, May 22, 1933, as recorded by G. E. Moore

Ludwig Wittgenstein leads us from Goethe to Darwin to a sardonic characterization of Schenker’s late work as overly reductive. Yet, when Schenker first described the *Urlinie* in print in 1921, he thought he had achieved something far greater: a theory of musical causality. In that same year, Wittgenstein published his *Logisch-Philosophische Abhandlung*. Therein, he critiqued explanatory theories based on causal necessity, including scientific theories that invoke so-called

---

75 In fact, Wittgenstein was familiar with Schenker’s ideas through Felix Salzer. As Eran Guter (2004, 193–94) has observed, “Salzer was . . . Wittgenstein’s nephew, and according to Brian McGuinness the two men spent some time together discussing Salzer’s own work and the music theory of Heinrich Schenker, who was Salzer’s mentor. These discussions began in 1926 and continued down to summers on the *Hochreit*, the Wittgenstein country estate, in the early 1930s.” Although Salzer did not study with Schenker until 1931, he had studied with Hans Weisse, one of Schenker’s students, beginning in the early 1920s (Koslovsky 2009, 18–19). For a biographical sketch of Salzer, including his relationship to the Wittgenstein family, see Koslovsky (2009, 13–52). The above epigraph is quoted in Guter (2015, 432).

76 Wittgenstein’s *Abhandlung* was translated into English in 1922 as *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, the title by which it is best known today.
natural laws. He described causality as a form of superstition—an idea that belongs to ages past, such as God and Fate. Schenker’s own conception of musical causality was deeply connected with his monotheistic religious beliefs, even equating the Ursatz with God (example 4.3.1, p. 328).

Today we might regard his organic theory of tonal coherence much as Wittgenstein regarded Darwin’s theory: as a source of great explanatory power, but also as something of a danger, where we risk not hearing all that a composition has to tell us. Schenker’s later tendency toward monism should be resisted.

In a diary entry dated July 31, 1925, Schenker recorded a dream that betrays his own concerns about organic unity even before fully achieving the method expressed in Der freie Satz.

He defends his theory against the capriciousness of none other than Beethoven:

> at a performance of his Septet [op. 20], Beethoven insists on not letting the last movement be performed! I am asked for my opinion on how that is compatible with the “organicism of the whole?”

This is a most private confession—a dream recorded in a diary. But more public doubts regarding the strictly causal (organic) aspects of Schenker’s theory are also found in Der freie Satz:

> The content of the second and the subsequent levels is determined by the content of the first level, but at the same time it is influenced by goals in the foreground, mysteriously sensed and pursued. (Schenker [1935] 1979, 68; quoted in Lubben 1993, 62; and Cook 2007, 294)

---


78 “Einerseits richtet sich der Inhalt der zweiten und der folgenden Schichten nach dem der ersten Schicht, zugleich aber nach dem geheimnisvoll geahnten und verfolgten Ziele im Vordergrund. Deutlicher schon als die erste läßt die zweite Schicht die Abzweigung in das Besondere des Werkes erkennen” (Schenker 1935, 111).
We saw how this mysterious influence of the foreground on the background was manifest through the concept of interruption. This influence challenges a truly organic, even monotheistic theory of music, where energy is transferred in one direction only. Schenker seems to concede that effects might influence their causes, that Creation might influence God.79 Cook writes, “The most generous construction, which is probably too generous, is that [Schenker] insisted on strict causality as a matter of principle, but in practice was more flexible, more humanistic than his principles should properly have allowed” (2007, 300). And with this thought, we return to where this dissertation began: the disparity between what Schenker says and what he does—a conflict between polemics and practice.

By reconstructing Schenker’s early Formenlehre, we gain a new perspective from which we might understand this conflict from a historical perspective—namely, that a pre-existing Formenlehre prompted him, at least in part, to follow a path that eventually led to the Ursatz (C. Smith 1996). Given this insight, we are invited to reimagine the relationship of background to foreground, including the relationship between so-called causes and their effects. Is this relationship causal in one direction, paradoxically causal in both directions, or is belief in causality a form of superstition, as Wittgenstein would have it?

We might disenchant Schenkerian theory by replacing causal relationships with logical relationships—in practice, this has already occurred in the United States with the reception of Schenker’s ideas by Milton Babbitt and Allen Forte80—but does this truly solve the difficulties that we encounter when attempting to redefine form in the terms of content? We either risk imposing unity of voice leading and form onto the music so that we “overlook the facts,” as in the analysis

79 For more on “retrocausality” (or “backward causation”), see Dummett (1954).
80 See Rothstein (1990, 199–200) and Bernstein (2015, 1–18).
of Bach’s C-minor fugue (example 4.3.3, p. 332); or, we risk analyses that seem to be internally at odds, as in the sketch of Beethoven’s F-major sonata (example 4.3.6, p. 345). The latter choice offers us the best way forward. As Richard Cohn writes,

To deny the monolithic status of the Ursatz is not to abandon Schenker, but rather to jettison an aspect of his late work that he valued highly, and to attach the remaining cargo of his late work to the paradigm of his earlier work, where, as Carl Schachter [1988, 525] puts it, “the elements of counterpoint combine with such other compositional factors as harmony, patterned rhythm, form, and motivic design in a complex fabric where each factor acts upon all others.” (Cohn 1992b, 169).

This is a revisionist version of Schenker’s late theory—although it is a version that presupposes the unified approach achieved in Der freie Satz (or nearly so at least). After this achievement, only then do we overcome it. To appropriate Wittgenstein, “[We] must, so to speak, throw away the ladder after [we] have climbed up it” ([1921] 1974, 89). 81

We might reimagine the relationship between inner form and outer form as a synthesis, “where each factor acts upon all others.” Schenker describes this “interplay of forces” in his first published description of the Urlinie:

A musical work comes into being as an interweaving of Urlinie, scale degree, and voice leading. All of these fundamental fluids and forces—motif and melody spring from the Urlinie—constantly interpenetrate one another; one must not be confused about this reality by the manner of conceptualization according to which we can bring each of these to consciousness only individually . . . . This means to say that it is possible, indeed necessary, to speak of the Urlinie too in particular, even though it may cooperate inseparably with others in the interplay of forces within the work of art. 82 (Schenker [1921] 2015, 4:9)

81 “Er muss sozusagen die Leiter wegwerfen, nachdem er auf ihr hinaufgestiegen ist” (Wittgenstein 1921, § 6.54).
This description is similar to what Christopher Brody calls fractional independence: a conception of form where the “parameters of tonal structure and thematic design are not independent—they move in tandem to some extent—nor are they perfectly in lockstep” (2015, 124). But we might also go a step further, preserving causality in two directions as if it were real. Inner and outer form affect each other in a reciprocal way: form in the foreground exerts its own force through the transformational levels to the background, while the background voice leading has a similar effect on the foreground (C. Smith 1996; Samarotto 2005). By acknowledging this, the generative aspects of Schenker’s theory recapitulate aspects of its historical development (a version of Haeckel’s law). This conclusion is not new, but given what we know about Schenker’s early Formenlehre and the role that it might have played in the development of his later ideas, we can state it with greater historical awareness and theoretical understanding.

In January of 1935, not long after Schenker had passed away, his longtime friends Moriz Rosenthal and Moriz Violin were grappling with these issues. How do we reconcile content with form, foreground with background, flower with Urpflanze, and corporeality with spirituality? How are we not only to understand but also experience the Urlinie and its relationship to the layers of voice leading as they are manifest in a composition?83 Violin tells Rosenthal,

For me, a remark of yours concerning the Urlinie sticks deep, deep in my ear and mind. You said approximately: "What, after all, can the individual notes (linear formations) signify over against the indefinable imponderabilities of melody, indeed of the whole work?" . . . Schenker distinguishes, as it were, the mental idea from the sensuous idea. He speaks of a musical foreground and background technique and [illegible] I should like to express that more precisely through the likeness [Gleichnis] or an eternal truth:

Kräftespiel des Kunstwerks nur untrennbar mit den anderen Kräften zusammenwirken” (Schenker 1921, 22).

83 See Samarotto (2015, 65–67) for how we might experience the Urlinie and composing-out framed “as a dichotomy between materiality and conceptuality.”
[illegible] Every living thing in the world lives off the creator’s foreground technique. His enchanting motivic enfoldings, the sensuality, craving, voluptuousness, the appeal of beauty: all these are in truth only form designed to gain recognition for the primordial law of his mental idea, of procreation (of the *Urlinie* of happening). The foreground, the secondary phenomenon, is indeed the primary thing in our lives and we are in fact closest to the creator when we carry within ourselves our *Urlinie* of life, love, this true mental procreative idea.

We breathe the fragrance of flowers. That is certainly not the spiritual mission of flowers. The fragrance awakes in us only a love for it [the flower]. We come closer to it and to the creator when we view it as botanist, as [illegible]. Then we shudder before the signs that show us how the law of procreation, this spiritual idea, was provided through mechanical procreative arrangements of eternal value. Then we will enjoy doubly both fragrance and spirit.84

---

APPENDIX 1

THE PATH TO RESEMBLANCE

§ A1.1. INTRODUCTION

“Der Weg zum Gleichnis” is an unpublished manuscript located in file 83 of the Oster Collection.1 This document is not dated, although it was likely written ca. 1895—the same year that “Geist der musikalischen Technik” was published. Schenker expresses skepticism in “Gleichnis” regarding both organicism and formalism—sentiments reminiscent of “Geist’s” final paragraphs.2 He also further develops the idea expressed in “Geist” that music evolved from an art based on imitating language to an art based on developing a motive (internal repetition).

The word “Gleichnis”—meaning resemblance, likeness, or parable—is taken from the opening of the Mystic Chorus at the conclusion of Goethe’s Faust (“Alles Vergängliche / Ist nur ein Gleichnis”).3 Resemblances are how we understand the world: they occur between painting and Nature, poetry and soul, and word and tone. However, these relationships all involve different domains. When we perceive motivic resemblances as a listener, or create motivic variants as a composer, we do so in the same domain. In Schenker’s view, this sets music apart from the other arts—an idea he likely took from Wagner.

---

1 File 83 also contains the notes on form discussed in chapters 2 and 3, as well as the manuscript transcribed in appendix 2 titled “Von der Natur der Kunstgesetze überhaupt.”

2 See parts IV and V of “Gleichnis” respectively. When first published in the Musikalisches Wochenblatt, “Geist” included a footnote stating that it was intended as part of a larger work in progress (Schenker 1895, 245). It is likely that both “Geist” and “Gleichnis” were part of this larger work.

3 See part III, p. 370. Schenker also quotes this phrase in Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, xxii).
Hanslick’s (1854) influence on Schenker is also clear in this essay—namely, that music is only a sign for itself. However, in the essay’s fifth part, Schenker argues that music can express something beyond the “purely musical” (*Reinmusikalische*). This, too, is in keeping with Hanslick’s aesthetics. As Mark Evan Bonds (2006, 110) observes, Hanslick “implicitly sanctions—or at the very least does not preclude—the validity of programmatic and even political interpretations of ‘absolute’ works.” For example, Schenker describes Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in A Major, op. 101/i, as “the most sublime program music imaginable” (see part V below, p. 385).

Schenker’s claims are buttressed by examples taken from Beethoven’s late piano sonatas (plus one example by J. S. Bach and another by Brahms). These examples provide the concrete analytical detail that “Geist” lacks. Curiously, many of these examples are identical to those found in A. B. Marx’s writings. I have numbered Schenker’s examples, added captions, and placed them within the text as they appear in the manuscript. I have also added Roman numerals and subheadings to help organize the essay’s five parts. Some of the Roman numerals and subheadings are Schenker’s own, while the titles that appear in square brackets are memorable phrases gleaned from the text.

The original document is written in Schenker’s hand, and it is often quite difficult to decipher as a result (see example A1.1.1 below). I thank an anonymous transcriber and Görkem Cilam, Assistant Director of the University of Massachusetts Amherst Translation Center, for their considerable help interpreting these documents. Any remaining errors are my own. Finally, Schenker’s original orthography is maintained whenever possible:

---

4 See the footnotes given in square brackets below. These citations are to examples found in the fourth edition of Marx’s *Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition* ([1845] 1868, vol. 3) and the second edition of Marx’s *Anleitung zum Vortrag Beethovenscher Klavierwerke* ([1863] 1875).
1. All editorial additions and changes are indicated in [square brackets];

2. An illegible word in the manuscript is indicated as [illegible];

3. A question mark indicates doubt regarding the transcription of a word (e.g., [illegible: entstammen?]);

4. When a word is partially legible, it has been partially transcribed, either preceded or followed by an em dash and a question mark (e.g., [illegible: Menschen—?]);

5. Words or phrases crossed out in the manuscript are indicated with a strikethrough;

6. Words in superscript indicate that they have been added by Schenker (or perhaps someone else) between lines of the original text;

7. Bold numbers in {curly brackets} indicate the item number in file 83 of the Oster Collection (e.g., {4} indicates that the following text appears on item 4 of file 83);

8. Archaic or unusual spellings in the text have not been corrected (e.g., Rhytmus versus Rhythmus, Theil versus Teil, or blos versus bloß).
EXAMPLE A1.1.1 The beginning of "Der Weg zum Gleichnis," by Heinrich Schenker (OC 83/2; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
§ A1.2. “DER WEG ZUM GLEICHNIS,” BY HEINRICH SCHENKER (OC 83/2–39)

[I. Künste des Bewusstseins]

{2} In einem höheren Masse noch als die andren Künste verdient Musik als die ursprüngliche Schöpfung des Menschen aufgefasst, gepriesen zu werden. Entbehrt doch unter allen nur sie allein, die eine, so in ihrer höchsten wie im niedrigsten Gebilde, und so heute wie am Anfang ihres Daseins, eines jeglichen Vorbildes der Natur u. jeglichen Zwecks. Haben Poesie, Malerei u. Plastik sämtlich die Aufgabe, ins Bewusstsein des Menschen die Erscheinungen der Natur hinüberzuleiten u. legt daher Insonderheit die erst vorm geistigen Auge die eigene Seele bloß, zeigen die beiden andere die Farben u. Umrisse aller Welterscheinungen u. hält Architektur, um auch diese Kunst zu nennen, immer am Wohnzweck, als erstem Kern, fest, so hat dagegen die Musik in diesem aber erwarteten Sinne leider keine Helferin an der Natur gefunden. Jene Künste sind dazu bestimmt, die Absicht der Noten gewesen, wenn man so sagen darf, zu verführen, die es vorhatte, den Menschen von den Tieren, Pflanzen u. Steinen durch das Bewusstsein seiner selbst, von des der übrigen Umwelt auszuzeichnen, u. so scheinen sie vor allem, sie sind gleichsam Künste des Bewusstseins, des grössten Geschenkes der Natur gegen die Menschen. Da es aber nur eine Natur gibt[, das einzige All, dieser gegenüber wieder nur das eine Bewusstsein, das einzige des Menschen, so gibt es von selbst daher nur eine {3} einzige Aufgabe, nämlich die Natur im Bewusstsein aufzulösen. Eine andere, zweite Aufgabe könnte gar nicht anstehen, denn mit einer solchen hätte die Natur sich selbst überschritten. Und es scheint denn fürs Erste jede Gelegenheit zur Entstehung einer anderen Kunst ausgeschlossen, sofern diese nicht schon vorher berufen wurde, an der Erfüllung jener
Aufgabe theilzunehmen. Eine solche Kunst aber war von Anfang, u. ist es noch die Musik. Sie vermittelt weder Inner- noch Aussenwelt dem menschlichen Bewußtsein; sie enthüllt die Seele nicht, wie Poesie, mindestens nicht bis zum selben Grad der Deutlichkeit, sie schildert nicht das Grün der Wiese, nicht das Laub des Waldes, wie Malerei; sie hält nicht menschliche oder tierische Form fest, wie Plastik; sie kehrt sich nicht an all das; nicht an Natur noch an Bewusstsein;—und doch erschien sie unter uns, u. theilte bald die Ehren der übrigen Künste. Wie konnte solches kommen?

II. [Kunst um ihrer selbst willen]


III. [Ein kühner, genialer Griff]

Gegenüber der Musik hatten so die übrigen Künste den Vortheil eines Vorbildes voraus, u. was denen noch so gross, erhaben, u. unerschöpflich, so war durch die stete Gegenwart des Zieles dennoch Ruhe, Sicherheit u. einige Behaglichkeit in der Übung derselben möglich. Der Künstler konnte stets wissen, was er zu wollen hatte, denn vor ihm stand das ewige Ziel: Natur. Selbst sein Irrthum war noch vom Licht des Zweckes erhellt u. durchleuchtet.

---

5 [This idea is also expressed in § 1 of Harmonielehre (1906). The “Gleichnis” manuscript may be the initial formulation of many ideas found throughout §§ 1–7 of Schenker’s first treatise.]
Aus demselben unschätzbaren Vortheil entsprang indessen eine noch tiefere Befriedigung der menschlichen Seele, die im Folgenden ihren besonderen Grund hatte. Es ist nämlich eine Eigentümlichkeit des Menschengeistes, dass er die Welt, somit auch sich selbst, nur im Gleichnis begreifen kann. Er nennt König den, der nicht Untertan heißt; reich denjenigen, der nicht Armut hat; Sonne, was nicht Mond ist; Mann, was nicht Weib ist; Tag, was nicht Nacht ist; Liebe, was \{6\} nicht Hass ist, u. so fort[]. Durch alle Erscheinungen der Welt, die er gegen einander stellen muss, um zu vergleichen, zu unterscheiden, und mit besonderem Namen zu bedenken. Gäbe es nur Liebe, nur Liebe allein in der Welt, wahrhaftig, es gäbe dann überhaupt keine! Goethe spricht dieses mit den berühmten Worten aus: „Alles Vergängliche ist nur ein Gleichnis.“ Die Art denna, nur durch das Gleichnis zu begreifen, ist Form unsres Bewusstseins. Natur, die uns das Bewusstsein gab, gab uns auch die Form dazu. In ihrem eigenen Interesse schien es [illegible] daher zu liegen, dass sie ihr Geschenk an uns nicht selbst schon vereitelte. Da sie also sich selbst zum Vorbild dem Künstler schenkte, setzte sie dadurch zum Gleichnis ihrer, wie sie umgekehrt die Künste sich selbst zum Gleichnis bestellte. Vorbild ward zum Gleichnis: die Natur als Gleichnis der Künste, Künste als Gleichnis der Natur. So erfüllte Natur unser Bewusstsein, unter Beibehalten ihrer Form, mit allem Inhalt der Welt, u. erreichte [illegible] ihren ursprünglichen Zweck, durch das Bewusstsein allein uns über alle Thierwelt zu erhöhen. Poesie ward Gleichnis des Menschen selbst: Vorbild und Gleichnis seiner Seele. Ob im Lyrischen, Dramatischen, überall stellt der Mensch sich selbst dar, macht sich zum Gleichnis seiner selbst, um sich u. seine anderen zu begreifen. „Erkenn dich selbst“ sagten damals die Alten. \{7\} Ähnlich erhielten Malerei u. Plastik die ganze grosse Welt der sichtbaren u. färbigen Erscheinungen zum Gleichnis: Linie und Farbe des Bildes wurden Gleichnis der Natur, wie diese Gleichnis des Bildes.
Musik u. wusste es auch in Wort u. Absicht. Die Periode der Versuche wird abgeschlossen: man wusste[,] was die Musik brauchte, um Kunst zu sein, u. damit begann schon auch die Kunst selbst. Man hat das [ihr written over das?] Gleichnis [illegible] der Musik gegeben.

Die Künstler hatten die glückliche rettende Idee gefunden, das Gleichnis der Musik nicht [illegible] ausserhalb {9} ihrer zu suchen, da sie dieses ohnehin nirgendwie sie [illegible: genaustens?] erfahren mussten, zu finden gewesen; vielmehr verlegten sie das Gleichnis der Musik in diese selbst hinein. Ein kühner, genialer Griff, der dem [illegible: Menschen—?] vielleicht die grösste Ehre bringt. War das auch künstlich, die Kunst zu ihrem eigenen Gleichnis selbst zu erheben, so war doch dadurch der Forderung unseres Bewusstseins, die nun einmal nicht zu umgehen war, voll genug geleistet. Allen Theilen ward auf einmal Recht geschehen: die Kunst hatte ihr Gleichnis wegbekommen, u. deswegen konnten [illegible] die Kunst nun erst begreifen u. entwickeln[.] Welch grosser Schritt!

[IV.] Über das Gleichnis selbst

Dieses Gleichnis aber heißt „Motiv“.


können diese Bedeutung erlangen. Ohne in diesem Zusammenhang alles Besondere, das zu dieser Materie gehört, zu schildern, führen wir ein paar Beispiele dafür an, dem Fleiss des Lesers es anheimstellend, sich an den Kunstwerken der Meister mehr daran zu üben.

**Example A1.2.1** J. S. Bach, Prelude no. 6 in D Minor, *The Well-Tempered Clavier*, book I, BWV 851, mm. 1–2

![Example A1.2.1: J. S. Bach, Prelude no. 6 in D Minor, BWV 851, mm. 1–2](image)

**Example A1.2.2** Brahms, Rhapsody in G Minor, op. 79, no. 2, mm. 1–4

![Example A1.2.2: Brahms, Rhapsody in G Minor, op. 79, no. 2, mm. 1–4](image)

{12} **Example A1.2.3** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i, mm. 1–4

![Example A1.2.3: Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i, mm. 1–4](image)

Solche Darstellung, Entwicklung des Gleichnishaften pflegt man oft auch besonders im Hinblick auf die cyklische [sic] Form der Sonate, auch Thematik zu nennen, wobei, wie leicht zu sehen, das Motiv auch Thema genannt wird. Wie überhaupt beide Bezeichnungen im melodischen Sinne bald näher zu einander gerückt werden, ja bis zur völligen Identität, bald weiter auseinander gehalten werden, bald bewusst, bald unbewusst, mit deutlicher Absicht oder keiner. Die Summe aller Gleichnisse, aller Thematik, die anderen später abzuhandelnden Arten[,] das Motiv

---

6 [Cf. Marx ([1845] 1868, 261–62, ex. 305) and Marx ([1863] 1875, 50, 53).]
eingeschlossen, pflegt man dann auch mit dem grossen Wort „organisch“ zu benennen. Nun
damit ist es aber genau so wie mit dem Motivischen, d.h. dem Gleichnis selbst: wie dieses nur
künstlichen Ursprungs, nicht in der Natur vorgebildet, nur der Form des unsres Bewusstsein
essprechend, so kann auch die Summer alles daran nicht mehr als künstlich genannt, sondern das
genannte Charakteristikum organisch[,] daher nur im freien, analogen, künstlichen Sinn begriffen
u. angewendet werden. Wenn man schon dieses Wort aus seinem eigenen Geltungsbereich
herausnehmen {14} wo es das letzte Geheimnis der Natur andeutet, u. auf die Kunst es anwenden
wird, um ihr damit die höchste Ehre völliger Gleichstellung mit der Natur zu bezeigen, so mag man
sich indessen immer dessen bewusst bleiben, dass eher Poesie, Malerei[,] oder Plastik die
Bezeichnung jenes Wortes verdienen, als Musik. Womit aber keineswegs eine Zurücksetzung
derer letzteren Kunst angesprochen werden will, da ja Musik auf künstlichen Voraussetzungen
ruhend auch nicht Anspruch erhebt darauf, andere, als künstliche Folgen zu zeitigen. In
Entstehung[,] sowohl, als in Entwicklung ist die Musik eine ganz andere Kunst, als die übrigen, dass
am allerwenigsten gerade jenes Wort auf alle, [illegible] geschweige nämlich im selben Sinn, passen
[illegible] möchte.

Motivische Gleichnisse im hoher Vollendung zu schaffen, ist eine Vormacht nur der
Genies. Oft gelingt es ihnen, das Gleichnishaft so zu verschleiern, [illegible] dass selbst geübte
Hörer es nicht wiederfinden können, von ungeübten Hörern zu schweigen, dieses gar nie, leider sehr zu
ihrem eigenen Schaden, wahrnehmen können. Und nicht selten steht man gar vor unlösbaren
Situation, ratlos im Zweifel, ob hier ein Gleichnis vorliege oder keines. Wer wollte, um nur ein
Beispiel zu nennen, auch mit [illegible] {15} Bestimmtheit behaupten, Takt 67 der e\textsuperscript{en} Sonate von
Beethoven sei gleichnishaft aus dem Bass des Taktes 54 u. ff. hervorgegangen:
der die als Verkleinerung in Achteln der Viertel h cis d in Takt 54; oder um noch ein Beispiel hier anzuführen, ob in den folgenden Takten 24–25 der Sonate asdur op[.] 110:

Das Gleichnis die zwischen den Klavieren eingeschlossenen Tongruppen umfasse, u als solches Beethoven bewusst gewesen, oder ob keinerlei Gleichnis zwischen den eingeklammerten Gruppen bestehe, u der Autor vielmehr ein Gleichnis auch auf den Discant allein, mit Bewusstsein beschränkte?

---

EXAMPLE A1.2.4 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i, mm. 67–68

EXAMPLE A1.2.5 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E Minor, op. 90/i, mm. 55–56

EXAMPLE A1.2.6 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in A-flat Major, op. 110/i, mm. 23–25

7 [Cf. Marx ([1863] 1875, 23–24).]
8 [Cf. Marx (1824a, 88).]

Unter Rhythmus verstehen wir die zeitliche Erscheinung, die zeitliche Form der Melodie selbst, als im Gegensatz zur reinen, sich ewig gleichbleibenden Zeit, die noch hinter dem Rhythmus besteht[illegible], die man zuweilen Metrik nennt. Ein Beispiel, an dem wir rhythmische Gleichnisse entwickeln werden, wird[illegible] uns dieses klar machen; es ist der Anfang der grossen Bdur Sonate von Beethoven op. 106[.]

Example A1.2.7 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 1–3


---

\[^9\] [Cf. Marx ([1845] 1868, 279, ex. 340).]
hier somit nicht durch ein abstraktes sogenanntes, metrisches Schema, nur durch die leibhaftige, wirklich Dauer, die wir selbst dem ersten Achtel verliehen haben. Auch in der Zeit begreifen wir einen „Theil“ nur dadurch, indem wir einen „Gegen-Theil“ dazu setzen. Was ein sei, kann uns erst ein zweites, nächstes sagen, u. ohne letzteres gäbe es überhaupt kein halbes, den so auch vor der Zeit verlangt unser Bewusstsein das Mittel des Gleichnisses, ohne welches es einmal nichts begreifen kann. [illegible: Also?] wir setzen einen Theil zum Ganzen so ins Gleichnis, dass es dessen dritten Theil ausmacht. (1 : 3) Hier gäbe es wieder kein Drittel, wenn nicht zwei andere Theile folgent, die über das Gleichnis der Theile zum Ganzen, wie zu einander selbst aussagen wurden. So theilt also unser Gefühl in angeborener Art die Zeit von selbst dort auf, dass sie im Gleichnis von 2 oder 3 uns erscheint. Andere Gleichnisse schafft sich unser Gefühl nicht, u. wenn zuweilen in Laune Künstler es verlangen, dass wir in Gleichnis 5 fühlen, es sträubt sich dagegen unser Gefühl, immer werde es verlängert u. zu dem ersten, weil erfahrene Gleichnissen 2 oder 3 zurückkehren. So wäre dann auf letzterem allein unser Gefühl für Zeit zurückzuführen, somit auch alles das, was wir Natur nennen. Es gibt meiner Ansicht nach keine andre Metrik, als in jenen Gleichnissen eingeschlossene Gefühl. Nun ist dieses Gefühl aber ihr Grundgefühl, das wir ja immer haben, wenn wir Zeit aufzuteilen genöthigt sind, es ist die Art selbst, womit wir Zeit hören, also nur Form des Gefühls, die uns nie verlässt. Diese stete Verwachsenheit der Form mit uns ist aber, wie selbstverständlich, Grund davon, dass wir in Beurtheilung der Zeit im Kunstwerk selbst besser von ihr absehen u. nur jene Form der zeitlichen Erscheinung betrachte, die die Melodie selbst hervorbringt. Dadurch dass die Melodie in ihrer eigenen Weise die Zeit aufgetheilt, wird unser Grundgefühl für Zeit nicht aufgehoben, aber umgekehrt reicht das nicht allein schon aus, um die
zeitliche Formen der Melodie zu begreifen. Diese wollen für sich, als Neues, höheres, u.
lebendiges Gleichnis aufgefasst werden. Auf das obige Beispiel angewendet, fühlen wir deshalb
was im allgemeinen Gleichnis der Zeit, das wir mit der Zahl 2 ausdrücken, doch daraus erwächst
[illegible] nicht der [illegible: Gewinn?], den wir haben, da wir die besonderen zeitlichen
Gleichnisse ins Auge fassen, wie die Melodie sie uns actuell, stets lebendig hervorbringt. Daher
wir dann mit Rhythmus nur eben \{19\} diese lebendigen zeitlichen Gleichnisse nicht jenes Grundgefühl
überhaupt bereichert haben.

Um zu den rhytmischen Gleichnissen zurückzukehren, die wir dem oben angeführten
Beispiel [illegible] entnehmen, so sehen wir das erste Achtel mit nachfolgender punktierter Note in
vollster Reinheit zum Vorbild, also Motiv im folgenden erhoben:

**Example A1.2.8** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 38–40

![Example A1.2.8](image)

[illegible] aber mehr gegenbildlich mit [illegible] in der Bassfigur:

**Example A1.2.9** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 47–48

![Example A1.2.9](image)
am interessantesten, weil sofort mit einem weiteren rhytmischen Motiv verbunden am Anfang selbst:

**Example A1.2.10** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 1–2

![Example A1.2.10](image1)

wo es zunächst den Anschein hat, als wollte auf das Achtel *wieder* eine ähnlich punktierte Viertelnote folgen. Weiterhin wird der Inhalt der Klavier b zum rhytmischen Vorbild erhoben, u. zwar so, dass ein Gegenbild in zweimal so grossen [illegible: Werth—?] ihm entgegentritt:

**Example A1.2.11** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 17–19

![Example A1.2.11](image2)

{20} *Oder* am kühnsten, in einer Art, die nur Beethoven allein. Ihm dem einzigen, zu Gebote stand, wird der volle Inhalt der Klammer c zum rhytmischen Vorbild erhoben, dass als Gegenbild ihnen folgendes folgen könnte:

---

10 [Cf. Marx ([1845] 1868, 280, ex. 342a).]
Man sehe nur wie das Motiv,—rhytmisches genommen \[illegible\] als so gross zu nennen, mit einem \textit{sf} anhebt, das ein genialer \[illegible: Werth?] ist sein \textit{will}, nicht für mechanische Stärke, ein mechanisches Forte, nur \[illegible\] für Leidenschaft u. Trotz, als \[illegible\] \[illegible\] dies \textit{nur} die Änderung des ersten Achtels in ein Viertel bewirkt \[illegible\] haben könnte. Wie weiterhin nun die beiden Viertel, Inhalt des kleinen \textit{b}, vorbildlich wirken, nur mit dem \textit{sf} am zweiten Gegenviertel so herrlich ausgestattet, \textit{wie} ein Gleichnis aber statt Viertels eine Pause steht, auf die \textit{aber} das zweite, mit \textit{sf} versehene Viertel flogt: Welch rhytmisches Gleichnis! Und wie viel Seele und Leidenschaft dazu! Und wer \[illegible: sein?], ob nicht auch noch nach

\textbf{Example A1.2.13} Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 112–13

als Gegenbild u. Gleichnis jene beiden Viertel \[illegible: gefühlt?] werden \{21\} möchten, als wäre hier bloß das \textit{sf} in \textit{jene} Breite gegangen nach der ihre Sehnsucht, genau geprüft, schon gleich am Anfang ging. Was ist dann [das] Forzato im zweiten Viertel mehr als sozusagen eine psychische Synkope, im Gegensatz zur physisch materiellen, die allein unter diesem Namen \[illegible\] bekannt?
Wenn wir [illegible] zum Schluss noch hinzufügen, es sei Art des rhytmischen Motivs in viel höherem Masse, als das mehr [illegible], gleich hinter einander sich viel zahlreiche Gleichnisse zu schaffen, u. aus dieser Hinsicht z.B. aus der [illegible] Sonate auf Takt

**Example A1.2.14** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 62–64\(^1\)

![Example A1.2.14](image)

u. ff. verweisen, so glauben wir über die Natur des rhytmischen Motivs [illegible] das wichtigste so weit es zur Klarstellung des für die Musik so [illegible] grundlegenden Begriffs Gleichnis dienen [illegible], gesagt zu haben.


{22} **Example A1.2.15** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i, mm. 100–111

![Example A1.2.15](image)

Dieses als Beispiel [illegible] wie der Mollunterdominante (T. 2–4) die [illegible: lei—?] durchkonstruiert (T. 8–10) aber im Melodischen selbst entgegentritt. Wenn man will, vergleiche man weiter

\(^{11}\) [Cf. Marx ([1863] 1875, 150).]
damit Beisp. 3, in ähnlicher Art, wo wir sehen, wie das melodische Vorbild zumindest in Moll (c), das Nachbild im Dur Dreiklang (g) liegt.

Als Beispiel im sogenannten eigentlichen harmonischen Sinn folgt aus derselben Sonate:

**EXAMPLE A1.2.16** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/i


Von der Ansicht, die wir später der Näheren auszuführen haben werden, ausgehend, dass der Contrapunkt im reinsten u. eigentlichsten Verstand des Wortes nur im zweistimmigen Satz authentisch ist, lassen wir hier ein paar Beispiele contrapunktischer Gleichnisse folgen, Beethoven: entstammen?, jedoch bloß auf den traurigen Satz, wie er durch die beiden äussersten Stimmen läuft, reduziert.
EXAMPLE A1.2.17 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E-flat Major, op. 81a/ii, mm. 1–3, 10–11

EXAMPLE A1.2.18 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in B-flat Major, op. 106/iii, mm. 13–16, 21–22

Mit solchem Gleichnis im Herzen ward nun Musik eine wirkliche Kunst. Sie ist es geworden, im Laufe der Zeiten, nicht schon von Anfang aber gewesen, wie die anderen Künste, denen das Gleichnis schon sofort a priori der Natur durch u. [illegible] sich selbst anbot. Da das Gleichnis der Musik min innerlich, abstrakter Art, darf man, wenn's beliebt, diese Kunst eine abstrakte nennen: Neben allen Künsten ist sie aus dem Grunde der Entstehung ihres Gleichnisses eben wohl die abstrakteste Kunst, die Kunst κατ’ εξοχήν. Wenn man will, kann man ferner Musik auch als eine Kunst par analogium auffassen, wenn man dem Umstand Rechnung trägt, dass

12 [Cf. Marx ([1863] 1875, 142) and Riemann (1889, 61).]
13 [Greek for par excellence.]
jenes Gleichnis nur eine analoge u. künstliche Nachbildung der Gleichnisse ist, wie sie sonst die Natur uns darbietet.

Menschen gelten, was aber nicht der Fall. Musik hat also in erster Linie Kunst zu sein, dann
komme, was kommen mag, der Mensch, die Natur, die ganze, ganze Welt, waren nur in zweiter
Linie.

Wie leicht zu errathen, sprechen wir hier von der Gattung Musik, die man missbräuchlich
mit dem besonderen Namen Programmmusik benennt. Missbräuchlich darum, weil alle gute u.
beste Musik in diesem Sinne Programmmusik sein kann u. es auch ist, ohne dass sie noch aufhört,
künstliche Musik, als wahre Musik u. wahre Kunst zu sein. Dahingegen die Besonderheit des
Namens weit weniger eine Auszeichnung, als Tadel der Gattung zu bedeuten hätte, wenn man
damit sage wollte, in ihm trete das Programm vor die Musik selbst in den Vordergrund. Was dann
aber sonst möchte man Kunst gewagt haben, wenn man nicht andernfalls, gleich uns, die
Ueberzeugung hat, schon Beethoven oder Haydn haben noch vor Berlioz, Liszt[,] oder Wagner
Programm- [27] musik geschrieben, und sogar eine bessere als diese. Wer, wie wir, daran glaubt,
und dafür die besten Gründe in sich trägt, dass z.B. der erste Satz aus der A\text{dur} Sonate von
Beethoven op. [101] die allersublimste Programmmusik, die je erreicht wurde oder werden kann,
[wilde] wird sich [illegible] hüten, das Wort Programmmusik im Sinne einer neuen, besonderen
Kunstgattung z.B. auf [illegible: Liszt?]; Musik zu „Tasso“ anzuwenden. Was würde er dann nur
neues über die Liszt’sche Musik sich gestehen oder aussagen können, was er nicht schon von
Beethoven tausendfach [illegible] auch sagen muss! Oder läuft der ganze Spass nur wirklich darauf
allein hinaus, dass jenes Wort von Beethoven nur einfach „Sonate“ sich nennt, dagegen Liszt’s
opus mit Tasso’s Namen überschrieben ist, das schon durch sich selbst einen Musiker, Dichter,
Charakter vielleicht sogar eine Begebenheit aus seinem so bekannten Leben anzeigt? Hat man also
Programmmusik alle jene Musik zu heissen, die eine besondere Ueberschrift hat, [illegible] einen
Name, oder gar eine verzwickte Erzählung, Sage oder Legende? Ist alle Welt wirklich so thöricht, nur um eine solche Lappalie willen, einen Gattungsunterschied zwischen z.B. dem letzten Streichquartetten Beethovens u. dem [illegible] {28} von Berlioz zu statuieren?


{29} Überleitung

[The following page is crossed out in the manuscript.]

Jedoch musste, um die Aufgabe der Tonkunst zu erfüllen, das Tonmaterial erst beschaffen werden; es musste das Tonsystem gefunden werden, worin die musikalischen wie poetischen
Gleichnisse darzustellen möglich war. Dieses aber zu finden war fast noch schwerer, als es schwer war, das inner-musikalische Prinzip zu entdecken, u. es dauerte Jahrhunderte, ja sogar Jahrtausende, ehe beschafft wurde, was wir besitzen.


Wehe aber dem, der solch schönes Geschäft der Treue aber mit dem ekeln Namen „Formalismus“ bewandelt. Dieser scheint nicht zu ahnen, wie arg er dadurch {32} nur seine Unkenntnis der wahren Kunst compromittiert. Gerne anerkennen wir [illegible] sein Recht darauf, sich von dem musikalischen Gleichnissen des Künstlers X oder Y gelangweit zu fühlen; so oft er aber, gar verständlich darüber geworden, die Lust verspüren möchte [illegible: wie sich?], gleich das ganze System der Gleichnisse niederzurennen, erinnere er sich nur [illegible] Beethoven’s oder Bach’s, die beide nur allem in jenem die Wunder der Kunst, wie auch der Seele geartet, ja selbst
Folgen wir denn seinen Spuren [illegible], u. sehen wir, wie er das Gleichnis gehandhabt, [u.] zu Nutz u. Frommen aller, die ihm hierin folgen möchten!


**Example A1.2.19** Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E-flat Major, op. 81a/i, mm. 1–2

Nun fragt es sich: Hat hier eine Beeinflussung eines Tonwerkes durch ein poetisches Wort- u. Situationsvorbild wirklich stattgefunden, oder nicht? Haben wir ferner die Pflicht, ihm zu glauben, oben stehe seine persönliche schriftliche Versicherung, oder auch das Recht, trotz dieser persönlichen Bürgschaft, jenes Gleichnis als solches zu leugnen? {35} Nein[,] wir denken: es müsse auf’s Wort des Meisters geglaubt werden, zumal der Eindruck der unter dem Einfluss des Gleichnisses geborenen Tonwerke so ist, dass er das Wort des Meisters mehr zu unterstützen als zu entkräften vermöchte. Haben wir aber einmal angenommen, es sei wirklich wahr, was Beeth. uns versichert, u. zwar wahr in Wort u. Ton, haben wir dann nicht schon durch dieses allein zugleich auch die Pflicht, der Musik ein Recht auf poetisches Gleichnis zuzugestehen? Wenn das Gleichnis in Beeth.’s Kunst sich vollzog, u. wir es selbst glauben, weil wir es doch nicht leugnen können, wie dürfen wir dann in einem den Gegensatz davon behaupten, Musik könne kein Gleichnis
ausdrücken? Soll u. muss es nicht schon genügen, dass dieses ihm, dem Autor, das Gleichnis voll ausgedrückt hat? [illegible] Was geht hierbei wir, die Zuhörer, die Kunst, u. der Künstler an? War ihm selbst nur des Gleichnis Thatsache u. Ereignis, so ist es nicht nur aus der Welt zu schaffen, gleichviel welchen Antheil wir daran haben oder keinen; u. wir dürfen nicht zögern zu sagen, Musik kenne poetische Gleichnisse aus– {36} drücken, u. sie drücke sie aus, ob wir sie wahrnehmen oder nicht. Das Alles folgt aus der Thatsache, der Wahrheit im Künstler, u. zwar schon daraus allein. Mit ihm, der behauptet, das Gleichnis erlebt u. geschaffen zu haben, müssen wir einstimmen zu sagen, Musik könne sehr wohl auch poetische Gleichnisse ausdrücken.

Doch auch wird, die blos hören, nicht schaffen, haben gleichfalls Rechte auf Thatsachen, nöthigenfalls auch einseitige gegenüber dem Künstler, wie vorher doi{ch} dieser gegenüber uns welche hatte. Unser Recht besteht nicht darin, sagen zu dürfen, dass diese als jene Tonreihe uns ein Gleichnis scheinen will diesem oder jenem seelischen Vorgang, ein Gleichnis dieser oder jener dramatischen Gebärde[,] usw. Geschieht es, dass eine Tonreihe uns eben an ein Bestimmtes aus dem Leben denken lässt, so ist ihr Gleichnis schon da, da es gekommen ist, wie jede Ideenassoziation, ungerufen, ungewollt, u. ohne dass wir sie finden könnten. Wir können ja nichts dafür, das was bei jener Tonreihe Kraft eines Gleichnisaktes der [illegible: Lebens—?] einfiel, {37} geschah es aber so, wer wird das Recht auch nehmen, diese Thatsache uns abzuleugnen, oder [illegible] überhaupt uns gar verwehren? Und warum sollte sie denn uns verwehrt werden? Wem schadet es denn, dass jene Thatsache unser ausschliessliches seelisches Eigenthum ist, u. vielleicht auch bleiben muss?

Ein Beispiel. So oft wir den jagenden „Durchführungsheil“ jener oben genannten Sonate hören, haben wir immer wieder den bestimmten Eindruck des Lebens; u. glauben nämlich leises Schluchzen zu sehen u. zu hören, denn alle Gedanken, alle Gefühle wie zusammenbrechen noch vor ihrem
Ende, wohin sie gehen möchte; als möchte er die Grausamkeit des Abschieds nicht zu Ende denken, nicht zu Ende fühlen, meist aus Mangel an Schmerz, oder weil ihm trostreicher dünkt, zu hoffen, bevor er ganz zur Beute des Schmerzes geworden, hören wir deutlich, wie all die letzten Worte ins Leere ihm fallen, ins Leere dorthin, wo Gefühle u. Geist sich zu entfernen scheinen, u. der Augenblick so hohl u. ewig wird, und nur der Körper, allein, ungefühlt, u. ungedacht von der Feuersbrunst des Schmerzes verzehrt wird. Wir hören jenen Theil ungefähr so, um es auch in Noten auszudrücken:

EXAMPLE A1.2.20 Beethoven, Piano Sonata in E-flat Major, op. 81a/i, mm. 73–89

Wenn nun die in den Bruchstücken? eines zweiten, unteren R—systems? enthaltenen Töne fehlen, wo sie fehlen[,] ja auch in der Sonate selbst, wo stets ihre andern musikalische u. poetische Gleichnissen enthalten, ist es nun nicht so, als hätte das erste Motiv nicht zu Ende gebracht werden können, wie aus Ohnmacht oder Schmerz? Und wenn nur wir allein es sind, die wir so hören, ist dieses darum weniger wahr? Ist die Thatsache meines Gefühls nicht etwa ebenso lieb, wie der Andern, wie gar dem Künstler die seine?


Auch dieses erfährt man aus Beethoven am besten.

Auslese Gleichnis.

In den thematischen Motivverwandlungen, kurz in allen Gleichnissen sämtlicher Kategorien herrscht das Gesetz der Auslese, das stärkste charakteristischste hat sich zu behaupten. Daher Auswahl. Abbreviation erinnernd an die des Dramas u. der anderen Künste.
APPENDIX 2
ON THE NATURE OF ARTISTIC LAWS IN GENERAL

§ A2.1. INTRODUCTION

“Von der Natur der Kunstgesetze überhaupt” is an unpublished manuscript located in file 83 of the Oster Collection. The same editorial conventions described in § A1.1 are used here. Roman numerals have been added to help organize the text’s seven parts. Notwithstanding the introduction, the numbered subheadings are original to the manuscript. I thank an anonymous transcriber and Görkem Cilam, Assistant Director of the University of Massachusetts Amherst Translation Center, for their help interpreting these documents.

The “Kunstgesetze” essay expresses many of the same ideas found in “Geist der musikalischen Technik” (1895), “Der Weg zum Gleichnis” (n.d.; see § A1.2), Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik (1903, rev. 1908), “Über den Niedergang der Kompositions kunst” (1905–6), and Harmonielehre (1906). These ideas include: (1) the immutability of music’s laws as apprehended by genius alone (§§ 1–3, 18–19); (2) the primacy of content over form (§ 9); (3) the importance of repetition and motivic development in music’s evolution (§ 11–12); (4) the historical importance of C. P. E. Bach, who established the conventions of sonata form, including the long-range transformations of a motive (fernliegende Verwandlungen eines Motivs) and the use of different keys to create contrasting sections (§ 15); and (5) the musical decline that occurred after Beethoven’s death, which, in Schenker’s view, was precipitated by Berlioz, Liszt, and Wagner (§§ 12, 20).
The first and last sentences of “Kunstgesetze” feel as if they belong to Harmonielehre in particular; perhaps they allude to the same quasi-historical Künstler persona who develops the tonal materials provided by Nature. Yet this essay also contains clues that suggest it was written well after Harmonielehre. First, the document is written in the hand of Schenker’s wife, Jeanette (although they were not married until 1919). This is unusual for Schenker’s earliest writings, which appear in his own hand. Second, in § 14 Schenker refers to “I u. II²” of Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien, or Harmonielehre (1906) and what became book II of Kontrapunkt (1922) respectively. Perhaps this dates the manuscript to sometime after Harmonielehre (and perhaps also after the first book of Kontrapunkt, which was published in 1910)—but judging “Kunstgesetze” by its contents, it was likely written before 1921. Because Schenker relies on motivic resemblances for musical coherence, “Kunstgesetze” likely dates from before ca. 1917, especially since any reference to the Urlinie (or a fließenden Linie) is conspicuously absent.¹ Or perhaps the essay was intended to be part of the new Formenlehre that Schenker had planned as the third volume of Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien.

In “Kunstgesetze,” Schenker describes how motives give rise to larger forms through the laws of Mannigfaltigkeit and Gebundenheit (§ 15).² Mannigfaltigkeit is a centrifugal force that generates motivic variants and is associated with the proliferation of content. Gebundenheit is a centripetal force that creates order from the “chaos” of the foreground and is associated with coherence (§ 17). It is tempting to apply these principles in relation to Schenker’s ([1976] 1903, ⁱ Before its publication, Schenker’s draft of II² included a section titled “Freier Satz,” which he later described as II³. This third book of Kontrapunkt eventually became Der freie Satz in the years following the development of the Urlinie concept ca. 1917–20; see Siegel (1999, 12–16, 16n13).

² For the role artistic laws play in Schenker’s early thought and their relation to thinkers such as Eduard Hanslick and Guido Adler, see Karnes (2008, 41–43).
rev. 1908) comments on C. P. E. Bach’s sonata-form movements: motives multiply in the foreground (*Mannigfaltigkeit*), while the resulting “chaos” is unified through a single key area (*Gebundenheit*). Contrasting sections set in different keys would then result in *Mannigfaltigkeit* of a higher order (and so on).³

Schenker concludes the “Kunstgesetze” essay by reiterating the primacy of content over form, but his final sentence comes as a surprise, for he also recognizes that form can serve an important purpose for the creative artist. In the “urge toward synthesis,” which Schenker equates to an urge toward form, the artist is driven to new compositional inventions that might not have occurred otherwise.⁴ Although form may be the result of content’s organic growth, this thought betrays a sense in which form also shapes that content. This is a telling concession indeed.

---

³ Schenker describes in § 15 below how it was C. P. E. Bach who first extended motivic content by creating “Gegensätzen auf Grund des Tonartwechsels.”

⁴ “Doch über solchen organischen Zusammenhang hinaus besitzt die Form in einem bis heute wohl noch unbeachteten Sinne einen besonderen produktiven Wert. Der Trieb zur Synthese, das ist zur Form, nötigt den Künstler zu Erfindungen, die er außerhalb des Zwanges einer Synthese sich gar nicht einfällen lassen könnte” (see § 24 below). For a more detailed exposition of this idea, see Schenker ([1895] 2007, 331).
EXAMPLE A2.1.1 The beginning of “Von der Natur der Kunstgesetze überhaupt,” by Heinrich Schenker (OC 83/159; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

§ 2. Hier sind die Beweisgründe: Erstlich ist die Kunst innerhalb des Kosmos so gut Schöpfung in der Welt wie jede andere u. so hat sie mit allen anderen Schöpfungen, seien es organische oder anorganische Körper, beseelte oder unbeseelte, die Wahrheit ihrer eigenen speziellen Gesetze gemein, die Gesetze des Entstehens, Fortbestehens, Vergehens, usw.

Nur die inneren Gesetze einer Schöpfung sind als deren Wahrheit zu verstehen, diese ist dann aber ewig u. unabänderlich, ebenso wie der Gegenstand selbst.


* dramatische Dichter siehe Tagebuch, dramatischer Konflikt, was Lüge ist
§ 3. Es ist richtig, daß die Gesetze der Kunst von den Künstlern selbst, freilich nur von

den Genies unter ihnen, verkündet werden, doch irrt, der da glaubt, sie seien deshalb bloß

subjektiveren Wertes; in Wahrheit verhält es sich nämlich anders u. zwar so: Die Gesetze, die die
Genies der Kunst anerschaffen, stammen zugleich von uns selber; auch wir hegten sie, ohne aber
von ihnen zu wissen; nun spricht das Genie sie aus, u. erlöst sie so! {161} Wir waren eben zu

schwach, sie selbst zum Ausdruck zu bringen u. besitzen sie erst durch die Kraft des Genies u. dass

das Gesetz unser ist dürfen wir selbst dann aussprechen, wenn wir unser eigenes im ersten

Augenblick nicht erkannten u. erst später dem Genie zuzustimmen uns bewogen fühlten. Ein

Beispiel möge die Wahrheit näher erklären: Wenn die Genies zum Zweck der Darstellung eines

Gegensatzes zugleich einen Tonartwechsel vornahmen (somit auch von anderen ihn forderten), so

ist auch diese Gesetz nicht nur aus ihrer eigenen sondern auch aus unserer Seele entnommen,

denn, früher als wir ahnten eben sie, daß Gedanke an Gedanke ohne Tonartwechsel gereiht den

Eindruck nur einer u. derselben Gruppe, nicht aber den eines Gegensatzes ergibt, u. daß in

solchem Falle Mannigfältigkeit daher vom Gegensatz psychologisch wohl unterschieden wird.

Daraus folgt nun, daß dieses Gesetz keine Ausnahme kennt, müßte doch die Verletzung des

Gebotes eines Tonartwechsels sofort den gegenteiligen {162} Eindruck einer bloß mannigfaltig

gebauten Gruppe hervorrufen. Es muss daher bei jedermann, sei er schaffender oder

nichtschaffender Künstler oder nur Laie, in der Kunst eben jener Zustand der

Empfindungsschwache angenommen werden (von dem oben die Rede gewesen) wenn er in

diesem Punkte noch indifferent u. unempfindlich bleibt. Solche Unentwicklung dürfen wir z.B.

auch bei Bruckner annehmen, wenn er, wie in Andante der IV. Symphonie zu sehen ist, dem

gegensätzlichen Gedanken nicht auch den Boden einer neuen Tonart bereitet. Ihm gegenüber
werden daher die Meister aller Zeiten Recht behalten, die zu solchem Zweck den Tonartwechsel präzis vornehmen, u. über kurz oder lang wird der Fehler Bruckners der Missbilligung sämtlicher Zuhörer verfallen, die bis dahin das Gesetz eines Bach, Emanuel Bach, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven usw. in sich bestätigt finden werden.

Man sieht, daß es irrig ist, {163} Gesetze der Kunst bloß für subjektiv auszugeben, u. daraus die Konsequenz zu ziehen, sie seien ewig veränderlich u. objektiv nicht bindend.

II. Vom Urgrund der Form (§§ 4–13)

§ 4. Alle Form läßt sich im Grunde zurückführen 1. Auf die organische Notwendigkeit des Inhalts selbst, u. 2. auf ein selbstständig anzuerkennendes Bedürfnis der Kunst als solcher. Um dieses deutlich zu machen, will ich die Poesie zuhelfe nehmen, deren Schuldigkeit u. Verschiedenheit uns die Frage auch nach der Form in der Musik näher erläutern wird.

§ 5. Ich wende mich zunächst der Poesie zu. Sie ruht auf dem Grunde der Sprache u. der Anteil des Inhaltes an der Form läßt sich folgendermaßen darstellen:

Habe ich bloß eine Tatsache u. diese nur in wenig Worten mitzuteilen, wie z.B. „Ich komme morgen, spätestens abends“, {164} so ist es an eben dem mitzuteilenden Inhalt gemessen ohne alle Bedeutung, ob die Stellung der Worte nun gerade so, oder anders, z.B.:

„Morgen, spätestens abends, komme ich“ geprägt wird.5

5 [Schenker conducts a similar linguistic exercise in Harmonielehre (1906, 45). He illustrates Inversion—i.e., the descending fifth from tonic to subdominant, which is in opposition to the Nature-given ascending fifth from tonic to dominant found in the overtone series—by reordering the words in a simple sentence: Der Vater ritt durch den Wald becomes Es ritt der Vater durch den Wald, or even Durch den Wald ritt der Vater.]


§ 7. Indessen bedeutet selbst der größte Inhalt u. noch so zweckmäßig angeordnet nicht an u. für sich schon Kunst zugleich; da, wie gesagt, die Poesie im Material der Sprache sich ausdrückt, so hat sie, um Poesie zu werden, erst eine deutlichere Abgrenzung nötig, gegenüber jenen weiten Gebieten der Sprache, die wir Gespräch, Alltag, Brief, kurz gesprochene oder geschriebene Prosa nennen dürfen.

noch aus eigener Erfahrung Ereignis werden kann, 2. unter Umständen auch noch eines metrischen Schemas, das dann gleichsam als ein künstliches Podium betrachtet werden kann, auf dem künstliche Worte wie Schauspieler agieren, um eine Illusion hervorzurufen, u. 3. Endlich auch des Reimes, der durch die ihm innenwohnende Absichtlichkeit auf Gleichklang, die Künstlichkeit der Kunst, nicht minder wie das metrische Schema selbst, sie darstellen hilft.

Wie im Theater Bühne und Vorhang, Kunst u. Leben aufs wirksamste wohl schon allein von einander trennen, so trennt auch die Bühne des metrischen Schemas die Worte des Gedichts von solchen des gewöhnlichen Lebens ab. Oder ein anderes Bild: Was die Chaussee unter den Wagen und Pfaden bedeutet, das ist das metrische Schema in der Kunst als eine gut angelegter, sicherer Weg der Gedanken u. der Sprache, die sich solcher Art von des Lebens Wirklichkeit abtrennen will.


§ 10. Freilich gerade die beiden letzteren waren seit jeher auch die einzige Sorge der musikalischen Kunst; denn während, wie oben gezeigt wurde, die Poesie ihren Stoff u. dessen
Beziehungen ohne weiteres dem Vorrat der Welt entnimmt, musste dagegen in die Musik sowohl erst der Stoff, als dessen Beziehungen künstlich hineingetragen werden. Daß es dann erst mit der Vermehrung des Inhaltes erst recht schwierige Bewandtnis hatte, mag schon aus der Schwierigkeit des Urprozesses geschlossen werden.

§ 11. Der künstliche Stoff in der Musik bildet das Motiv u. die Wiederholung ist jenes künstliche Ferment, das zur Inhaltszeugung u. Vermehrung der Beziehungen den ersten Weg wies.

{169} So betrachtet zeigt die musikalische Kunst ihre ersten Stadien in jenen Wiederholungen, die sich als Kanons, u. später hin selbst noch in der Fuge um ihrer selbst willen ausbreiten, ohne noch den Inhalt deshalb wesentlich zu vermehren, denn durch Vielheit allein dehnen Wiederholungen wohl den Inhalt, bereichern ihn aber noch durchaus nicht, wenn sonst gedankliche oder tonartliche Gegensätze fehlen, die bereits wieder auf einer anderen Technik beruhen.

Wagners in seinem Musikdrama; wo er die Musik in einem Ausmaße, wie es bis dahin weder in Opern noch auch Liedern, selbst durch Komponisten, nicht gewagt worden, dazu zwingt, mit der Poesie gleichen Schritt zu halten, was natürlich nur unter beinahe vollständigem Verzicht auf jene Technik geschehen konnte, die die Musik durchaus nicht mehr entbehren darf, wenn sie auf dem Rang einer wirklichen Kunst Anspruch erheben soll.

§ 13. Die Wiederholung scheidet die Musik übrigens auch von der Malerei u. Plastik. In anderer Weise nämlich, als es bei der Poesie der Fall ist, knüpfen die letzteren Künste an die gegebene Umwelt, da Gegenstand der letzteren auch ihre Gegenstände sind, u. so läßt sich, wenn man den Unterschied der Musik gegenüber sämtlichen anderen Künsten kennzeichnen will, gerade die Wiederholung als dasjenige Gesetz der Musik bezeichnen, das nur ihr allein angehört; wie denn sofort auch dieses klar wird, daß die Musik ein solches Gesetz einzuverleiben bloß deshalb nötig hatte, weil sie zum Unterschied gegenüber den übrigen Künsten jeder Beziehung von Haus aus entbehren muss. In diesem Sinne nun aber ist die Wiederholung das Gesetz einer Beziehung eines allerersten Gleichnisses, wodurch dem Urstoff, d.i. dem Motiv, dieselbe Erläuterung u. Klarheit zuteil wird, wie dem Stoff, die Gegenstand der Poesie, Malerei, Plastik wird, u. dort seine Erläuterung aus der Umwelt bezieht, vor der er auch stammt.—

[III.] Von der Ausführung der Form (§§ 14–15)

{172} § 14. Da die Motivbildung Urstoff aller Form in der Musik ist, so hat vor allem eben das Motiv die bestimmteste Prägung zu erhalten.
In den frühen Epochen, natürlich aber denjenigen, die Wesen u. Wert des Motivs bereits kannten, empfand man besonders stark auch die Notwendigkeit, einer Präzisierung des Motivs; damit ist es heute leider anders u. schlechter geworden. Die Verwahrlosung der letzten Generation in bezug auf die Erfordernisse der musikalischen Technik, hat auch in Hinsicht schon des Motivs selbst zu dem kläglichen Resultat geführt, daß dessen Bestimmtheit vernachlässigt wurde.

Diese Erscheinung hängt mit der parallellaufenden auch in der Malerei u. Poesie zusammen, die, unter dem Titel Impressionismus bekannt, nur die Eindrücke von Gegenständen, u. nicht diese selbst in den Vordergrund stellt. Ging ehemals die Malerei bloß dem Gegenstand selbst nach, u. suchte ihn von innen aus zu erforschen, um alle Forderungen erfüllen zu können, die jener stellte, so gibt dagegen der Maler von heute, da er in Ermangelung ergiebiger Nervenkraft den schweren sachlichen Forderungen des Gegenstandes nicht gewachsen ist, bloß den Eindruck wieder, den er selbst von ihm empfängt. Der Schaden liegt klar zu Tage: denn erstens kommen uns die Gegenstände selbst abhanden, die doch in erster Reihe zu stehen haben; ferner verliert die Kunst am Besitz so vielfältiger subtilen technischen Mittel, wie sie erforderlich sind, um die an dem Gegenstand zu Tage tretenden Schöpfungswunder (die der Farbe eingeschlossen) auszudrücken; u. führen ja auch die Gegenstände zu Eindrücken einen jeden zu einem eigenen u. anderen, weshalb es nicht erst nötig ist[,] sie der vollen Gegenständlichkeit zu entkleiden, da mit der Beschauer zu einem Eindruck gelange, davon abgesehen, daß der impressionistische Eindruck des Künstlers den Beschauer um seinen eigenen Eindruck bringt.—

{174} Hat doch schließlich die Malerei, um den vollen Eindruck der wahren Natur zu erreichen, noch so unendlich schwieriges zu vollbringen, da sie die Wirkung bloß auf das Auge
des Beschauers zu berechnen u. darin, d.i. in dessen Auge, jene Wirkungen auszulösen hat, die in der Wirklichkeit den Zuschauer sich auch durch andere Nerven, wie z.B. die Gehör, Geruch u. Gesichtsnerven, vermittelt werden. Welche Aufgabe doch für die malerische Kunst künstliche Fälschungen zu ersinnen u. anzuwenden, die es möglich machen, daß der Betrachter des Bildes, einzig vermöge seiner Augennerven, Stimmungen der Natur imaginiere, die, wie z.B. Feuchtigkeit der Athmosphäre, glühendes Singen des Sonnenballs usf. im Grunde Tastnervengefühle voraussetze! Hat so die Malerei vor allem die Schwierigkeit des Problems zu erledigen, wie im Beschauer eine Stellvertretung, ein Austausch in seinen Nervenfunktionen zu erzwingen sei, so möchte hinter einer solchen Hauptaufgabe die andere wohl {175} zurücktreten, die sich bloß mit der Wiedergabe von subjektiven Eindrücken bescheidet, ohne die Majestät des Gegenstandes selbst erreichen zu wollen.

In der Musik nun drückt sich die impressionistische Tendenz technisch dadurch aus, daß die Klänge unauskomponiert bleiben. Ist nämlich die Auskomponierung eines Klanges dessen einziger Beweis, wie ich das bereits in I u. II² ausgeführt habe, u. kann diese Erkenntnis fast so formuliert werden: „quod non est in melodia, non est in harmonia“, so ergibt sich e contrario, daß das Nichtauskomponieren der Klänge heute bereits den Impressionismus bedeuten muss. Es ist dann mit die Folge der unauskomponiert gebliebenen Klänge so, als würde man mittelst einer Eisenbahn, wie sie heute alleingebrauchlich; von Ort zu Ort eilen u. so wenig man in letzterem Falle sagen kann, man habe die Orte auch wirklich kennen gelernt, die man nur durchreilt, {176} ebensowenig werden die Klänge erkannt, die man so rasch mit dem Ohre durchreilt hat. Daher bleibt alles Eilen von Klang zu Klang unfruchtbar, u. hindert das Ziel zu erreichen, das allein
erstrebenswert, nämlich die bestimmte Fassung des Motivs. So sagt Goethe, „Propylaen“: „Wer zu den Sinnen nicht klar spricht, redet auch nicht rein zum Gemüt. “


Fasse ich nun den Begriff des dichterischen Stoffes, soweit darunter dessen sämtliche Beziehungen u. Situationen verstanden werden können, so wird derjenige Dichter wohl als der stärkere zu bezeichnen sein, {179} der sozusagen die meisten Atome des Stoffes u. deren Zusammenhänge erforscht u. in entsprechender Auslese, in neuer Synthese, dem Leser oder Zuhörer wiedergegeben hat.

* {178} Denn immerhin obliegt es der Kunst völlig eigene, in der Natur selbst ja nicht einmal vorhandene Zutaten, ihren Produkten zu amalgamieren, ohne welche sie keine Kunst wäre.
Ganz so auch in der Musik. Denn wenn auch hier, wie später ausführlich gezeigt werden soll, selbst die weiteste Form den eigenen Weg der Wiederholung gehen u. außerdem sich unabänderlich auch des Mittels des Tonartwechsels bedienen muss, so ist es, Dank dem genialen Instinkte unserer großen Meister, gelungen, dem Zusammensetzungsprinzip der Natur auch in der Musik zum vollen Siege zu verhelfen. Nicht nur ist es ihnen gelungen[,] so schon den einzelnen Gedanken selbst aus verschiedenen kleinen Einheiten, gleichsam musikalischen Atomen, zusammenzusetzen, sondern über den einzelnen Gedanken hinaus, in der Folge sämtlicher, ähnlich das Zusammensetzungsprinzip wal- {180} ten zu lassen, mit Zuhilfenahme aber nicht nur der Auslese (die ja notwendig) sondern auch von Zusammenhängen tieferer Natur, die völlig jenen Zusammenhängen gleichen, wie sie in den Beziehungen eines dichterischen Stoffes noch deutlicher erkennbar herrschen. Die Kunst, in der Musik solche Zusammenhänge zu schaffen, ist verhältnismäßig jungen Datums, u. Errungenschaft der genialen Instinkte unserer Meister. Noch hat z.B. Philip Emanuel Bach selbst, der der erste die Erweiterung des Inhalts durch Schaffung von Gegensätzen auf Grund des Tonartwechsels durchgeführt hat, jene visionäre Kraft nicht, die ihn befähigt hätte, fernliegende Verwandlungen eines Motivs, also das, was wir in der Musik thematische Durcharbeitung nennen, so zu ahnen u. zu schaffen, wie es später {181} ein Haydn, Mozart u. noch intensiver ein Beethoven u. Brahms zu gestalten wußten.—

[IV.] Von der Gebundenheit (§§ 16–17)

§ 16. Würde man es in der Sprache wagen, in demselben Satzen zunächst von einem Subjekt A. zu sprechen, sich in einem Neben Absatz sofort aber auch schon an ein Subjekt B. zu verlieren,
und sodann in einem 3. oder 4. Nebensatz neuerdings wieder an noch andere Subjekte C., D.,
usf. so müsste aus solcher Summe von Subjekten eine übermäßige Belastung unserer
Vorstellungskraft sich ergeben. Man kennt zur Genüge die heillose Verwirrung, die aus solchen
Einschachtelungen u. falschen Fortsetzungen entstehen. Wir haben Mühe zu begreifen, um
welches Subjekt es sich eigentlich in der Hauptsache handle, welche Beziehungen dann zwischen
den Subjekten untereinander walten u. verlieren darüber alle Sicherheit, den Gedanken
des Schriftstellers zu verstehen u. müssen sogar annehmen, daß der letztere selbst keinerlei
Klarheit darin hatte, was er mitteilen wollte.

Ebenso wenig gestattet aber auch die Musik eine übermäßige Ausdehnung der
Zusammensetzung, sei diese auf bloß eine Gedankeneinheit oder auch auf das ganze Werk, als die
Summe des einzelnen Gedanke, angewandt, die Motive sind dann gleichsam jene logischen
Subjekte, A., B., C., D., usf. deren eben nicht zu viele aufeinander folgen dürfen, wenn wir eine
Einheit darin noch begreifen sollen. Wie in der Poesie, so handelt es sich auch in der Musik
darum, das richtige Maß zwischen Mannigfaltigkeit u. Gebundenheit zu halten. Neues um Neues
ergäbe nämlich in der Musik ebenso wie in der Poesie eine Verwirrung von Subjekt zu Subjekt,
wobei in der Musik nicht einmal die Logik der Stufen—u. Klangfolgen diese heilen
könnte. Setze ich, um schon hier Beispiele für das Gesagte zu bringen, den ersten Gedanken aus
Beethovens Emoll Sonate als Muster eines sehr gut zusammengesetzten Gedankens, so mögen als
warnende Bilder schlecht zusammengesetzter Gedanken dienen zunächst Schubert, Cdur
Symphonie, Andante u.—freilich um vieles schlechter noch Bruckners VII. Symphonie, I. Satz, 2.
Gedanke oder Adagio, 1. Gedankengruppe.—
§ 17. Auch für die Gebundenheit gibt die Natur selbst, ebenso wie für die Zusammensetzung, das allerwirkamste Vorbild. Ist denn nicht der ewige Gang der Sterne, das Abrollen der Jahreszeiten, ist nicht in uns selbst der Blutlauf u. der Puls eine strenge Gebundenheit?

Doch muss die Gebundenheit immer nur eine Fülle voraussetzen, denn jegliche Armut steht unter ihr, da sie eben zu wenig Stoff bietet, woran der Geist Auslese u. Gebundenheit üben könnte. Wo zu wenig vorhanden, ist eine durchempfundene u. durchgearbeitete Ordnung ebenso überflüssig, als selbstverständlich.

Eben daher kommt es, daß der Durchschnittsmensch als solcher, der ja die Geistesarmut geradezu verkörpert, den Wert u. Segen der Gebundenheit weder ahnt noch kennt. Sich selbst ins Chaos des Lebens verlierend u. verschwimmend als Atom unter Atomen, unfähig zu sehen, wie die Natur unendliche Manigfaltigkeit treibt um ihr eine ebenso unendliche Gebundenheit gegenüber zu stellen; noch weniger fähig, als Weltorgan zu dienen, das durch gottähnliche Schöpferkraft der Welt zu neuen Kombinationen vereint, wird er auch in der Kunst am meisten wieder an- gezogen durch Bilder des Chaos, nur weil diese, u. nicht die Gebundenheit, ihm Reichtum zu bedeuten scheint. Wie jedes Lebewesen nun einmal zentripetal denkend u. empfindend u. unvermögend des so schwierigen Geschäftes, das Chaos mit Gebundenheit zu meistern, gefällt er sich darin, just das Chaos den Reichtum zu nennen, worin er selbst lebt u. das er um sich herum sieht. Sein inneres Auge reicht nicht so weit, um hinter der Manigfaltigkeit der Natur auch deren Gebundenheit zu sehen, u. daher empfindet er, was ihm in die äußeren Augen fällt, eben nur den Vordergrund der Manigfaltigkeit. Mit dieser Empfindung, die ihm selbst so unendlich schmeichelt, stellt er sich nun aber auch vor die Kunst, wo er ebenso
[V.] Allgemeines über die Form (§§ 18–21)

§ 18. Ich sagte schon, daß die Entstehung sämtlicher Formen den genialen Instinkten der großen Meister zu verdanken ist, die andererseits doch nie wieder auch unsere eigenen Instinkte dadurch zum Ausdruck gebracht hat.

Man braucht nur, um zu einer klaren Erkenntnis hier zu gelangen, sich zu vergegenwärtigen, daß die Epoche, in der unsere großen Meister gelebt haben, noch gar nicht jene Lehren kannte, die ja erst später aus ihren Werken deduziert werden konnten; daraus folgt, daß sich einem Em. Bach das innere Wesen der Sonatenform offenbar auf einem anderen Wege, als dem eines Lehrbuches, oder sonstiger mündlicher Anregung erschlossen u. was konnte es denn anderes gewesen sein in diesem Falle, als jene divinatorische Gabe, die den Künstler befähigt im voraus die Wirkung zu wissen, die er selbst erst neu zeugt. Wir haben also die Pflicht, die auf dem Wege solcher divinatorischen Gabe entstandenen Formen als Form—Axiome zu betrachten, die keinerlei Wandel mehr unterworfen sein können. Kommen doch dann Gesetze zum Ausdruck (z.B. Wiederholung, Tonartenwechsel, u. Rückkehr zur Haupttonart) die die Musik ebenso ewig beherrschen werden, als das Gesetze der Lehren das Weltall durchdringt.

Freilich erblicken Künstler u. Laien, die die Spontaneität einer Formgeburt aus genialem Instinkt ebenso schwer wie den letzteren selbst begreifen können, in der Form zugleich auch ein fertiges, wie sie meinen objektiv dastehendes Schema, jederman zu seiner eigenen Verfügung. Ja,
ein solches Nicht-begreifen jener höchsten Instinkte, hat so manchen Künstler sogar so weit getrieben, in jeglicher musikalischen Form nur einen Irrtum, eine Willkür u. Lüge zu sehen u. daraus einen Vorwurf der Kunst selbst zu machen, daß sie angeblich in Folge ihrer Künstlichkeit eine solche Umzüchtung einer Lüge zur Wahrheit gestatte. In einem solchen Falle ist es nur gerecht, den Vorwurf mangelhafter Instinkte zu den ewigen Gesetzen der Musik an den Künstler selbst zurückzuschleudern u. sei der Künstler auch einer, wie z.B. Richard Wagner, der von einem Irrtum auch bei den Beethovenschen Formen spricht.

Haydn, Mozart[,] usw. sich offenbart haben. Man kann daher auch bei Mendelssohn u. Brahms von einer originalen Neuerfindung der Form sprechen, die besonders zu Recht besteht, wie z.B. auf dem Gebiete der Wissenschaft Entdeckungen gleichzeitig oder nach einander unabhängig gemacht werden können.

Nur das Genie alleine hat Zutritt zu den letzten Geheimnissen der Formnotwendigkeit, den Talenten aber ist es nur möglich Trugbilder jener ewigen Formnaturen zu glauben, die sie im Widerspruch zur Wahrheit sich selbst schaffen, um in ihnen auch zugrunz zu gehen. Oder anders: War die Form bei großen Genies die spontane Verkörperung transcendenter Gesetze, so sinkt sie bei den Talenten bloß zu einer Denkform herab, die sie bald dazu benützen, um sich über das naturgeborene Kunstwerk der Genies Rechenschaft zu legen, bald aber auch dazu um leider auch selbst Kunstwerke mit ihrer Hilfe zu verfertigen. Die Kluft aber zwischen den Formen dort wie und hier ist eine ewig unüber-\{191\}brückbare. Ewig wahr, kunst—wie naturwahr bleiben die Sonaten eines Haydn, verlogene Trugbilder aber nur Sonaten der . . .

sich die Kunst mit denselben Gesetzen u. denselben Formen behilft u. ausdrückt. Auch
hierin ist, wie ich schon zeigte, der Unterschied vom Genie u. Talent zu erkennen[,] ohne
weiteres schreibt ein Brahms seine Konzerte, wie sie ein Mozart u. ein Beethoven vor ihm
geschrieben haben; er konnte sie ja auch anders nicht schreiben. Nur aber ein bescheidenes
Talent, z.B. Liszt glaubte nicht an die Stabilität des Konzertformgesetzes u. drängt der Form, bloß
weil ihn eine höhere Macht ihn vor dem Irrtum nicht bewahrt, in seinem Konzert eine Lüge auf.

So muss die gewiss doch auffällende Erscheinung gedeutet werden, daß nach Beethoven
die stärkeren musikalischen Talente wie Schubert, Schumann, Mendelssohn u. Brahms auf die
Seite Haydns, Mozarts, Beethovens sich stellten, während die schwächeren Talente wie Berlioz
und Liszt neue Wege zu gehen u. auch gehen zu müssen glaubten, inzwischen aber doch nur
schlechtere Musik machten.

Es folgt daraus aber auch dieses, daß bei Unabänderlichkeit die Formen nicht auch
schon die Individualität des Genies aufgehoben wird. So wird ein Brahms’sches Werk niemals mit
einem Beethoven’schen verwechselt werden, auch wenn bei beiden Meistern dieselbe
Notwendigkeit befolgt wird.

Mit der Unabänderlichkeit der Form ist zugleich auch die Unabänderlichkeit ihres
inneren Charakters gegeben. Jede Form bleibt immer das, was sie bei ihrer Entstehung offenbarte.

In diesem Sinne mag von einem jugendlichen Charakter bei der Fugenform oder Suite
gesprochen werden, welche ihre Jugendlichkeit ewig bewahren wird, mögen Jahrhunderte noch
über sie hinweggehen, wie Jahrhunderte schon über sie dahingegangen sind; denn was bedeutet
die Fugenform anderes, als jene Form, in der das Gesetz der Wiederholung ohne Combination
mit dem Gesetz des Gegensatzes allein Breite u. Tiefe sucht. Bei Fortwirken nur des einen
Gesetzes ist die Länge von vornherein beschränkter, zumal wie in jedem Kunstwerk, so auch bei
ihr Auslese u. Gebundenheit beobachtet werden müssen.\{194\} Es steht dem Künstler demnach
frei, von dieser jugendlichen Form, die von der Dynamik der Sonatenform so verschieden ist,
nach Belieben auch noch heute Gebrauch zu machen, nur wisse er, daß niemals die Fuge etwas
anderes werden könne u. solle, als was sie schon vor Jahrhunderten gewesen.

Der Fugenform aber gegenüber von Alter zu sprechen, von „Furchen des Alters“, wie
man es zuweilen zu lesen bekommt, ist dasselbe, als würde man angesichts des Portraits eines
Kindes aus dem 17. Jahrhundert von einem alten Menschen sprechen, bloß wegen des 17.
Jahrhunderts. Und wie die Fugenform, ebenso bewahren denselben Charakter für immer auch die
anderen Formen. Ewig werden die 4-teiligen Formen, die Rondos u. die Sonaten den ihnen
zukommenden (u. später auch näher auszuführenden) Charakter behalten.

§ 21. Der innere Charakter der jeweiligen Form beruht so stark auf seiner inneren
Wahrheit, daß nicht jeder Inhalt in eine beliebige Form gezwängt werden kann. Wer könn-
\{195\} te z.B. in einer 4-teiligen Form Gedanken ausdrücken, wie sie z.B. Chopin in seinen
Balladen bringt? Wehe dem, der es träfe, denn er hätte gelogen.

Die innere Wahrhaftigkeit der Form entlarvt sogar die Unwahrhaftigkeit eines Genies wie
Chopin, wenn er seine Gedankenwelt in eine Ordnung fügen will, die jener von Haus aus
widerstrebt. Unvergleichlich in der Haltung kleinerer Kunstgebilde, versinkt er, vielleicht aus
physischer in eine künstlerische Ohnmacht, dem breiteren Inhalt in der Form seine eigene
Wahrheit zu gewinnen.

Wie alle letzte Natur, so ist auch die letzte Natur eines Formcharakters unergründlich tief
u. nur den stärksten Geistern zugänglich; man vergleiche mit den Rhapsodien von Brahms
Opus . . . die Balladen von Chopin: wie beinahe hattlos bei so vieler unvergleichlicher Schönheit u. Originalität sind die letzteren gegenüber jenen u. zw. Nur deshalb, weil besser als Chopin seine Form, Brahms die seine verstanden, wobei es ganz irrelevant ist, daß die Form bei beiden nicht dieselbe.

[VI.] Allgemeine Anblicke der Formen unserer Meister (§§ 22–23)

§ 22. Der Umstand, daß die Meister die Kunst ihrer Formen aus den Instinkten heraufgeholt haben, bringt für die Erscheinungen der Formen nach außen Vorteile, wie die dem inneren Charakter zukommen.

Notwendigkeit innerer Gesetze, also auch der psychologisch so naturgemäß fundierten
Kunstgesetze herrscht, ist genau soviel Inhalt gegeben, als es die Notwendigkeit braucht u. genau
soviel Form als der Inhalt braucht. Keine überflüssige Zutat drängt sich in die Glieder des Baues
um gleichsam dem Körper Fell u. Rundung zu geben. Natur—nackt mit allen Notwendigkeiten
schon des ersten Gedankensamens ruht das Genie vor uns, so gut ein Wunder, wie das einer
Blume. Viel eher daher spreche man bei klassischen Werken von ihren [illegible: flimmende?]
Formen wie sie dem durch {198} geheimnisvolle Inspiration aus den gewaltigen Instinkten
hervorbrechenden impressionistischen Inhalt einzig u. allein entsprechen. Es ist dieses einzusehen
gerade heute umso notwendiger, als in Folge des oben dargestellten Misverhältnisses bezüglich die
wahren Form u. deren Schemas, die Sehnsucht nach frei-flimmernden Formen lebendig wurde,
die endlich uns von den angeblich nur schematischen Erzeugnissen unserer Meister erlösen
sollten, der Kunst u. uns selbst zum Heile. Wahrhaftig die Sehnsucht, die überall laut wird, ist ja
schon längst erfüllt u. eben nur durch die Werke unserer Meister; nur weiß eben die Welt davon
gar nichts u. kommt daher—wie edel waltet doch die Nemesis über dem undankbaren
Menschgeschlecht—in die groteske Lage z.B. ein schlechtes Werk von Reger für flimmernder als
eine Beethoven’sche Sonate zu halten, während es in Wirklichkeit nur eben schlecht ist.—

Mit aller Macht der Instinkte vermochten unsere großen Meister ihren Werken
Manigfaltigkeit u. Gebundenheit mitzugeben u. selbst {199} als nach der monotematischen
Epoche, mit deren Erzeugnissen die Gebundenheit im gewissen Sinne schon von selbst verknüpft
war, die polytematische gekommen, die in ihren Werken Gebundenheit ungleich schwieriger
machte, gelang es dennoch den Meistern, auch diese Schwierigkeit zu überwinden u. in ihren
Sonaten u. Symphonien eine Gebundenheit größten Stils zu erzeugen, wie sie von den spätern
Geschlechtern kaum erst wahrgenommen, in der heutigen Kunstpraxis aber nicht wieder anzutreffen ist.

§ 23. Es ist müßig, darüber zu streiten, ob die Gebundenheit der Form mehr dem Kunstverstande als der Inspiration zuzuschreiben sei, u. zwar ist es darum müßig, weil es irrig ist, die beiden Begriffe, die ja wieder nur Denkformen der reflektierenden Menschen sind, beim wahren Künstler getrennt anzuwenden. Alle Verwirrung in Auffassung u. Ausdruck kommt daher, daß für die auf das Kunstwerk gerichtete schöpferische Tätigkeit des Künstlers in der Bereicherung, Kunstverstand, eben das Wort Verstand zu Hilfe genommen wurde. Man begeht {200} den Fehler, dieses ominöse Wort des Alltags im Sinne des Alltags auch noch dort zu deuten, wo es sich um die Kunst handelt. Man übersieht, daß der Verstand als geistige Funktion ja auch je nach dem Gegenstande modifiziert wird, dem er sich zuwendet; so ist z.B. der auf Gelderwerb gerichtete Verstand bei aller Unteilbarkeit der geistigen Funktion doch wieder ein anderer Verstand, als der auf die Kunstschöpfung gerichtete. Besser wäre es freilich, wenn man zur Vermeidung von Irrtümern für Kunstverstand eine anderes, neues Wort schaffen u. anwenden könnte; indessen mag, so lange es eben nicht der Fall ist, es trotzdem notwendig sein, sich stets vor Augen zu halten, daß auch der Kunstverstand beim großen Künstler von wirklicher Inspiration getragen wird. Nur damit allein erklärt es sich, daß ein Bach, ein Beethoven eine so unerhört tiefsinnige Kunst der Zusammenhänge der tematischen Durcharbeitung offenbaren, das will sagen: Nicht allein Arbeit ist es bei ihnen, die solche Schätze zutage gefördert hat, sondern immer wieder die Begeisterung. {201} Wäre es nur der Verstand im gemeinen Sinne des Wortes gewesen, so wären sie wohl niemals dorthin gelangt, während es andererseits auch anderen, minder begabten Komponisten möglich wäre, solche Zusammenhänge zu creieren. Im letzten
Grunde also ist es immer nur die Begeisterung, die im Künstler wirkt, selbst auch dann, wenn er feilend, kürzend oder verlängernd seinem Werk die letzte Form zu geben sich bestrebt. In diesem Sinne wird, wenn vom Unterschied eines Schumann oder Schubert gegenüber Brahms gesprochen werden soll, die stärkere Inspiration beim letzteren angenommen werden müssen, da sie in seinen Werken zu vollendeteren Formen geführt hat.

Von Arbeit im gewöhnlichen Sinne des Wortes kann man daher weniger bei den Genies selbst, als bei den Talenten sprechen, die auch die Kunst der Zusammenhänge vom Standpunkt eines Trugbildes, wie die Schemen der Form selbst, sehen. Bei den Genies ist eben alle Tätigkeit tief, wie die Natur selbst, während bei den Talenten alle Mechanik obenauf liegt, sofort herstellen, sofort erinnerbar.—

[VII.] Nutzen der Form (§ 24)

§ 24. Wie sehr die Form selbst notwendiges Produkt des Inhaltes ist, habe ich oben bereits gezeigt; desgleichen habe ich bereits dargestellt, welchen Einfluß die Form auf die Themenbildung nimmt. In diesem Sinne stellt die Form ein organisch notwendiges Correlat des Inhaltes u. im Grunde diesen selbst, nur von einer anderen Seite gesehen, denn nichts enthält die Form, was nicht zugleich Inhalt wäre, wie denn auch umgekehrt nichts der Inhalt enthält, was nicht zugleich die Form ausmachen würde.

Doch über solchen organischen Zusammenhang hinaus besitzt die Form in einem bis heute wohl noch unbeachteten Sinne einen besonderen produktiven Wert. Der Trieb zur
Synthese, das ist zur Form, nötigt den Künstler zu Erfindungen, die er außerhalb des Zwanges einer Synthese sich gar nicht einfallen lassen könnte.
APPENDIX 3
ON MUSICAL CAUSALITY

§ A3.1. INTRODUCTION

Schenker intended for “Von der musikalischen Kausalität—Rückblick u. Epilog,” found in this appendix, to conclude an early draft of Kontrapunkt, book II. As Hedi Siegel (1999) has shown, initial plans for book II contained three sections that ultimately were not included in the version published in 1922. These sections discuss free composition (“Freier Satz”), the voice leading of thoroughbass (“Von der Stimmführung des Generalbasses”), and musical causality (“Von der musikalischen Kausalität”).¹ The “Kausalität” section, transcribed here by William Rothstein and edited based on the guidelines in § A1.1, appears in the hand of Jeanette Kornfeld (see example A3.1.1), whom Schenker endearingly refers to as “Lie-Liechen.”² At the end of the document, we learn that it was completed on Jeanette’s forty-third birthday: August 31, 1917.³

“Kausalität” addresses many of the themes found throughout Schenker’s writings, both early and late. These themes include music’s fundamental laws (Urgesetzen) and their ability to explain an infinite variety of phenomena, the relationship between Nature and Art, the corrupting

¹ See Siegel (1999, 13, fig. 1). A handwritten draft of “Von der Stimmführung des Generalbasses” is located in the Felix Salzer Papers (SP 52/1–8), while a typescript of this document made by Ernst Oster is located in file 6 of the Oster Collection. After substantial revisions and the further development of Schenker’s ideas, “Freier Satz” eventually became what is better known as Der freie Satz (1935); see Kosovsky (1990, 370–81).

² “Kausalität” is written in ink pen, although it appears that various emendations have been added in pencil in Schenker’s handwriting. These additions include the underlining of many key words throughout the text.

³ Heinrich and Jeanette would later marry in November of 1919.
influence of program music and music drama in the nineteenth century, and the inadequacy of
previous textbooks on form, which are allegedly ignorant of musical synthesis and causality.
Perhaps Schenker’s focus on causality was an attempt to solve a problem first identified in the
“Geist” essay (Schenker [1895] 2007, 328–29)—namely, for any musical content to be truly
organic, it must be animated by some causal mechanism, as described at the end of chapter 1 (see
§ 1.4). Throughout “Kausalität” it also becomes clear that, at least for Schenker, musical synthesis
and causality are deeply connected to his religious sensibilities. Near the end of the document, he
describes music as a primordial gift from God (ein Urgeschenk von Gott); and in an earlier passage,
he describes how, for those few geniuses, the primordial laws of music are worshiped as if they
were religious commandments (Die Urgesetze aber verehre man wie gleichsam Religionsgebote).4

In contrast to program music and music drama, which rely on external sources for their
coherence, Schenker locates causality in what might be described as the purely musical worlds of
counterpoint and harmony. Musical causality manifests through the dynamic interaction of
consonance and dissonance. In the horizontal dimension, causality manifests through a melodically
fluent line (die Kausalität der fließenden Linie), especially the forward motion created by the
resolution of dissonant passing tones of all kinds (metrically accented or unaccented). And in the
vertical dimension, causality manifests through the Stufe, which serves as the basis for composing-
out (die Kausalität der Auskomponierung). Schenker describes how causal forces also manifest
through mixture (Mischung), modulation (Modulation), chromatic semitones (Chroma), thematic
design (die Kausalität der Thematik), and even form (die Form als kausaler Motor!). Yet, despite such

4 Schenker’s identification of musical causality with his monotheistic religious beliefs was
described in chapter 4 (see § 4.3).
diverse phenomena, we are reminded that “Music knows only a few laws—Ur-mothers—from which everything comes. . . . the infinite sum of the cosmos.”

---

5 “Die Musik kennt nur wenige Gesetze—Urmütter—aus denen alles kommt. . . . die unendliche Summe des Kosmos.”
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**Example A3.1.1** The beginning of “Von der musikalischen Kausalität—Rückblick u. Epilog,” by Heinrich Schenker (OC 51/1378; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)
§ A3.2. “VON DER MUSIKALISCHEN KAUSALITÄT—RÜCKBLICK U. EPILOG,” BY HEINRICH SCHENKER (OC 51/1378–91)

{1378} Nun ist der Augenblick gekommen, die Summe der ganzen hier getanen Arbeit zu ziehen. Wie könnte dieses aber fruchtbarer geschehen, als wenn wir uns vergegenwärtigen, wie viel ureigener Kausalität den Gesetzen innewohnt, die hier an uns vorübergezogen sind. Unter Kausalität hat man sich einen Trieb, einen Zwang vorzustellen, der den Ton als gleichsam ein lebendes, logisch denkendes Wesen legitimiert, also logische Motore sozusagen, wie wir sie analog unserer Sprache zu geben, s. II¹, S. 376.⁶ Nur die vertiefte Einsicht in das Vorhandensein einer solchen rein musikalischen Kausalität kann der Musik das ihr eigene Wesen erhalten bezw. wiedergeben, wenn es ihr zeitweise wie eben jetzt, verloren gegangen ist.


---

⁶ [The designation “II¹” refers to the first book of Kontrapunkt (Schenker 1910, 376). In the first edition, p. 376ff. corresponds to part 2, chapter 4, § 12. This section discusses dissonant suspensions (dissonanten Synkopen), which Schenker relates to ideas regarding musical causality and logic. For an English translation of this passage, see Schenker ([1910] 1987, 290–91).]

⁷ [These pages correspond to part 2, chapter 1, § 2 of Kontrapunkt, book I. For the corresponding pages in the English translation, see Schenker ([1910] 1987, 110–12).]
Wirkung schreitet dann im Kopfe des Komponierenden voran, um die Töne hier- oder dorthin zu lenken, also etwas hervorbringen, {1379} wozu auch der denkende Mensch sich immer bereit findet finden muß.

An diesem allerersten Prinzip gemessen bewährt sich die Dissonanz noch viel deutlicher als ein wahrer Motor; sucht sie aber auch wieder der [illegible] die Konsonanz u. so, gehend u. kommend, den Tonereignissen die Wege vorzeichnet, S. ?

Aber auch den Intervallen im einzelnen wohnt die lebendige Kraft inne, um derentwillen man sie ebenfalls als musikalisch-logische Motore ansprechen muß. Wir sehen, wie die Quint den Klang gleichsam als sperrend sich äußert; die Quart Zweifel erregt, blos weil sie eine zweite Quint [illegible] nicht sein kann, u. sonst andere Erscheinungen, die andere Wirkungen zeitigen; wie die Terz die Grundtonhaftigkeit des tieferen Intervalles nicht auszuschließen braucht, die bei der Sext zumindest in Zweifel kommt. Alle diese Wirkungen sind einmalig; nicht übertragbar u. sofern es [illegible] nur auf die Intervalle [illegible] ankommt, vermag daher niemals eine Quart auszudrücken, was eine Quint vermag, sowenig als die Terz Sext dasselbe, wie die Terz. So schweben auch diese Wirkungen in der Phantasie des Komponierenden voran; wohl ihm, wenn er ihre [illegible] Forderung versteht u. die [illegible] Kausalität sich so ausleben läßt, wie es in der [illegible] Erscheinung vorher bestimmt ist.

Die kausale Macht des Durchganges in horizontaler Richtung äußerst sich schon durch den schwachen Taktteil, auf dem er erscheint, wobei es zunächst gleichgiltig ist, ob [illegible] der D[urch]g[ang] konsonant oder dissonant ist. Schon ist [illegible] in die Differenzierung eines starken u. schwachen Taktteils die Vorbedingung einer Kausalität gegeben, u. soll dann der starke Taktteil als solcher zur Geltung kommen, so verlangt {1380} er von selbst—u. hierin wirkt er seine

Im speziellen sei hier noch der Einzelerscheinungen des Durchganges gedacht, vor allem der Sept als Durchgang. Welche schärfere Wirkung, welche stärkere Kausalität strömt der D[urchg]ang aus, wenn er als Sept in sich auch noch den Ausgangspunkt aufgesaugt, also auch noch die Ellisionswirkung in sich hat. Welche Konzentration bewirkt die Sept, wenn sie auf dem Punkt ihres Erscheinens uns dazu zwingt, hier an dieser Stelle, mag der Klang wo immer stehen, ein Stark u. Schwach vorwegzudenken, sodann das Ueberspringen des starken u. das Einsammeln aller kausalen Kraft bloss auf dem schwachen Taktteil, der aber, vom starken entblöst, infolge verminderner Kausalität selbst einen starken vorstellt.
Welche Wirkungen finden sich bei der Wechselnote zusammen! Gibt das Metrum rhythmische Knotenpunkte an, sofern wir mit diesem Ausdruck die starken Taktteile bezeichnen wollen, so fügt die Wechselnote um ihrerseits eine andere Kategorie Knotenpunkte hinzu, indem sie uns zwingt, ihren konsonanten Ausgangspunkt auf dem schwachen Taktteil ebenfalls als einen anzusehen. So werden zwei Takte energischer zusammengeschlossen, wie gleichsam durch einen doppelt geschlungenen Strick.

Und wäre es bei der Antizipation nur gleichsam um einen Fingerzug nach vorn zu tun, so darf auch diese kausale Kraft nicht unterschätzt werden.

Daß die Nebennote den Hauptton zurückzubringen gesonnen ist, wer vermöchte ihr das schon zum voraus anzusehen? Es genügt, daß sie uns mit sich auf ihren Weg fortreibt, u. uns schon damit ein Kommendes andeutet. Führt sie uns aber endlich zurück, so ist es inzwischen wie das Erlebnis des Weges reifer geworden u. der Ton, bei dem wir landen, ist nicht mehr derjenige, von dem wir ausgingen.

Der dissonante Durchgang spendet gar doppelte Kausalität: als Durchgang u. als Dissonanz.

In jeder Überbindung liegt auch wieder, wie bei der Wechselnote, eine Art Doppelstrom von Kausalität. In einem Bett strömt das Metrum dahin, u. im andern sucht die Überbindung ihr Bett. Und indem so beide Kräfte gegeneinander wirken, wirken sie zugleich auch füreinander.

Ist gar der Vorhalt dissonierend, so tritt hinzu die motorische Kraft der Dissonanz. Beim wirklichem Vorhalt schiebt sich eben der Vorhalt (wie jedes andere Ornament, das auf Vorhaltswirkung beruht) vor, um die darauf folgende Hauptnote gleichsam zu bedecken.
Die Rückung wieder stellt gleichsam eine plötzlich von links daherspringende Kausalität vor, im unerwarteter kausaler Ruck, dessen motorische Kraft man freilich sehr bald zügeln muß.

Von elementarster Gewalt äußert sich in der horizontalen Richtung die Kausalität der fließenden Linie; sie ist es, die längst bei sich weiß, was da kommen wird, die Knotenpunkte der Linie verteilt, die kleinen kausalen Motore der Durchgänge und Vorhänge zu Leben und Wirkung aufruft. Zu ihr, von der alles kommt, gehen schließlich auch alle Wirkungen ein.

In der Welt der vertikalen Richtung regen sich wieder unzählige Kräfte, bestimmend, vorwärtsdrängend, zwingend und unerbittlich einmalig. So erscheint uns vor allem die Stufe selbst als der letzte Urgrund, die Kausalität der Auskomponierung. So wie sie durch ihren Begriff die Synthese der Auskomponierung kausal verdolmetscht, trägt in sich die Tonalität wieder die Kausalität der Stufengänge.

Wer gedachte nicht im speziellen des unermüdlichen Motors der V. und VII. Stufe, deren Eindeutigkeit in allen Lagen und Nöten Klarheit schafft?

Aber auch in der Mischung hat man eine kausale Kraft zu achten, sofern sie immerhin auf der Voraussetzung zweier, wenn auch gleichnamiger und zueinander gehöriger Diatonien beruht. Gehe ich von der einen Diatonie in die zweite ein, so harrt meiner sicher noch ein Weg, der Weg der Rückkehr, wenn ich nicht durch die Ellision einer solchen (auf Grund der vorherbestimmten immanenten Idee der Mischung) den psychologischen Effekt einer Spannung erzielen will.
Und so bedeutet in noch viel höherem Grade die **Modulation** eine Kausalität, bei der man sogar die Haupttonart verläßt. Hier wieder ist die Wiederherstellung derselben ein psychologisch vorgezeichneter Weg, was der Modulation ihre motorische Kraft verleiht.*


* Wie traurig, daß Bruckner . . .
wüß. Aus dem Chaos wird ein Etwas, aber wie es würde ist nicht zu erfahren, jedenfalls wird die Brücke nicht von Ideen geschlagen.

Und zu alldem nun noch die Form als kausaler Motor! Welch eine übergewaltige Summe von motorischen Kräften nun hier in dieser Welt. Was alles erzwingt der Gedanke, um das zu sein, was er sein will u. muß. Was fordert nicht alles die Beziehung zweier Gedanken, wenn sie diese u. keine andere sein will u. muß. Und so vom Kleinsten bis zum Weitesten wissen Formteilchen wie die ganzen Sätze Ansprüche zu erheben, die den Tönen zugleich Wegweiser sind. So manches davon wird in verschiedenen Lehrbüchern über die Form erzählt, aber leider wieder nur ungenügend, mit völliger Außerachtlassung der geheimsten kausalen Kräfte. Nach Möglichkeit gedenke ich dieses Versäumnis der anderen nachzuholen. Hier gestatte man mir aber zum Voraus, etwas von den Wundern kausaler Kräfte zu verraten, daran bis heute noch niemand gedacht hat. (Umstellung: Chopin, Berceuse, Cismoll; Brahms: Bdur-Variationen; Schubert: Quintett usw.)


---

8 [“Robinson-Leben” is a reference to Daniel Defoe’s novel Robinson Crusoe.]
Dort hat man gleichsam Tonmarionetten mit [illegible: Sprachbänden?] vor sich, aber nicht die Musik selbst; im Musikdrama, wegen vollständiger Ausschaltung der Kausalitäten der Synthese (insbesondere doch der Formen!) einen verhängnisvollen Widerspruch gegen die Musik.


Die Urgesetze aber verehre man wie gleichsam Religionsgebote; sie zeigen Identität in Erscheinungen, die sonst als verschieden begriffen werden. Auf dieses Zurückführen aller Erscheinungen muß der Musiker am stärksten dringen. Von hier aus winkt ihm die Wohltat der Erkenntnis, daß es ja auch mit der menschlichen Sozietät besser stünde, wenn man sich nur in Leben der Moral u. Gesetzen zu einer ähnlichen Erkenntnis nur [illegible] weniger Urgesetze durchringen könnte, auf die dann die Einzelperscheinungen zurückgeführt werden. Blatt! (Der
Urbegriff des Verbrechers; Blättchen vom 14.VIII.1916) Zugegeben sei aber, daß die Auswirkung der wenigen ethischen Gebote schwerer ist, als die der Ton-Urgesetze; denn woran sämtliche Religionen scheiterten u. bis aus Ende der Welt scheitern werden ist ja, daß gegen den Zweiten u. Dritten kein ethisches Gebot durchgesetzt werden kann, wenn dieser es nicht versteht oder nicht verstehen will. Wohingegen ein Tonleben, das nur dem Künstler selbst reine Entstehung verdankt, eben dieser, ohne Störung durch Zweite u. Dritte, die wenigen Urgesetze zum Triumphe wie ein Schöpfer führen kann. Umso frevelhafter u. verbrecherischer, wenn er dieses Glücks unkundig sich der Gunst unwürdig erweist durch Unfleiß, Unachtsamkeit, Bedachtnahme auf widersprechende Interessen u.s.f. [Illegible: a note is written in pencil in the right margin]


Uns erfreut u. imponiert schon eine Maschine u. zwar nur wegen des Effektes ihrer mechanischen kausalen Bezüge—als wäre der Effekt die Seele der Maschine, als hätte der Mensch in der Maschine ein Lebewesen, gleichsam ein Kind gezeugt, so freut er sich des Zusammenklanges der kausalen Kräfte. Warum weiß er aber so wenig noch von den kausalen Bezügen in der Kunst? Goethe: Propyläen, Einleitung, S. 4 Blatt! Δ Voraussicht.

Woher immer das letzte Geheimnis kommen mag, so ist doch der Mensch Träger desselben, u. so drücken die Urgesetze zugleich einen einfachen, reinen Menschheitsbesitz aus. Die Psychologie der Urgesetze ist so einfach wie die Einfachheit; sie scheint vom geringsten
Menschen zu kommen u. vermag sich an den geringsten zu wenden. Sie gehören allen gemeinsam an, obgleich sie, schaffend oder nachschaffend, doch nur sehr wenige zum Ausdruck bringen können. Vielleicht wäre es möglich, die Menschen ihres eigensten Besitzes sich bewußt machen zu lassen, nur müßte man ihnen zuvor die Neigung austreiben, sich lieber zwanzig Regeln mit tausend u. abertausend Ausnahmen anweisen zu lassen, als selbst ein wenig über so wenige Urgesetze nachzudenken.

An allem Bösen ist die Unfähigkeit u. Trägheit Schuld u. sicher ist jene Ursache dieser. Doch für so unfähig halte ich die Menschen eben nicht, daß sie hinter die Urgesetze nicht selbst kommen könnten. Sie scheinen nur das Weitere, das Wiedererkennen der Urgesetze in der Mannigfaltigkeit. Die Welt der Erscheinungen, die auf sie einstürmt, ist so gewaltig groß, daß sie, wie sie glauben, Eile haben müssen, auf diese oder jene Weise dem plötzlich sich darbietenden Problemen beizukommen. Sie glauben auf rechtem Wege zu sein, wenn sie annehmen, viele Erscheinungen auch mit vielen Regeln begreifen zu können u. ahnen nicht, daß gerade umgekehrt nur wenige Gesetze dazu genügen. Sie ahnen aber auch nicht, daß sie über jeder Lösung stolpern. Zuliebe einer Regel, die sie anwenden zu müssen glauben, verwechseln sie die eine Situation mit der andern, nur damit sie die Regel anwenden können.

Die da aber der Urgesetze nicht mächtig sind, sind verurteilt zu leiden am Leben u. Denken, als stellten sie sich als irgend eine falsche quere Anwendung des biologischen Prinzipes dar. Ihrer harrt das Loos, sich stets davor zu fürchten, was wohlverstanden doch nur von Segen für die Menschheit u. Kunst sein muß. Da sie nicht zu erkennen vermögen, wie sich an den Genies immer nur dieselben Urgesetze bewähren, die ein jedes freilich

nach seiner Art zum Ausdruck bringt, glauben sie in der Bewegung der genialen Temperamente auch eine Bewegung der Gesetze zu erkennen, so daß sie zu dem Schluß gelangen, der Stillstand sei die einzige Gefahr für die “Kunst.” Als ob nicht Gottes große weite Natur noch länger in denselben Gesetzen hängengeblieben wäre u. doch im Wechsel der Jahreszeiten wohl auch für die Menschen zur Genüge Wechselndes hervorbringt; als ob nicht dieselbe Natur bestimmt wäre, noch weiter {1390} nach denselben Gesetzen sich auszuleben, um doch Tag um Tag Neu u. wechselnd zu bringen. Wer selbst stille steht, möchte alles um sich her in Bewegung wissen, aber derjenige, der in Bewegung ist, weiß, daß er nicht stillsteht. Bei aller Identität der Urgesetze stand Brahms nicht still, da er nach Beethoven erschien; wohl aber stehen still alle diejenigen, die die Bewegung bei Brahms noch nicht zu erkennen vermögen, geschweige daß sie erkennen, wie diese Bewegung eine geniale Auswirkung ewiger Urgesetze ist.

Blatt vom 25.III.17 u. 7.IV.17.

Hat es aber mit den Urgesetzen solche Bewandtnis, so wird man es wohl glauben, daß es in der Musik auch Schlechtgeschriebenes gibt, so wie man auch in der Sprache schlecht geschriebene Dokumente von gut geschriebenen zu unterscheiden weiß (wohl doch schon von Schulaufsätzen her!)[.] Zitate aus der „N.Fr.Pr.“ sprachliche Entgleisungen. Genau so verhält es sich in der Musik: auch hier schreiben die meisten Autoren schlechte Musik, bei der den Kenner sehr deutlich hören, wo ein Besseres versäumt wurde u. daher auch die Beweisführung sowohl gegen den Autor als alle diejenigen, die ihn verteidigen möchten, führen kann. Strauß—Reger—Gutes vom Schlechten zu unterscheiden ist aber ein hygienisches Prinzip sowohl in der Kunst wie im Leben. Man stirbt an schlechten Werken genau so wie an giftigen

9 [“N.Fr.Pr.” stands for Neue Freie Presse, a popular daily newspaper in Vienna.]
Pilzen; u. was noch weit verhängnisvoller: mit den an der Kunst sterbenden Menschen stirbt ja leider auch die Kunst mit! Mache sich doch der Mensch endlich der Gunst Gottes würdig.


*

Lie-Liechens Geburtstag

[August 31,] 1917
APPENDIX 4

A COMPRENDIUM OF SCHENKER’S FORMS

EXAMPLE A4.1 Six full-movement forms

(A) In Schenker’s handwriting (OC 83/255; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

(B) Transcription (OC 83/255)

Auf Theilung u. Wiederholung.

Formen:

(1-teil. Form: \(a_1 \rightarrow a_2\))

2-teil. Form: \(a_1 \rightarrow a_2\)

3-teil. Form: \(a_1 \rightarrow b \rightarrow a_2\)

4-teil. Form: \(a_1 \rightarrow b_1 \rightarrow a_2 \rightarrow b_2\)

5-teil. Form: \(a_1 \rightarrow b_1 \rightarrow a_2 \rightarrow c_1 \rightarrow a_3\)

oder: \(\{a_1 \rightarrow b_1 \rightarrow a_2 \rightarrow c_1 \rightarrow (b_2) \rightarrow a_3\}

6-teil. Form: \(a_1 \rightarrow b_1 \rightarrow c_1\) (Df) \(a_2 \rightarrow b_2 \rightarrow c_2\) (≈ \(a_1 \rightarrow b_2 \rightarrow a_3\))
EXAMPLE A4.2 Five types of two-part form

(A) In Schenker’s handwriting, enlarged with transcription (OC 83/259; used courtesy of the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations)

(B) Partial transcription (OC 83/259)

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>a1</th>
<th>a2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I–I</td>
<td>I–I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I–I</td>
<td>Tön[art] mod[uliert]–I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(II or V)–I</td>
<td>Tön[art] mod[uliert]–I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I–V</td>
<td>Rückm[odulation]–I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I–M[odulation]</td>
<td>Rückm[odulation]–I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
**Example A4.3** Four types of sonata-form exposition arranged from the most sectional to the most continuous

(A) Type-A exposition: *Modulationspartie* absent (OC 83/87)

(B) Type-B exposition: *Modulationspartie* fused with the II. *Gedanke* (OC 83/88 and 89)

(C) Type-C exposition: The I. *Gedanke* fused with the *Modulationspartie* (OC 83/90)
EXAMPLE A4.3 CONTINUED

(D) Type-D exposition: The end of the I. Gedanke and the beginning of the II. Gedanke fused with the Modulationspartie (OC 83/91)
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