



## Yale University Department of Music

---

### A Schenker Bibliography

Author(s): David Beach

Source: *Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Spring, 1969), pp. 2-37

Published by: Duke University Press on behalf of the Yale University Department of Music

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/843213>

Accessed: 15/12/2009 03:57

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=duke>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



Duke University Press and Yale University Department of Music are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Music Theory*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

**A****Schenker**

## Introduction†

Heinrich Schenker has emerged as one of the most significant individuals in the history of western music. His contribution to the field of music theory is unique – that is, his theories represent the only instance of what might properly be labelled a theory of tonality.\*1 Because his conception of musical structure, which resulted from his detailed investigation of the works of the great tonal composers, differed so radically from those

I am indebted to Ernst Oster and Allen Forte for their invaluable assistance and advice in the preparation of this bibliography.

# Bibliography

DAVID BEACH

preceding him, it seems now that the controversy which has surrounded his works was inevitable. Nevertheless, whether one is willing to accept all, part, or none of Schenker's ideas, it cannot be denied that they have exerted more influence on musical thought in the twentieth century than those of any other theorist.\*2 As Schenker would have hoped, this influence has by no means been limited to the fields of music theory and pedagogy.\*3

The fact that Schenker's ideas are so often misunderstood is a direct result of his revolutionary approach to musical structure. To put it bluntly, many musicians, assuming they have the desire, simply do not possess the patience nor intellectual stamina necessary for the comprehension of an approach so foreign

to their own. It is impossible to grasp the real significance of what Schenker intended without detailed study of a number of his works. The earlier works contain his most significant concepts only in their embryonic stages, yet it is almost impossible to understand the contents of the later publications without first reading the earlier ones. To this one must add the further obstacle presented by Schenker's often difficult style of writing.

Most of Schenker's works are no longer in print. Very little is available in German and even less in English translation. (More specific information about this will be provided later on.) This means that many musicians (I am thinking especially of students here) are forced to rely on secondary sources. Unfortunately, very few of these sources help to clarify his ideas and, in fact, they often propagate popular misconceptions about them. Such a situation does little to facilitate the understanding of the profound insights with which Schenker interpreted the inner workings of great musical works of art.

The influence of Schenker's ideas on music pedagogy in this country is witnessed by the number of courses offered at institutions of higher learning which purport to deal, at least in part, with what is commonly called "Schenkerian Analysis". All too often, the only relation between such courses and Schenker is his name. Thus students are often faced with second- or third-hand information about concepts attributed to Schenker, without being made aware of the proper sources. The primary purpose of this bibliography, then, is to provide as complete a listing as possible of both primary and secondary sources. In most cases, the important features of each entry are mentioned, especially when it is necessary to clarify the position of an author or to point out an obvious misconception. It is hoped that the information contained herein will be especially useful to the inquiring student as well as provide additional source material for those who are already acquainted with Schenker's ideas.

The bibliography itself is divided into two main sections: the first is concerned with Schenker's own publications, both theoretical and practical. This information involves a listing of Schenker's major publications, including editions of music, as well as a partial listing of his articles and reviews. The availability and projected publication of specific works in German or English translation have also been indicated. The second section deals with writings by others about Schenker and his method of analysis. This body of literature can be divided into the following categories:

- (1) Works which attempt to explain or interpret his theories. Some of these are major publications but most are simply surveys of his work.
- (2) Criticisms of his concepts. These are usually directed toward specific ideas with which the author disagrees.
- (3) Applications of his ideas. These include applications to Gestalt psychology and to the analysis of music other than that of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Of course there are some publications which do not fit neatly into any of these categories and others which fall into more than one. An attempt has been made to clarify such situations when necessary.

An effort has also been made to be as thorough as possible in compiling this bibliography. To the best of my knowledge, all pertinent material in English has been listed. However, I am fully aware of the fact that the listing of sources in German and other foreign languages is incomplete.\*4 It would be virtually impossible to track down all of Schenker's minor publications (e.g., short articles and reviews appearing in newspapers) as well as many articles published in foreign periodicals. I would appreciate learning of additional sources from readers and apologize in advance for omissions.

## I. SCHENKER'S WORKS

For the sake of clarity, I have divided Schenker's works into the following three categories: (1) theoretical works (see Appendix A for a chronological listing), (2) editions of music (see Appendix B), and (3) articles and reviews (see Appendix C for a partial listing by source). A brief discussion of his unpublished works (books and sketches in various stages of completion) is also included. Finally, I have indicated which of Schenker's publications are currently available, or will be available in the near future, either in German or English translation.

### A. Theoretical Works (See Appendix A for complete bibliographic information.)

Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik (als Einführung zu Ph. Em. Bachs Klavierwerken mitumfassend auch die Ornamentik Haydns, Mozarts, Beethovens etc.), 1904. Neue revidierte und ver-

mehrte Auflage, 1908.

This extended essay on ornamentation is based on C.P.E. Bach's "Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments" (Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen, 1762); it was written in conjunction with, and partly as an introduction to, his edition of the "Klavierwerke" (discussed later). Schenker considered C.P.E. Bach to be one of the greatest composers and musical thinkers, and points to his influence on Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. The title of this essay is somewhat misleading since it deals with other aspects of Bach's works (e.g., form and performance) as well as ornamentation. The comments on form hint at Schenker's concept of the scale-step [Stufe] first stated in his Harmonielehre, as it relates to his conception of tonality. The main portion of the essay is devoted to discussions of the various ornaments.

Instrumentations-Tabelle von Artur Niloff [a pseudonum]. Mit einer Einführung, 1908.

This short publication is divided into the following four sections: (1) the classification of instruments; (2) the production of musical pitch; (3) emergence of instruments into families; (4) transposing instruments. Also included is a large table which shows each instrument (with examples from the literature), its range, and its transposition.

#### Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien

Vol. I: Harmonielehre, 1906

Vol. II: Kontrapunkt (Part 1, 1910; Part 2, 1922)

Vol. III: Der freie Satz, 1935

This series, published intermittently over a span of thirty years, represents the full cycle of development and transformation of Schenker's conception of musical structure. The growth of his most important concepts can be traced from their initial statements in his Harmonielehre to their final form of expression in Der freie Satz. The importance of many of these ideas to Schenker's central thesis becomes clearer with each subsequent volume; others lose their relevance and quite naturally disappear. It is absolutely necessary to be aware of this continual process of growth and development within "New Musical Theories and Fantasies" if one is to arrive at a fair evaluation of any or all of its parts. In fact Schenker intended it to

be, among other things, a documentation of these changes. One should be aware of the fact that these volumes were also designed to instruct in the traditional disciplines of harmony, counterpoint, and form. For it is in Schenker's approach to this material that we find a radical departure from the past.

At the time of the publication of his *Harmonielehre* \*5, Schenker was partially under the influence of conventional concepts. But the real importance of this publication lies in the fact that it contains many of his less conventional ideas in their initial stages of development. Of primary importance here are his concepts of the scale-step [Stufe] and the process of "compositional unfolding" [Auskomponierung], which has been documented by Oswald Jonas, as follows:

The chief merit of Schenker's early work consists in having disentangled the concept of scale-step (which is part of the theory of harmony) from the concept of voice-leading (which belongs to the sphere of counterpoint). The two had been confused for decades. . . The theory of "Auskomponierung" shows voice-leading as the means by which the chord, as a harmonic concept, is made to unfold and extend in time. \*6

Scale-step, then, is a far more inclusive term than "chord" (synonymous with "triad" in conventional theory) as the basic unit of harmony. A scale-step might encompass any number of "chords", all of which serve to prolong that harmony in time. (It should be pointed out here that this process of prolongation can apply to melodic phenomena as well.) The application of these ideas to increasingly broader levels of compositional structure eventually led Schenker to his concept of the "fundamental structure" [Ursatz] in *Der freie Satz*. Another important contribution contained in this volume is the distinction made between "tonicalization" [Tonikalisierung] and modulation. This, of course, is a direct outgrowth of the concepts of scale-step and Auskomponierung. The above-mentioned concepts are of basic importance to the development of Schenker's central thesis. Others are less significant; many were altered considerably in subsequent publications and others wisely dropped.

Kontrapunkt \*7, the second volume in this series, is a complete treatise on species counterpoint. Included are numerous references to the classical treatises (Fux, Albrechtsberger, Bellerman, Cherubini) as well as criticisms of the existing approaches to the subject. It is, in fact, a history of counterpoint pedagogy as well as a systematic study of fundamental problems

of voice-leading within the framework of strict composition. Of primary significance here is the fact that Schenker incorporates his concepts of musical structure and motion, first stated in his *Harmonielehre*, into this discussion. Part 1 of *Kontrapunkt* is devoted to detailed discussions of *Cantus Firmus* and principles of two-voice composition. Part 2 begins with a continuation of procedures discussed in Part 1 as applied to three-, four-, and multi-voiced composition. The last section of this part, "Transition to Free Composition" [Übergänge zum freien Satz], is probably the most significant single section in the development of Schenker's conception of musical structure. Here Schenker shows the relationship between strict and free composition, by approaching the latter through so-called "mixed species", which, by convention, belongs to the former. As the title suggests, "Transition to Free Composition" contains the seeds of what is to follow. For that matter, many of the ideas presented throughout the *Kontrapunkt* volume appear later in *Der freie Satz* in condensed forms.

Schenker's final work, *Der freie Satz* #8, was published in 1935 shortly after the author's death. It is divided into two partial volumes; the musical figures are contained in the *Anhang*, separate from the text. Although the title might suggest a book on compositional method, in reality it is a study of structure in tonal music. Schenker shows how counterpoint combines with harmony, and other musical elements such as rhythm, to form musical composition. He arrived at his theory of tonal structure through detailed analysis of compositions by the great masters. His method of analysis is the result of this life-long study, and the concepts presented in this work are the final synthesis of those contained in his earlier publications. The contents of *Der freie Satz* are divided into three main sections, corresponding to Schenker's concept of three levels of musical structure (foreground, middleground, and background). Starting with the background, Schenker shows how it is prolonged by the content of the middleground, and that of the middleground is prolonged by the content of the foreground. Viewed in this manner, a musical work of art can be seen as the "interacting composite" of these levels; this is the central thesis of Schenker's conception of musical structure.

In his discussion of the background level, Schenker presents his discoveries of the fundamental line [*Urlinie*] and fundamental structure [*Ursatz*]. #9 The *Ursatz* of a composition is its skeletal structure, which one may arrive at through a process of reduction beginning with the foreground detail. As Jonas has observed:



With the Ursatz concept, the circle of Schenker's system is closed: it opened, in "Harmony", with the quest for a pattern in Nature for music as art. It closed with the discovery of the primordial chord and its artistic re-creation through the process of "Auskomponierung".\*10

Much of *Der freie Satz* is devoted to the discussion of specific techniques of prolongation at the middleground and foreground levels. Also included are brief discussions of form, and meter and rhythm. Schenker's conception of form in tonal music is closely related to his concepts of *Ursatz* and *Ursatz*. All of the above-mentioned concepts are clearly illustrated in the *Anhang* to *Der freie Satz*, a collection of musical examples and diagrams drawn from the literature of tonal music. With the aid of the analytic sketch, one is more easily able to follow and appreciate Schenker's understanding of musical structure.

Beethovens neunte Sinfonie. Eine Darstellung des musikalischen Inhaltes unter fortlaufender Berücksichtigung auch des Vortrags und der Literatur. 1912.

Schenker dedicated this study of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony to "the memory of the last master of German composition, Johannes Brahms". As might be expected, the analytic approach exhibited in this study is quite traditional in comparison with his later works; yet it contains a number of deep musical insights and was a unique effort for the time. A clear outline of the form is provided at the beginning of the detailed discussion of each movement. Each part contains a "literature" section (discussion of available sketches and comments on other analyses) and a section in which problems of performance are discussed. Especially interesting are Schenker's comments on rhythmic detail and instrumentation as it relates to structure. Numerous musical examples and reductions are included but the sketch technique used in later analyses is not evident. This early example of Schenker's analytic approach provides an interesting comparison with his later analyses of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony (1925) and Third Symphony (1930).

Der Tonwille. Flugblätter zum Zeugnis unwandelbarer Gesetze der Tonkunst einer neuen Jugend dargebracht von Heinrich Schenker, 10 issues. 1921-24.

Contained in these ten monographs are numerous essays on music and its structure, over twenty-five analyses of composi-

tions, and a number of miscellaneous comments relevant to Schenker's work. Of particular importance are the two essays concerning his concept of the *Urlinie*, and two related to questions of performance ("Der wahre Vortrag" and "Wirkung und Effekt"). Other essays are: "Von der Sendung des deutschen Genies", "Gesetze der Tonkunst", "Geschichte der Tonkunst", "Die Kunst zu hören", and "Beethoven zu seinem Opus 127". Analyses contained in *Der Tonwille* are of compositions by Ph. Em. Bach, J.S. Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Händel, Haydn, Mendelssohn, Mozart, Schubert, and Schumann. Included in these analyses are a number of musical diagrams and sketches which are early examples of Schenker's method of graphic presentation. The analysis of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, which originally appeared in *Der Tonwille* in three separate installments, was published separately in 1925.

Das Meisterwerk in der Musik. Drei Jahrbücher: I, 1925; II, 1926; III, 1930.

These three volumes constitute a continuation of *Der Tonwille*. Included are seven essays, approximately fifteen analyses of separate compositions, and comments and miscellaneous thoughts (concerning the relationship between art and the world in general). Of special significance is the essay on "The Art of Improvisation", in which Schenker states his views that improvisation underlies the creation of a masterwork, and that free composition is based on the strict and elemental contrapuntal forms. Also included are further observations on the *Urlinie* concept (2 separate contributions), essays on organic structure in fugue and sonata form, one titled "Weg mit dem Phrasierungsbogen" (Down with Phrasing Marks!), and the following essay in *Jahrbuch III*: "Rameau oder Beethoven? Erstarrung oder geistiges Leben in der Musik?". Analyses contained in the *Jahrbücher* are of compositions by J.S. Bach, Beethoven, Chopin, Haydn, Mozart, Max Reger, and Domenico Scarlatti. With the exception of the one essay mentioned above (and a few miscellaneous remarks), the entire *Jahrbuch III*\*11 is devoted to a detailed analysis and discussion of Beethoven's Third Symphony. Included in the analysis are the following: detailed dissection and discussion of each movement, comments on Beethoven's revised copy and the original from 1806, discussion of questions of performance, a "literature" section, and diagrams of the entire composition. This is the most interesting and complete of all of Schenker's analyses of large-scale compositions.

# Fünf Urlinie – Tafeln, 1932.\*12

These "Five Analyses in Sketchform" provide further examples of Schenker's method of graphic presentation. The analyses were actually done by students of Schenker under his close supervision and published without additional commentary. The five compositions are:

- (1) Bach. Choral: "Ich bin's, ich sollte büßen" (Matti-häuspassion).
- (2) Bach. Wohltemperiertes Klavier I, Praeludium I (C dur).
- (3) Haydn. Sonata Es dur, G. A. No. 49 (First movement, development section).
- (4) Chopin. Etude F dur, Op. 10, No. 8.
- (5) Chopin. Etude C moll, Op. 10, No. 12.

Johannes Brahms. Oktaven und Quinten, edited by Heinrich Schenker, 1933.

This work is based on examples of parallel octaves and fifths that Brahms found in compositions of other composers. Schenker interprets Brahms' comments and adds some of his own. The significance of the study is pointed out by Allen Forte as follows:

He [Schenker] makes clear that the significance of Brahms' collection of examples of parallel fifths and octaves lies in the composer's recognition of the contradiction between a theory which dealt with immediate relationships only, often of a transient nature, and his own highly refined sense of hearing which encompassed large spans.\*13

B. Editions of Music (See Appendix B for complete bibliographic information)

Ph. Em. Bach. Klavierwerke [Auswahl]. Neue kritische Ausgabe. Two Volumes: I, 6 Sonatas; II, 3 Sonatas, 4 Sonata movements and 1 Rondo.

This selection is taken from Ph. Em. Bach's Six Collections "für Kenner und Liebhaber". It is based on the Breitkopf und Härtel "Urtext Edition" and was done in conjunction with the Beitrag zur Ornamentik. Included are fingerings and footnotes.

G. F. Händel. Sechs Orgelkonzerte [Op. 4]. Nach den Originalen für Klavier zu 4 Händen bearbeitet. 1904.

J. S. Bach. Chromatische Phantasie und Fuge (d moll). Kritische Ausgabe mit Anhang. 1910.

In the appendix to this critical edition Schenker discusses principles of fingering, non-legato, dynamics, and problems of composition and performance. He also compares different sources and discusses different readings.

Erläuterungsausgaben der letzten fünf Sonaten Beethovens. Op. 109 (1913); Op. 110 (1914); Op. 111 (1915); Op. 101 (1920).

These critical editions of four of the last five piano sonatas by Beethoven (Schenker was unable to complete this series because the autograph of Op. 106 was, and is, missing) are based on the autographs, first editions, and revised copies. The merits of each of these sources are discussed at great length by Schenker in his commentaries. (Schenker was one of the first to realize the importance of autograph study in relation to one's conception of dynamics, phrasing, rubato etc. in a specific piece. In fact he considered himself [justifiably so] the founder of that science!) Also included are quotes from the Literature (Bülow, Marx, Reinecke etc.) and critical discussions of their views. The music itself is presented with a minimum of editing — fingerings, measure numbers, and short footnotes only. However, analyses are provided (least in Op. 109, more in Op. 110, and extensive ones in Op. 111 and Op. 101) which include comments on form, performance and rhythm, and articulation. Special attention is given to rhythm and harmonic progression, and (where applicable) the significance of Beethoven's own fingerings is discussed.

Beethoven. Klaviersonaten. 192-.

This critical edition of the complete piano sonatas of Beethoven is based on the autographs and first editions. The sonatas were first published in single editions and later in four volumes. Aside from a few footnotes, only Schenker's fingerings are added. Beethoven's own fingerings are made recognizable by the use of italics.

Beethoven. Sonata, Op. 27, No. 2 (facsimile reproduction). 1921. (Includes a Foreword and three sketches by Beethoven.)

### C. Further Information

Articles etc.: Schenker published a number of short articles, essays and reviews in various newspapers and periodicals between 1892 and 1935. A few were published after his death in *Der Dreiklang*, *Monatschrift für Musik* (edited by Oswald Jonas and Felix Salzer), 1936-38. As was mentioned earlier, it is almost impossible to track down all of these short contributions; a partial listing by source is given in Appendix C.

Unpublished material: When Schenker died in 1935, he left behind a large number of unpublished sketches and manuscripts in various stages of completion. An incomplete book on interpretation, "Die Kunst des Vortrags", is in the possession of Oswald Jonas and is to be published in Germany by Universal Edition under his supervision. The following two manuscripts are in the possession of Felix Salzer: "Von dem Stimmführung des Generalbasses" (Aus dem Nachlass), and "Kommentar zu Ph. E. Bach's Versuch. . ." (incomplete). Numerous sketches were left unpublished, most of which are in the possession of Ernst Oster. The following is a partial list of sketches which he is preparing for publication. All are in his possession except for the Handel, which is in Salzer's possession.

Bach.	French Suite in E. Brandenburg Concerto No. 5 in D Motet: Singet dem Herrn
Beethoven.	Several piano pieces, especially Op. 106 (and particularly the Fugue).
Chopin.	Preludes and Nocturnes Scherzo in D $\flat$ , Op. 31 Finale of Sonata in B $\flat$ minor, Op. 35 Etudes (complete) Mazurkas
Handel.	Suite no. 2 in F (Adagio I)
Brahms.	Paganini Variations, Op. 35 Waltzes, Op. 39 Piano Pieces, Op. 76, 79, 116, 117, 118, and 119.

Availability of Works: The following of Schenker's publications are currently in print, all of which are published by Universal Edition: *Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik* (UE 812); *Der freie Satz*

(Part III of *Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien*), second edition, edited by Oswald Jonas (UE 6869/69a); *Oktaven und Quinten* (Brahms); *Ph. Em. Bach, Klavierwerke*; *Beethoven, Klaviersonaten*. Reprints of Schenker's analyses of Beethoven's Fifth and Ninth Symphonies (UE 26306 and 26307) will be available shortly. Universal Edition is also planning to publish the *Erläuterungsausgaben der letzten fünf Sonaten Beethovens*, revised by Oswald Jonas. The first two to be issued are Op. 101 (UE 26301) and Op. 110 (UE 26304). A forthcoming reprint of *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik* (3 vols. in 1) is listed in Bulletin 19 (Autumn 1968) of Blackwell's Music Shop (Oxford, England). Finally, *Fünf Urlinie-Tafeln* is scheduled to be reprinted by Dover Publications.

**Translations:** The only available translation of a major publication by Schenker is: *Harmony*, edited and annotated by Oswald Jonas, translated by Elisabeth Mann Borgese (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954). \*14 A few sources mention a translation of *Kontrapunkt, Part I*, by John Petrie Dunn, but it is not available. \*15 A translation of *Der freie Satz* by Ernst Oster should be published soon by M. I. T. Press. \*16 As was mentioned above, Oster is also planning to publish some of Schenker's sketches in his possession. Included in the first group of sketches scheduled for publication are: *Bach, Inventionen* (selected); *Chopin, Scherzo in D $\flat$  (Op. 31)* and *Finale of Sonata in B $\flat$  minor (Op. 35)*; *Brahms, Waltzes (Op. 39)*. A translation by Orin Grossman of Schenker's essay "*Vom Organischen der Sonatenform*" (*Das Meisterwerk in der Musik, Jahrbuch III*) was published in the *Journal of Music Theory*, 12/2 (1968). One would hope that more of these short essays will be translated and published in the future. \*17

## II. WORKS CONCERNING SCHENKER AND HIS THEORIES

This part of the bibliography is divided into the following three sections: (1) explanations and surveys of Schenker's works, (2) criticisms of his theories, and (3) applications of his ideas. A complete listing of sources which deal in some way with Schenker and his theories is provided in Appendix D. \*18 Since this body of literature is quite extensive, only the most important of these works will be mentioned in the following discussion. Reference in the text to a specific book or article will be made by author and title only; complete bibliographic information can be found by referring to Appendix D.

## A. Explanations and Surveys

The most complete explanation and discussion of Schenker's theories is contained in Oswald Jonas' book, "Das Wesen des musikalischen Kunstwerks: Eine Einführung in die Lehre Heinrich Schenkers".\*19 The importance of this work lies in the fact that Jonas, a Schenker student, provides further information about his most important concepts, such as those of the *Urlinie* and *Ursatz*, in an effort to clarify and interpret them in Schenker's own terms. Unfortunately, there is no equivalent book in English.\*20 Most of the articles written in an attempt to explain Schenker's concepts are too limited, and end up simply as surveys of his works. Very few have contributed significantly toward the understanding of his ideas.

Two of the best introductions to Schenker's ideas, in English, are: Allen Forte, "Schenker's Conception of Musical Structure" and Adele Katz, "Heinrich Schenker's Method of Analysis".\*21 In the former, Forte gives detailed explanations of Schenker's most important concepts and indicates their significance. Schenker's own works are discussed, as in much of the pertinent literature about him. The last part of the article is devoted to discussions of five unsolved problems in music theory and how Schenker's ideas might contribute toward their solutions. The five unsolved problems cited by Forte are: (1) constructing a theory of rhythm for tonal music, (2) determining the sources and development of triadic tonality, (3) gaining information about compositional technique, (4) improving theory instruction, and (5) understanding the structure of problematic modern works. Katz's article is divided into two main sections: (1) Tonality and (2) Harmony (which includes a section on counterpoint). Much of the article is concerned with a discussion of Schenker's most important concepts and the definition of terms associated with them. Katz also points out the difference between Schenker's approach to musical structure and those of the earlier theorists (Riemann, in particular, is noted). This difference is explained by her definitions of the words Analysis and Synthesis [Schenker's approach]. "Analysis is the dissection of a work into its various parts. Synthesis is the re-assembling of a work whose various parts grow out of one principle" [p. 312]. A further source of interest is the Introduction and Chapter I (The [Schenker's] Concept of Tonality) of her book, *Challenge to Musical Tradition: A New Concept of Tonality* (to be discussed later).

There are also a few articles of importance which are concerned with the clarification and amplification of specific areas of

Schenker's conception of tonal structure. Two that warrant special mention here are: Ernst Oster, "Register and Large-Scale Connection" and William Mitchell, "Heinrich Schenker's Approach to Detail". The first of these is based on Schenker's view that register can have structural significance; that is, it can play an important role in establishing the larger connections in a musical composition. (Schenker devotes a chapter of *Der freie Satz* to a discussion of "Obligatory Register" [obligate Lage].) Oster goes on to show "a number of instances where register contributes in an essential way to clarifying certain contrapuntal, structural, or thematic-motivic connections and relations" [p. 57]. The primary value of Mitchell's article is that it points out Schenker's concern with detail. This fact is too often overlooked, especially by those who have criticized Schenker's ideas concerning large-scale connection. Mitchell makes the point that "no valid appraisal of his theory of the whole can be made before complete familiarity with his theory of detail has been gained" [p. 118].

## B. Criticisms

Responsible criticism is a difficult task. It demands at least two things of the critic: (1) thorough understanding of the object of criticism and (2) constructive suggestions for change and for alternate solutions. Unfortunately, most of the criticisms that have been leveled at Schenker's ideas are characterized by the opposite traits. Specific concepts have been isolated from their context, occasionally out of ignorance but more often to the deliberate advantage of the critic. This is most noticeable in those criticisms that have been aimed at Schenker's earlier publications and at his concepts of the *Ursatz* and *Ursatz*. Rarely in these instances can one find any solutions, especially constructive ones, offered as alternatives. I do not mean to imply that Schenker's ideas are above criticism. They are not. But when questioning specific concepts, one must always relate them to their proper context and criticize them within this context.

One must also keep in mind the fact that Schenker's ideas went through a continual process of development and transformation during his lifetime. It is quite natural that some of the ideas presented in his earlier publications became obsolete and simply disappeared, while others were changed considerably in subsequent publications. An example of the former is Schenker's preoccupation with the number five (e.g., the first five partials of the overtone series, the interval of a fifth, etc.) in his *Harmonielehre*. Although he dropped this line of investigation



later on, it has still been the object of much unfavorable criticism.\*22 The process of growth and development associated with Schenker's thinking is clearly reflected in his analyses. An excellent example of this is his analysis of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony (1925), originally published in three separate installments in *Der Tonwille* (1921-24). Not only does his method of notation change from first installment to last, but a clear change in thinking as to what musical events constitute the background of the piece is evident. The later publications, especially *Der freie Satz*, contain a number of analyses of pieces that Schenker had discussed in earlier publications. These later analyses show a more highly developed way of musical thinking and a more rigorous application of his principles. In the large number of analyses published by Schenker, there are naturally some that are questionable and a few that are simply wrong. (One can only point to all those that are excellent and allow for human error!) One criticism that centers on an analysis of a specific piece (Bach's Prelude in d minor from his Twelve Little Preludes, No. 6 - BWV 940) can be found in Walter Kolneder's article, "Sind Schenkers Analysen Beiträge zur Bacherkenntnis?". (Schenker's analysis was published in *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*, Jahrbuch I.) There is good cause to question Schenker's interpretation of this piece but, unfortunately, Kolneder does not come up with a better solution. In this sense, the criticism is empty and meaningless.

By far the most popular targets for criticism have been the concepts of the *Urlinie* and *Ursatz*. Schenker arrived at them, or more precisely discovered their existence, after years of searching for the fundamental and natural laws of tonality. They did not come into being, as is often implied, as theoretical abstractions or fabrications from which Schenker derived the rest of his ideas. They are, rather, the final stage of development, chronologically and conceptually, in the evolution of his understanding of tonal structure. They are truly meaningful only when one considers them in relation to other levels of musical structure. But those who have criticized the *Urlinie* and *Ursatz* most often have divorced them from this context and treated them as isolated theoretical constructs. This mistake has resulted in such misconceptions as the characterization of Schenker's ideas as "static". One who has criticized the concepts of the *Urlinie* and *Ursatz* on this basis is John Daniskas in his book, "Grondslagen voor de analytische Vormleer der Musiek".\*23 The inaccuracy of this view has been pointed out by Milton Babbitt as follows:

Nothing could be less accurate than Daniskas's charac-

terization of Schenker's methods as embodying a 'static' notion of tonality. Schenker's essential concern is with the means whereby the inceptually static triad is activated in time in accord with the principles of structural polyphony, which makes possible the unfolding through various levels of the total temporal-spacial unity which is the musical composition.\*24

Another who has criticized Schenker's concepts of the *Urlinie* and *Ursatz* is Roger Sessions. He gives the following two objections:

The first is that it [the *Urlinie-Ursatz* concept] is far too primitive as a description of the actual events which constitute a musical work, or the sensations and apperceptions that constitute the ultimate comprehension of that work. (p. 176). . . [The second] is in essence the Alexandrian or 'ex post facto' conception which envisages creation as the painstaking and meticulous embodiment of principles that were once vital and in process of development, but whose very definiteness and, so to speak, formulability proclaim either their insufficiency or their exhaustion. . . . It is precisely when Schenker's teachings leave the domain of exact description and enter that of dogmatic and speculative analysis that they become sterile. (p. 177)\*25

An objection similar to Sessions' first one is stated by Walter Riezler in his article, "Die 'Urlinie'". This is pointed out by Michael Mann as follows:

He [Riezler] takes great pains to show by analogy with the other arts that an analysis of any art work proceeding from a given framework can never give evidence of specific traits contained within the framework without supplementing the basic structural principle by specific ideas such as are found in music in the concepts of motives, rhythmical patterns, etc.\*26

The most obvious fault in these criticisms is that both Sessions and Riezler have separated Schenker's concept of the whole from his concept of the parts. They have failed to grasp the real significance of the *Urlinie* and *Ursatz* in relation to middle-ground and foreground events. Sessions is particularly vehement in his condemnation of these ideas, yet he acknowledges the fact that Schenker's earlier publications contain a number of clear and profound insights.

The most extensive critique of Schenker's theories is contained in Michael Mann's article, "Schenker's Contribution to Music Theory". Although he quotes Sessions (and Riezler) extensively, Mann differs from him on the following point: "Schenker's work must be accepted or rejected in its entirety." (p. 7) Later in the article, he states:

. . . we have found ourselves compelled to reject Schenker's analytic method in all its phases as inseparably bound up with the fixed conservatism which characterizes his view of music history, and as therefore essentially sterile in tendency: a negation, rather than an explanation, of musical realities. (p. 26)

In this statement, we find a common objection to Schenker's view of music history, namely his preoccupation with the music of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This objection has been answered in two ways: There are those who have attempted to apply certain of Schenker's ideas to the analysis of contemporary and "pre-tonal" music. (This will be discussed more fully later on.) These attempts have been condemned by others on the grounds that Schenker was exclusively concerned with the fundamental laws of tonality and therefore his ideas do not and should not be applied to music other than that of the tonal period. Since these laws manifest themselves in their purest or most perfect form through the masterworks of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it is only natural that he was concerned almost exclusively with that period in music history. And although Schenker had little regard for contemporary music, this should not affect our evaluation of his ideas as they apply to tonal music. We must meet him on his own ground — the music of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Mann points out a further objection to Schenker's ideas — what he calls "an accusation of coldness and dogmatism". This particular view is the basis of Paul Henry Lang's Editorial in the *Musical Quarterly*.<sup>\*27</sup> What begins as a review of Donald Francis Tovey's "Beethoven" and Adele Katz's "Challenge to Musical Tradition", ends up as an irrational and emotional attack on Schenker. Lang makes a distinction between a "technical expert" [Schenker] and an "esthete" [Tovey]. In essence, he thinks that Schenker's approach lacks feeling and is too cold and calculating. He goes on to say that ". . . Schenker — and his fervent disciples ever more — attack all those who find beauties that cannot be proved by logic or be reduced to their constituent atoms." (p. 300) This is, of course, ridiculous and a complete misrepresentation of Schenker's approach to

music. It is especially surprising coming from a man of Lang's stature and influence. One possible reason for this characterization of Schenker's approach as "cold and dogmatic" may be related to his self-assured and often offensive manner of presentation. It is understandable to be irritated by this manner, but it should not affect one's evaluation of the meaning and significance of his ideas. Schenker's primary concern was with real music, not theoretic formulation. The latter was a by-product of his investigation of the music he viewed as living art.\*28

### C. Applications

As was mentioned earlier, a number of attempts have been made to apply Schenker's ideas to the analysis of contemporary and "pre-tonal" music. The extent to which these ideas have been borrowed and the success of their application has differed from one author to another. Some of Schenker's ideas are infinitely more "usable" than others in this context. For example, concepts such as those of structural levels, large-scale connection, and reduction can be made flexible enough to apply to most any kind of music, while others (e. g. Urlinie and Ursatz) are inseparable from the laws of tonality. As mentioned previously, these attempts have been condemned by others on the grounds that Schenker's total concern was with the fundamental laws of tonality as manifested in the masterpieces of the tonal era. Any applications to music other than that of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is viewed as a misinterpretation (or misrepresentation) of his ideas. This controversy has resulted in major disagreements even among Schenker's students.

One of those who has applied certain of Schenker's ideas to the analysis of contemporary music is Allen Forte in his book, "Contemporary Tone Structures".\*29 Forte acknowledges his indebtedness to Schenker "for the notion of the analytic sketch and for certain terminology" [foreground, middleground, background, spans of structure, functional relationships, etc.]. The basic technique used in this study is reduction, and "aid is provided by the analytic sketches, which constitute a visual means for comprehending structure, a means which is often more direct and more valuable than the verbal commentary". (p. v) Techniques and terminology are borrowed but never is an attempt made to apply a tonal concept in a non-tonal context. The major works discussed are: Bartók, Fourth String Quartet; Schoenberg, Phantasy for Violin with Piano Accompaniment; Stravinsky, Petrouchka. The shorter works analyzed are:

Stravinsky, *Larghetto* from the *Five Fingers*; Milhaud, *Midi from Une Journée*; Sessions, Number III from *From My Diary*; Copland, Number 3 from *Four Piano Blues*; Bartók, Number VIII from *Fourteen Bagatelles*, Op. 6; Hindemith, *Fuga undecima in B* from *Ludus Tonalis*. Scores of the shorter pieces are included for ease in following the analyses.

Analyses of contemporary pieces employing certain of Schenker's ideas can also be found in Adele Katz's book, "Challenge to Musical Tradition: A New Concept of Tonality".\*30 Beginning with chapter 2 (chapter 1 is an explanation of Schenker's conception of tonality), the book is divided into discussions of the following composers: Johann Sebastian Bach, Philip Emanuel Bach, Josef Haydn, Beethoven, Richard Wagner, Debussy ("first challenge to the bulwark of tonality"), and Stravinsky and Schönberg ("representatives of the new order in music"). These particular composers were chosen because they "offer a well-rounded picture of the possibilities afforded by the tonal system, as well as an introduction to the techniques of the polytonal and atonal systems". (p. xxi) These latter "systems" are investigated in an effort "to find the new concept of tonality they express". Throughout the book, the basic terminology associated with Schenker's ideas and a sketch technique derived from his method of graphic representation are both in evidence.

The most well-known and also the most controversial of the works based on Schenker's theories is Felix Salzer's "Structural Hearing: Tonal Coherence in Music".\*31 Some have condemned it vehemently while others have accepted it as the main source of Schenker's theories in English. Its external layout is similar to that of Schenker's *Der freie Satz*: It is published in two volumes, the first containing the text and the second containing numerous analyses of compositions from the Middle Ages to the present. The contents of volume 1 are divided into three parts, as follows: Part I (definition of the basic terms used throughout the book and their implications); Part II, *The Pedagogic and Systematic Approach to Structural Hearing* (includes; *The Contrapuntal Concept*, *The Harmonic Concept*, *Structure and Prolongation I, II, III*, and *the Concept of Tonality*); Part III ("the implications and consequences of structural hearing as they concern problems of musical understanding, interpretation and musicology"). Many of Schenker's ideas are used by Salzer in the discussion and analysis of "pre-tonal" compositions as well as modern works.\*32 To those who are already acquainted with Schenker's works, his influence is clear throughout. To others, it is often difficult to tell whether a particular idea should be attributed to Schenker or to Salzer.

The primary motivation behind *Structural Hearing* was the organization of Schenker's ideas into textbook form. This is pointed out by Salzer, as follows:

This book is based on Heinrich Schenker's revolutionary conceptions of tonality and musical coherence. . . . My purpose is to mold his conceptions into a workable, systematic approach for use by teachers, students and performers, as well as by anyone seriously interested in the problems of musical continuity, coherence, and structure. (Dover Edition, p. xv)

Until recently, *Structural Hearing* has been the only textbook in English which deals extensively with Schenker's theories.\*33 As a major source of reference for serious students of harmony and counterpoint, it has been extremely influential. But for many it has become the sole source of information about Schenker. This is an unfortunate situation. The result has been that ideas are often associated with Schenker's name when, in truth, they have little or nothing to do with him. One may blame Salzer for not clearly differentiating between his and Schenker's ideas, but the real blame should rest on those who have never bothered to consult the primary sources. In its own terms, *Structural Hearing* is a serious and valuable contribution to the understanding of tonal structure.

Attempts to apply certain of Schenker's ideas to the analysis of contemporary music have also been made by Roy Travis in his articles, "Towards a New Concept of Tonality?"\*34 and "Directed Motion in Schoenberg and Webern". Both are strongly influenced by Salzer's *Structural Hearing*. The contemporary compositions discussed in the former are the opening of Stravinsky's *Le Sacre du Printemps* and two pieces from Bartok's *Mikrokosmos*. Analogies are made between the structure of these pieces and selected compositions from the eighteenth and nineteenth century literature. Most striking is Travis' definition of tonality: "Music is tonal when its motion unfolds through time a particular tone, interval, or chord." (p.261) This concept of tonality is also applied to the analysis of Schoenberg's Op. 19, No. 2 (from *Six Little Piano Pieces*) and Webern's *Piano Variations*, Op. 27 (second movement), in his second article. The extension of the meaning of "tonal" to include a particular tone or interval is a radical departure from Schenker's concept of tonality. It is also a major point of difference between Travis and others who have attempted to apply "Schenkerian analysis" to the understanding and interpretation of modern music.

An interesting discussion of the relationship between Schenker's theories and Gestalt Psychology is provided by Hellmut Federhofer in his collection of five essays, "Beiträge zur musikalischen Gestaltanalyse".\*35 Federhofer's approach to Schenker's ideas is basically scientific. One thing he is concerned with is the "scientification" of Schenker's technique of reduction. (Schenker would have opposed this as he would have opposed the "scientification" of anything associated with art.) In the third essay, Federhofer discusses in detail the connection between "Gestalt" and musical form. The last two papers (Der strenge und freie Satz und sein Verhältnis zur Kompositionslehre von Heinrich Schütz in der Fassung seines Schülers Christoph Bernhard; Tonale und reale Beantwortung bei Johann Sebastian Bach) are devoted to discussions of certain problems in the older music in relation to Schenker's ideas. Sketches of pieces by Bach, Mozart, and Brahms are provided in the Anhang.

Many of the recent studies concerned with the rhythmic structure of music have also been influenced, at least indirectly, by Schenker's theories. The most detailed of these is the study made by Cooper and Meyer.\*36 In it, a technique of reduction is applied to the analysis of the "rhythmic organization of phrases, periods, and sections". The authors also may have been influenced by Schenker's concept of structural levels in the formulation of their concept of "Architectonic Levels", although there is no direct correlation between the two. The importance of Schenker's concept of structural levels to the formulation of a theory of rhythm has been pointed out by Forte in "Schenker's Conception of Musical Structure". He states that although Schenker did not attempt to formulate a general theory of rhythm, certain of his statements suggest that rhythm, like pitch, may exist at different levels of structure. He goes on to say that the following two questions need answering before a general theory of rhythm can be formulated:

- (1) At what structural level do rhythmic events begin to determine the tonal structure of a given work? (2) What is the nature of the relationship between the constituent rhythmic levels in a given work? Clearly, the analytic techniques developed by Schenker would be indispensable in the answering of these questions. (p. 21)

In "Some Problems in Rhythmic Theory and Analysis", Peter Westergaard discusses both Forte's comments and the ideas contained in the Cooper-Meyer book. Although he likes the flexibility of the Cooper-Meyer approach, he feels that it is inadequate and points to Forte's suggestions for the formulation

of a theory of rhythm for tonal music. Once this is accomplished, Westergaard suggests that it might be possible to apply Schenker's concepts to the study of rhythm in contemporary music. He points out that contemporary music and music of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are more closely related with respect to rhythm than pitch structure. He also notes that Schenker's ideas have already been applied to pitch structure in contemporary music. The rest of the article is concerned with an analyses of the rhythmic structure of Webern's Piano Variations, Op. 27 (third movement).

Two interesting and unique studies which employ Schenker's basic approach to music are: "The Fantaisie-Improptu--A Tribute to Beethoven" and "The Dramatic Character of the Egmont Overture", both by Ernst Oster. In the former, Oster compares Chopin's Fantaisie-Improptu with parts of Beethoven's Moonlight Sonata. After detailed analyses of both compositions, he comes to the conclusion that Chopin consciously and deliberately modeled his piece on some of the main features of Beethoven's finale. It is probably for this reason that Chopin kept it from publication. (It was published by Jules Fontana after the composer's death.) The major portion of the second article is devoted to a detailed analysis of Beethoven's Egmont Overture. Oster shows how Beethoven built an entire composition on a minimum of material and how he developed and shaped this material in a musical way to achieve a dramatic effect. In this context, he points out the necessity of considering music and drama on their own terms, not in terms of one another (as Wagner has done). In both of these articles, Oster states his belief that detailed and meaningful analysis is possible only with the use of Schenker's approach to music. Only in this way is it possible to discover the structural relationships which exist in a work of art.

It is difficult to determine the extent to which Schenker's ideas have influenced musical thought and practice in the twentieth century. The publications that have grown out of his work are testimony to the importance of his concepts but this alone is not an accurate measure of their influence. One can only guess at the impact they have had on music performance and pedagogy. Many musicians have openly stated their indebtedness to Schenker but few have done so in print. Two that have are Wilhelm Furtwängler and Bruno Walter. (See Reference 3.) A discussion of the importance of Schenker's ideas in relation to performance is contained in "Heinrich Schenker und grosse Interpreten" by Oswald Jonas. Schenker's ideas have also greatly influenced the teaching of harmony and counterpoint,



analysis, and even the composition of tonal music. There are numerous courses offered at colleges and universities in this country which are based to some degree on his approach to music. In a few of these the subject matter is approached from Schenker's point of view, but in many there is little correspondence between Schenker's ideas and what is actually taught. This latter situation is reflected in Israel Silberman's article, "Teaching Composition via Schenker's Theories". Silberman states that "any course of instruction in composition that purports to deal with classical style must take cognizance of the theoretical findings of Schenker". (p.301) His approach to teaching composition in this style is to analyze a given composition and then use its basic structure as a model for creating new compositions. (This approach is not really new. Composers have been writing music this way for centuries.) The composition used as a model in this article is the exposition of the first movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata, Op.2, No.1. One can overlook the fact that Silberman uses certain of Schenker's ideas and rejects others; many of them simply cannot be applied to the act of composing. What cannot be overlooked is his analysis of the Beethoven piece. Here it is evident that Silberman, despite all he has to say about Schenker, does not really understand the significance of Schenker's analytic approach. Nowhere in Examples 1 and 2 (diagrams) is there any indication of the relationships which exist within and among the different levels of structure in this piece. Also both reductions show the piece beginning on  $f^2$  rather than  $ab^2!$ \*37 It is unfortunate that Schenker's analysis of this piece (Der Tonwille, Heft 2) was not available to the author. Of course there are also many good ideas contained in this article. But what is deplorable is that Silberman's "application" of Schenker's ideas does not give a fair representation of his approach to musical structure.

The number of publications based on Schenker's theories is one testimony to their influence. In some cases this influence is subconscious (or at least undocumented)\*38, but most often it is clearly defined. Complete discussion of each of these publications is beyond the scope and purpose of this bibliography. The most important of these have been mentioned in the preceding discussion; others are simply listed in Appendix D. Before coming to a close, I would like to mention two further sources of interest. One is the "Analysis Symposium" (published in this periodical). The purpose of this symposium is to publish two or three analyses of the same composition for the purpose of comparison. An effort is made to represent diverse analytic approaches, one of these being oriented toward

Schenker's approach. The other is "The Music Forum" (edited by William Mitchell and Felix Salzer). In the first volume of this annual, the editors state their intent to publish, among other things, articles which are based on Schenker's approach to music. Both of these sources are helping to bring Schenker's ideas before the musical public. A particularly encouraging sign is the scheduled publication of some of Schenker's works that have not been generally available. Even more significant is the probability that translations of some of his works will be available in the near future. All of this points to an increasing interest in his work.

APPENDIX A: A CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING OF SCHENKER'S  
THEORETICAL WORKS

- 1904        Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik. Vienna: Universal Edition.
- 1906        Neue Musikalische Theorien und Phantasien. Vienna: Universal Edition.  
Vol. I: Harmonielehre.
- 1908        Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik. Neue revidierte und vermehrte Auflage.  
Vienna: Universal Edition.
- Instrumentations – Tabelle von "Artur Niloff". Vienna: Universal Edition.
- 1910        Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien. Vienna: Universal Edition.  
Vol. II, Part 1: Kontrapunkt (Cantus Firmus und zweistimmiger Satz).
- 1912        Beethovens neunte Sinfonie. Vienna: Universal Edition.
- 1921-1924   Der Tonwille. 10 issues. Vienna: A. Gutmann Verlag. (Republished  
later in 3 volumes by Universal Edition).
- 1922        Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien. Vienna: Universal Edition.  
Vol. II, Part 2: Kontrapunkt (Drei- und mehrstimmiger Satz).
- 1925        Beethovens fünfte Sinfonie. Vienna: A. Gutmann Verlag. (Also Universal  
Edition, 7646).
- 1925-1930   Das Meisterwerk in der Musik. München: Drei Masken Verlag.
- Jahrbuch I, 1925  
             Jahrbuch II, 1926  
             Jahrbuch III, 1930
- 1932        Fünf Urlinie – Tafeln. Vienna: Universal Edition.
- 1933        Johannes Brahms. Oktaven und Quinten u. A., aus dem Nachlass heraus-  
gegeben und erläutert von Henrich Schenker. Vienna: Universal Edition.
- 1935        Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien. Vienna: Universal Edition.  
Vol. III: Der freie Satz. Two Volumes: I, Text; II, Musical Figures.  
Second Edition, edited and revised by Oswald Jonas, 1956.

## APPENDIX B: SCHENKER'S EDITIONS OF MUSIC

Ph. Em. Bach. Klavierwerke. Neue kritische Ausgabe. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1902-3.

Vol. I: 6 Sonatas

Vol. II: 3 Sonatas, 4 Sonata movements, and 1 Rondo

G. F. Händel. Sechs Orgelkonzerte. Nach den Originalen für Klavier zu 4 Händen bearbeitet. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1904.

J. S. Bach. Chromatische Phantasie und Fuge (d moll). Kritische Ausgabe mit Anhang. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1910.

\*Erläuterungsausgaben der letzten fünf Sonaten Beethovens. Vienna: Universal Edition.

Sonata, op. 109, E dur, 1913

Sonata, op. 110, As dur, 1914

Sonata, op. 111, c moll, 1915

Sonata, op. 101, A dur, 1920

Beethoven. Sämtliche Klaviersonaten. Nach den Autographen rekonstruiert von Heinrich Schenker. Vienna: Universal Edition, 192-. Neue Ausgabe revidiert von Erwin Ratz. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1947.

Beethoven. Sonata, Op. 27, Nr. 2. Mit drei Skizzenblättern des meisters, herausgegeben in Faksimile - Reproduction von Heinrich Schenker. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1921.

\*Schenker was unable to complete this series because the autograph of Op. 106 was, and is, missing.

APPENDIX C: A PARTIAL LISTING OF ESSAYS AND REVIEWS  
BY HEINRICH SCHENKER

Die Zunkunft (Berlin)

"Mascagni in Wien". October, 1892.

"Eine jung-italienische Schule?". December, 1892.

"Mascagnis 'Rantzau'". February, 1893.

"Notizen zu Verdis Falstaff". May, 1893.

"Friedrich Smetana". July, 1893.

"Der Sonzongno-Markt in Wien". August, 1893.

\*"Anton Bruckner". October, 1893.

"Ruggiero Leoncavallo". January, 1894.

"Konzertdirigenten". April, 1894.

"Deutsch-Oesterreichischer Musikverkehr". April, 1894.

"Verdis Falstaff". May, 1894.

"Tantiemen für Instrumentalkomponisten". May, 1894.

"Anton Rubinstein". August, 1894.

"Eugen d'Albert". October, 1894.

"Siegfried Wagner". February, 1896.

"Das Heimchen am Herd" [Rubin Goldmark]. April, 1896.

"Johannes Brahms". May, 1897.

Neue Revue (Vienna)

- "Epilog zur Schubertfeier". February, 1897.
- "Johannes Brahms". April, 1897.

Die Zeit (Vienna)

- "Zur musikalischen Erziehung". September, 1895.
- \*"Mozarts 'Don Juan'". April, 1896.
- \*"Über Brahms". May, 1896.
- \*"Anton Bruckner". 1896.

Musikalisches Wochenblatt (Leipzig).

- "Brahms, 5 Gesänge für gemischten Chor op. 105". August, 1892.
- \*"Bruckner, Psalm 150 für Chor, Soli und Orchester". 1893.

Der Kunstwart (Munich). +

- "Eine Rettung der klassischen Musik-Texte: Das Archiv für Photogramme in der National-Bibliothek, Wien." March, 1929.
- "Ein verschollener Brief von Mozart und das Geheimnis seines Schaffens". July, 1931.

Wiener Abendpost

- "Beethoven 'Retouche'". January, 1901.

Der Geist der musikalischen Technik. (A brochure. Original brochure owned by the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Wien.)

+Further articles can be found in Deutsche Zeitschrift, a continuation of Der Kunstwart.

\*These articles were republished in: Der Dreiklang, Monatsschrift für Musik (edited by Oswald Jonas and Felix Salzer). Vienna: Krystall-Verlag. 1936-38. Also included in this publication are the following short essays and analyses by Schenker:

- "Vom Hintergrund in der Musik" (From Der freie Satz)
- "Von der Stimmführung im generalbass" (from the earlier unpublished version of Der freie Satz)
- "Von der Diminution" (From Der freie Satz)
- "Urlinietafel zu Haydns 'Chorale St. Antoni'"
- "Ein Kommentar zu Schindler, Beethovens Spiel betreffend"

## APPENDIX D: WORKS CONCERNING SCHENKER AND HIS THEORIES

## BOOKS

- Daniskas, John. *Grondslagen voor de Analytische Vormleer der Musiek*. Rotterdam: W.L. and J. Brusse, 1948.
- Federhofer, Hellmut. *Beiträge zur musikalischen Gestaltanalyse*. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1950.
- Forte, Allen. *Contemporary Tone Structures*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1955.
- Jonas, Oswald. *Das Wesen des musikalischen Kunstwerks. Eine Einführung in die Lehre Heinrich Schenkers*. Wien: Im Saturn-Verlag, 1934.
- Katz, Adele T. *Challenge to Musical Tradition: A New Concept of Tonality*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945.
- Salzer, Felix. *Sinn und Wesen der abendländischen Mehrstimmigkeit*. Wien: Saturn-Verlag, 1935.
- Salzer, Felix. *Structural Hearing: Tonal Coherence in Music*. Two volumes. New York: Charles Boni, 1952. New York: Dover Publications, 1962.
- Roth, Hermann. *Elemente der Stimmführung (Der strenge Satz)*. Stuttgart: Carl Grüniger Verlag, 1926.

## ARTICLES

- Bamberger, Carl. "Das Schenker-Institut am neuen Wiener Konservatorium", *Anbruch (Österreichische Zeitschrift für Musik)*, 18. Jahrgang, Heft 1 (Jänner-Februar, 1926), pp. 7-8.
- Citkowitz, Israel. "The Role Of Heinrich Schenker", *Modern Music*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (November-December, 1933), pp. 18-23.
- Dale, Frank Knight. "Heinrich Schenker and Musical Form", *Bulletin of the American Musicological Society*, Vols. 1-3, No. 7 (1936-41), pp. 12-13.
- "Der Nachlass Heinrich Schenkers", *Der Dreiklang (Monatsschrift für Musik)*, I (April, 1937), pp. 17-22. (Oswald Jonas, unsigned).
- Federhofer, Hellmut. "Die Funktionstheorie Hugo Riemanns und die Schichtenlehre Heinrich Schenkers", *Bericht über den Internationalen Musikwissenschaftlichen Kongress (Wien)*, 1956, pp. 183-190.
- Federhofer, Hellmut. "Die Musiktheorie Heinrich Schenkers", *Schweizerische Musikzeitung*, Jahrgang 87, Nr. 2 (Oktober, 1947), pp. 265-268.
- Federhofer, Hellmut. "Heinrich Schenker", *Anthony van Hoboken Festschrift (zum 75. Geburtstag)*. Mainz: B. Schott's Söhne, 1962, pp. 63-72.
- Federhofer, Hellmut. "Heinrich Schenker". *Riemann Musik Lexikon (zwölfte völlig neubearbeitete Auflage in drei Bänden herausgegeben von Willibald Gurlitt)*, Band 2. Mainz: B. Schott's Söhne, 1961, pp. 596-597.
- Forte, Allen. "Schenker's Conception of Musical Structure", *Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (April, 1959), pp. 1-30.

Geiringer, Karl. "Heinrich Schenker". *Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, edited by Eric Blom. Fifth Edition, 1954(Sixth Printing, 1964). New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., pp. 477-478 (Vol. 7).

Hartmann, Heinrich. "Heinrich Schenker und Karl Marx", *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift*, Jahrgang 7, Nr. 2(1952), pp. 46-52.

Hirshkorn, K. "Die Stimmführung als Leitstern des Geigers. Die Bedeutung Heinrich Schenkers", *Musikerziehung Zeitschrift zur Erneuerung der Musikpflege*, XII(1959), pp. 233-234.

Jonas, Oswald. Introduction to "Harmony" by Heinrich Schenker, trans. by Elisabeth Mann Borgese. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. v-xxiv. 1954.

Jonas, Oswald. "Die Kunst des Vortrags nach Heinrich Schenker", *Musikerziehung* (März, 1962), pp. 127-129.

Jonas, Oswald. "Heinrich Schenker". *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart: Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Musik*, edited by Friedrich Blume. Basel: Bärenreiter Kassel, 1963, columns 1670-1672(Vol. 11).

Jonas, Oswald. "Heinrich Schenker und grosse Interpreten", *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift*, Jahrgang 19(December, 1964), pp. 584-589.

Jonas, Oswald. "Nachtrag zu Schenkers Aufsatz über Schindler", *Musikerziehung* (1965), pp. 205-209.

Jonas, Oswald. "On the Study of Chopin's Manuscripts", *Chopin-Jahrbuch 1956* (Internationale Chopin-Gesellschaft). Wien: Amalthea-Verlag, pp. 142-155.

Jonas, Oswald. "The Photogram-Archives in Vienna", *Music and Letters*, 15 (1934), pp. 344-347.

Jonas, Oswald. "Das Wiener Photogramm-Archiv", *Anbruch*, 18. Jahrgang, Nr. 1(1936), pp. 6-7.

Katz, Adele. "Heinrich Schenker's Method of Analysis", *The Musical Quarterly*, Volume 21, No. 3(July, 1935), pp. 311-329.

Kaufmann, Harald. "Fortschritt und Reaktion in der Lehre Heinrich Schenkers", *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 126. Jahrgang, Heft 1(1965), pp. 5-9.

Kessler, Hubert. "On the Value of Schenker's Ideas for Analysis of Contemporary Music", *Periodical of Theory-Composition* (Illinois State Teacher's Association), I(1958), pp. 1-11. (Mimeograph).

Kolneder, Walter. "Sind Schenkers Analysen Beiträge zur Bacherkenntnis?", *Deutsches Jahrbuch der Musikwissenschaft*, 3. Jahrgang(1958), pp. 59-73.

Lang, Paul Henry. Editorial. *The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 2(1946), pp. 296-302.

Mann, Michael. "Schenker's Contribution to Music Theory", *The Music Review*, 10(1949), pp. 3-26.

Mitchell, William J. "Heinrich Schenker's Approach to Detail", *Musicology*, Vol. 1, No. 2(1946), pp. 117-128.

Oster, Ernst. "Register and Large-Scale Connection", *Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 5, No. 1(April, 1961), pp. 54-71.

Plettner, Arthur. "Heinrich Schenker's Contribution to Theory", *Musical America*, Vol. 56, No. 3(February 10, 1936), p. 14.

Reich, Willi. "Kant, Schenker und der Nachläufer", *Drei und Zwanzig*, Nr. 15-16 (1934), pp. 29-32.

Riezler, Walter. "Die Urlinie", *Die Musik*, Vol. 22, No. 7(April, 1930), pp. 502-510.

Salzer, Felix. "Die historische Sendung Heinrich Schenkers", *Der Dreiklang*, I(April, 1937), pp. 2-12.

"Heinrich Schenker". *Baker's Biographical Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. Fifth Edition, revised by Nicolas Slonimsky. New York: G. Schirmer, 1958, p. 1433.

Schmid, Edmund. "Autographe und Originalausgaben Beethovens", *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, 119. Jahrgang(December, 1958), pp. 746-747.

Siedel, Elmer. "Ursatz". *Riemann Musik Lexikon*(zwölfte völlig neubearbeitete Auflage in drei Bänden), Sachteil(begonnen von Willibald Gurlitt, fortgeführt und herausgegeben von Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht). Mainz: B. Schott's Söhne, 1967, pp. 1010-1011.

Sessions, Roger. "Escape by Theory". *Modern Music*, Vol. 15, No. 3(1938), pp. 192-197.

Sessions, Roger. "The Function of Theory". *Modern Music*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (1938), pp. 257-262.

Sessions, Roger. "Heinrich Schenker's Contribution", *Modern Music*, Vol. 12, No. 4(1935), pp. 170-178.

Silberman, Israel. "Teaching Composition Via Schenker's Theory". *Journal of Research in Music Education*, Vol. 12, No. 4(Winter, 1964), pp. 295-303.

Slatin, Sonia. "The Theories of Heinrich Schenker in Perspective". Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1967.

Travis, Roy. "Towards a New Concept of Tonality?", *Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 3, No. 2(November, 1959), pp. 257-284.

Vrieslander, Otto. "Heinrich Schenker", *Die Musik*, Vol. 19, No. 1(1926-27), pp. 33-38.

Vrieslander, Otto. "Heinrich Schenker", *Kunstwart*, IX(1930), pp. 181-189.

Waldeck, Arthur and Nathan Broder. "Musical Synthesis as Expounded by Heinrich Schenker", *The Musical Mercury*, Vol. 11, No. 4(1935), pp. 56-64.

Wingert, Hans. "Über die 'Urlinie' und ihren Schöpfer", *Zeitschrift für Musik*, Vol. 3, No. 5(1950), pp. 244-246.

Wolf, Hans. "Schenkers Persönlichkeit im Unterricht", *Der Dreiklang*, VII(Oktober, 1937), pp. 176-184.

Zuckerkandl, Victor. "Bekenntnis zu einem Lehrer", *Anbruch*, 17. Jahrgang, Heft 5(Mai, 1935), pp. 121-125.

Zuckerkandl, Victor. "Urlinie, Ursatz". *Harvard Dictionary of Music*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960, pp. 779-780.



## FURTHER SOURCES OF INTEREST

Analysis Symposium. Published at irregular intervals in the Journal of Music Theory.

Vol. 10, No. 1(Spring, 1966): Mozart's Menuetto in D, K. 355. Howard Boatwright and Ernst Oster, contributors.

Vol. 12, No. 2(Winter, 1968): Schubert's Moment musicale in C, Op. 94, No. 1. Matt Hughes, Lawrence Moss, and Carl Schacter, contributors.

Beach, David. "The Functions of the Six-Four Chord in Tonal Music", Journal of Music Theory, Vol. 11, No. 1(Spring, 1967), pp. 2-31.

Cockshoot, John V. The Fugue in Beethoven's Piano Music. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1959.

Der Dreiklang (Monatschrift für Musik), edited by Oswald Jonas and Felix Salzer. Vienna: Krystall-Verlag. 1937-38. This publication contains a number of articles and analyses, a few of which have been listed above, which are related to Schenker's theories.

Eibner, Franz. "Chopins Kontrapunktisches Denken", Chopin-Jahrbuch 1956 (Internationale Chopin-Gesellschaft). Wien: Amalthea-Verlag, pp. 103-122.

The Music Forum, edited by William J. Mitchell and Felix Salzer. New York: Columbia University Press. Vol. 1(1967): Bergquist, Peter. "Mode and Polyphony around 1500: Theory and Practice"; Mitchell, William J. "The Tristan Prelude: Techniques and Structure"; Salzer, Felix. "Tonality in Early Medieval Polyphony: Toward a History of Tonality".

Kliwer, Vernon L. "The Concept of Organic Unity in Music Criticism and Analysis". Ph.D. Dissertation, Indiana University, 1961.

Oster, Ernst. "The Dramatic Character of the Egmont Overture", Musicology, Vol. 2, No. 3(April, 1949), pp. 269-285.

Oster, Ernst. "The Fantaisie-Impromptu--A Tribute to Beethoven", Musicology, Vol. 1, No. 4(1947), pp. 407-429.

Reynolds, William. "Unity in Music", Journal of Music Theory, Vol. 2, No. 1 (April, 1958), pp. 97-104.

Salzer, Felix and Carl Schacter. Counterpoint in Composition: A Study in Voice Leading. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Thomson, W.E. "A Clarification of the Tonality Concept", Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Indiana, 1952.

Travis, Roy. "Directed Motion in Schönberg and Webern", Perspectives of New Music, Vol. 4, No. 2(Spring-Summer, 1966), pp. 84-89.

Vrieslander, Otto. "Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach als Theoretiker", Von Neuer Musik(1925), pp. 222-279.

Westergaard, Peter. "Some Problems in Rhythmic Theory and Analysis", Perspectives of New Music, Vol. 1, No. 1(Fall, 1962), pp. 180-190.

## R E F E R E N C E S

- 1 An attempt to formulate a theory of the twelve-tone system analogous to Schenker's theory of tonality is mentioned by Michael Kassler in his article, "Toward a Theory That is the Twelve-Note-Class System", *Perspectives of New Music*, Vol. 5, No. 2(Spring-Summer 1967), footnote 53.
- 2 The word theorist should be emphasized here. In no way do I intend to belittle the importance and influence of composers like Schoenberg and Webern on Twentieth-century musical thought.
- 3 Schenker, of course, intended many of his ideas to relate directly or indirectly to performance. The influence of his ideas on two prominent musicians, Wilhelm Furtwängler and Bruno Walter, is pointed out by Allen Forte in his article, "Schenker's Conception of Musical Structure" (*Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 1-2). Furtwängler devotes a chapter to Schenker in his book, *Ton und Wort* (Wiesbaden: F. A. Brokhaus, 1954), and Walter acknowledges Schenker's influence in his autobiography, *Theme and Variations* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947).
- 4 A biography of Schenker by Oswald Jonas, to be published in Germany, is now in preparation. I would hope that some of this information will be included in that publication.
- 5 *Harmonielehre*, the first volume of *Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien*, was first published anonymously – by an artist [von einem Künstler] – in 1906 by J. G. Cotta, Stuttgart. The publication rights were taken over by Universal Edition at a later date.
- 6 Oswald Jonas, *Introduction to Schenker's Harmony*, translated by Elisabeth Mann Borgese (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), p. ix.
- 7 Part 1 of *Kontrapunkt* was first published by J. G. Cotta (Stuttgart) in 1910. Part 2 was published by Universal Edition in 1922.
- 8 Two of those who have reviewed this important work are Roger Sessions ("Escape by Theory", *Modern Music*, Vol. 15, No. 3. (1939), pp. 192-197) and Carl Dahlhaus (*Die Musikforschung*, XII(1959), pp. 523-525).
- 9 The relationship between these concepts and the foreground of a composition has proved a stumbling block for many. It is impossible to grasp their meaning and significance without having followed, step by step, the process of reduction which led Schenker to them.
- 10 Oswald Jonas, op. cit., p. xxiv.
- 11 *Jahrbuch III* has been reviewed by Oswald Jonas (*Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, XV(1932-33), pp. 92-94.) and E. W. (*Music and Letters*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (1931), pp. 306-307.).
- 12 "Five Analyses in Sketchform" was published simultaneously by the David Mannes Music School (New York) under the direction of Hans Weisse, one of Schenker's students. Weisse, an influential teacher himself, was really the first to introduce Schenker's theories to this country in the 1930's.
- 13 Allen Forte, "Schenker's Conception of Musical Structure", *Journal of Music Theory*, 3(1959), p. 25.

- 14 This translation has been reviewed by J.K. Andrews (*Music and Letters*, Vol. 37, No. 2(1956), pp.180-182) and William J. Mitchell (*The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 41, No. 1(1955), pp.256-260).
- 15 I have seen a copy of Dunn's translation of *Kontrapunkt*, Part II, owned by Ernst Oster. It is handwritten and reproduced by Opolograph, University of Edinburgh.
- 16 Another translation of *Der freie Satz* was done by T. Howard Krueger (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1960).
- 17 Translation of other essays and analyses by Schenker are scheduled for publication in future issues of this periodical. This is also the case with *The Music Forum*, edited by William Mitchell and Felix Salzer (New York: Columbia University Press).
- 18 The following three sources were particularly helpful to me in compiling Appendix D: Hest, Jeffrey. "A Union Bibliography of the Works of Heinrich Schenker and Works Pertaining to the Schenkerian System of Analysis", Queens College of the City University of New York, February, 1968 (first draft, unpublished); Mast, Paul. "Heinrich Schenker", Eastman School of Music, May 1969 (bibliography unpublished); Slatin, Sonia. "The Theories of Heinrich Schenker in Perspective", Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University, 1967 (bibliography).
- 19 A completely revised and enlarged edition of this book is being prepared by Jonas and is scheduled for publication by Universal Edition (UE26202) in the fall of 1969.
- 20 An attempt to organize Schenker's ideas into textbook form has been made by Felix Salzer (also a Schenker student) in his book, *Structural Hearing: Tonal Coherence in Music*. However, many of the ideas presented in this book are either those of the author or his own personal adaptation of those of Schenker. For this reason, *Structural Hearing* was not intended nor should it be considered, as is often the case, as truly representative of Schenker's ideas.
- 21 Other informative introductions to Schenker's ideas are: Oswald Jonas, Introduction to "Harmony", trans. by Elisabeth Mann Borgese (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954); Arthur Waldeck and Nathan Broder, "Musical Synthesis as Expounded by Heinrich Schenker" (*The Musical Mercury*, Vol. II, No. 4(1935)); Milton Babbitt, Review of Salzer's "Structural Hearing" (*Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 5, No. 3(Fall 1952), pp. 260-265.
- 22 One such criticism appears in H. K. Andrew's review of Schenker's "Harmony", edited by Oswald Jonas and translated by Elisabeth Mann Borgese (University of Chicago Press, 1954), in *Music and Letters*, Vol. 37(1956), pp.180-182. Besides his objection to Schenker's "acceptance of an (albeit modified) acoustical basis for harmony", Andrews criticizes him for his "almost complete disregard for the history and development of music and musical technique before the time of J.S. Bach".
- 23 Another who has characterized Schenker's theories as being static is Leonard Meyer (*Emotion and Meaning in Music*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956, pp. 52-54).
- 24 Milton Babbitt. Review of Salzer's "Structural Hearing" in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 5, No. 3(Fall 1952), p. 262.

- 25 Roger Sessions. "Heinrich Schenker's Contribution", *Modern Music*, Vol. 12, No. 4(1935). A more vehement attack by Sessions on the same subject can be found in "Escape by Theory" (A review of *Der freie Satz*), *Modern Music*, Vol. 15, No. 3(1938).
- 26 Michael Mann. "Schenker's Contribution to Music Theory", *The Music Review*, Vol. 10(1949), pp.16-17.
- 27 Paul Henry Lang. Editorial. *The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 2(April 1946), pp.296-302.
- 28 In "Heinrich Schenker und grosse Interpreten" (*Österreichische Musikzeitschrift*, December, 1964), Oswald Jonas points out that Schenker was a practical musician (composer, performer, critic) as well as a theorist. He also indicates the impact Schenker's ideas have had on performance.
- 29 *Contemporary Tone Structures* has been reviewed by Hans Keller (*Music and Letters*, Vol. 32, No. 2(1956), pp.187-189) and Howard Boatwright (*Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 1, No. 1(1957), pp.112-118). A rebuttal by Forte to the latter was published in the *Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp.201-205, and Boatwright's subsequent answer was published in the following issue, pp.85-92.
- 30 *Challenge to Musical Tradition* has been reviewed by Percy M. Young (*Music and Letters*, Vol. 28, No. 4(1947), pp.390-391) and Paul Henry Lang (Editorial, *The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 2(1946), pp.296-302). The latter is more of an attack on Schenker than an evaluation of Miss Katz's book.
- 31 *Structural Hearing* has been reviewed by Milton Babbitt (*Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 5, No. 3(1952), pp.260-265), Nathan Broder (*The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 39, No. 1(1953), pp.126-129), and Norman Lloyd [pro] and Oswald Jonas [con] (*Notes*, Vol. 10, No. 3(June, 1953), p.438 and p.439). In the Introduction to Schenker's "Harmony" (translated by Elisabeth Mann Borgese), Jonas criticizes Salzer as follows:  

Recently an attempt was made to offset this objection [that Schenker's theory is too 'narrow' and 'lopsided'] by applying Schenker's ideas to modern music and its interpretation: 'Structural Hearing' by Felix Salzer (New York: Charles Boni, 1952). Such an attempt was possible only through misinterpretation of Schenker's basic theories, first of all his concept of tonality, and therefore is failed to doom. (footnote 2, p. viii)
- 32 Much of the third part of *Structural Hearing* is concerned with the analysis of older music. The application of Schenker's ideas to the analysis of this music was begun by Salzer in his earlier work, *Sinn und Wesen der abendländischen Mehrstimmigkeit* (Wien: Saturn-Verlag, 1935).
- 33 A textbook on counterpoint which is strongly influenced by Schenker's ideas has recently been published: *Counterpoint in Composition* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969) by Felix Salzer and Carl Schachter.

- 34 A response to this article by Ernst Oster marks the beginning of an interesting controversy. In "Re: A New Concept of Tonality(?)" (*Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 4, No. 1(April, 1960), pp.85-98), Oster criticizes Travis on a number of points. His main criticism centers around Travis' total reliance on Salzer's Structural Hearing as a source of information and ideas. A number of errors in his analyses of the Chopin and Mozart pieces are detected and Oster points out that Schenker's analysis of one of the same pieces was never consulted. He also criticizes Travis for his failure to indicate the differences between his approach and Schenker's. Along the way, Oster criticizes Salzer for making similar modifications in Schenker's ideas and his failure to document these changes.

In a Letter to the Editor (*Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 4, No. 2(November, 1960), pp.274-275), Hans Neumann responds to Oster's criticisms of Salzer's Structural Hearing. He criticizes Oster for misrepresenting Salzer's intentions for implying that Salzer had "belittled" Schenker's work. Neumann states that Salzer had given Schenker sufficient credit and therefore was under no obligation to "account for every single departure from dogmatism and orthodoxy". Otherwise he does not discuss the merits of Oster's criticisms of Salzer's and Travis' extensions of Schenker's ideas.

Oster's point of view is defended by Arthur Komar in his Letter to the Editor (*Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 5, No. 1(April 1961), pp.152-156). Komar points to the fact that Salzer departs from Schenker even in his approach to traditional music. He gives three examples of instances where their analyses of pieces by Beethoven and Chopin differ. And although he does not feel it was necessarily Salzer's responsibility to do so, Komar states that it would indeed clarify the situation if all departures from Schenker were documented. Komar's main objection is to those who "cite Structural Hearing as the published source of their knowledge of Schenkerian techniques". Roy Travis is included in those he mentions.

- 35 A review of this book by Mosco Carner was published in *Music and Letters*, Vol. 32, No. 2(1951), pp.177-180.
- 36 Cooper, Grosvenor and Leonard B. Meyer. *The Rhythmic Structure of Music*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- 37 A better analysis of the opening measures of this piece is contained in "Heinrich Schenker's Method of Analysis" (*The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 3(1935), Example 9) by Adele Katz.
- 38 One example of this is "Unity in Music" (*Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 2, No. 1(April, 1959), pp.97-104) by William H. Reynolds. Although Schenker's name is never mentioned, a number of ideas and terms generally associated with his approach to music are used by the author. In "Re: Analysis and Elementary Harmony" (*Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 2, No. 2(November, 1958), pp.240-249), William Gettel disagrees with many of the statements contained in the Reynolds article. Gettel also makes use of a number of ideas and terms generally associated with Schenker's name. (Schenker and Salzer's Structural Hearing are mentioned in footnote 1.) In "Re: Analysis and Unity" (*Journal of Music Theory*, Vol. 3, No. 1(April, 1959), pp.140-147), Reynolds replies to Gettel's criticisms.