

- *Suzanne Danco, Guido Agosti (London LPS 23)
- *Anton Dermota, Hilde Dermota (Telefunken LGX 66023)
- *Ernst Haefliger, Eric Werba (Heliodor 25048)
- Lotte Lehmann, Bruno Walter (Odyssey 32 16 0315)
- *Petre Munteanu, Franz Holetschek (Westminster WN 18010)
- Peter Pears, Benjamin Britten (London OSA-1261)
- Aksel Schiøtz, Gerald Moore (Danish Odeon MOAK-3)
- *Cesare Valetti, Leo Taubman (RCA Victor LM/LSC 2412)
- Fritz Wunderlich, Hubert Giesen (Deutsche Grammophon 139125)

The following analyses represent a variety of views concerning Songs 2-5. My purpose in presenting the additional analyses is to offer the reader some alternatives to the analyses presented above, as well as to emphasize the important point that analyses are theories, not facts, and that the presentation of an analysis is never, in and of itself, a disproof of some other analysis of the same work.

The excerpt by Allen Forte uses Schenker's sketches of Song 2 as an illustration of Schenker's analytic theories and techniques, which are the basis for all the analyses presented here.

HEINRICH SCHENKER



[Song 2][†]

The biographical facts of the life of Heinrich Schenker (1867-1935) are hardly commensurate with the importance and influence of his theories in academic circles today. Having, as a young man, caught the attention of Brahms and Busoni, Schenker went on to become a private teacher of piano and theory. He attracted a talented student clientele, some of whom—most notably Oswald Jones, Felix Salzer, and the late Hans Weisse—emigrated to the United States and brought his theories to several universities and conservatories here. Schenker wrote many books and essays, a great number of which were published (in the original German). To date, only his *Harmony* (written in 1906) and *Five Graphic Music Analyses* (dating from his last years) are available in English (along with a few articles). Schenker's culminating work, *Der freie Satz* (Free Composition), was just short of completion at the author's death. Although still available in the original German, no English translation of this important book has yet been published. A survey and discussion of Schenker's basic theoretical ideas can be found in Allen Forte's essay *Schenker's Conception of Musical Structure*¹, a portion of which follows this excerpt.

[†] From *Der freie Satz*, 2nd rev. ed., Anhang, Fig. 22b, p. 8. The commentary appears in the discussion of the concept of "interruption," p. 71 of the main volume. Copyright 1956, Universal Edition; used by permission.

1. *Journal of Music Theory*, III/1 (April, 1959), 1-30.

Commentary: The bass carries an arpeggiation of the fifth down through the third without, however, invalidating the interruption.

ALLEN FORTE

[Schenker's Analysis of Song 2][†]

Allen Forte is one of a handful of American theorists who have been responsible for promulgating the theories of Schenker in the English-speaking world. Currently a member of the theory department at Yale University, Forte is the author of numerous books and articles on theory and for several years was editor of the *Journal of Music Theory*.

I can think of no more satisfactory way to introduce Schenker's ideas, along with the terminology and visual means which express them, than to comment at some length upon one of his analytic sketches. For this purpose I have selected from *Der freie Satz* a sketch of a complete short

[†] From *Schenker's Conception of Musical Structure*, in *Journal of Music Theory*, III/1 (April, 1959), 7-14, 23-24. Reprinted by permission of the *Journal of Music Theory*, Copyright, 1959.

work, the second song from Schumann's *Dichterliebe* [see above]. I shall undertake to read and interpret this sketch, using, of course, English equivalents for Schenker's terms.¹

Here in visual form is Schenker's conception of musical structure: the total work is regarded as an interacting composite of three main levels. Each of these structural levels is represented on a separate staff in order that its unique content may be clearly shown. And to show how the three levels interact, Schenker has aligned corresponding elements vertically. I shall make a quick survey of this analytic sketch and then give a more detailed explanation.

The lowest staff contains the major surface events, those elements which are usually most immediately perceptible. Accordingly, Schenker has designated this level as the *foreground*. In deriving his foreground sketch from the fully notated song, Schenker has not included all its actual note values. Those which he does include represent in some cases the actual durational values of the work; but more often they represent the relative structural weight which he has assigned to the particular tone or configuration. This sketch omits repeated tones, and shows inner voices in mm. 8-12² only, indicating that there they have greater influence upon the voice-leading.

On the middle staff Schenker has represented the structural events which lie immediately beyond the foreground level. These events, which do not necessarily occur in immediate succession in relation to the foreground, comprise the *middleground*. It should be evident now that the analytic procedure is one of *reduction*; details which are subordinate with respect to larger patterns are gradually eliminated—in accordance with criteria which I will explain further on.

Finally, on the upper staff, he has represented the fundamental structural level, or *background*, which controls the entire work.

Now let us consider the content of each level in some detail. This will provide an opportunity to examine other important aspects of Schenker's thought, all derived from his central concept.

A series of sketches such as this can be read in several directions.

1. The rendering of Schenker's technical expressions into English presents a number of problems, not the least of which is the fact that there are already, in some cases, two or more published versions of the same term. It is to be hoped that with the publication of *Der freie Satz* (now being translated) a standard nomenclature will be established.

2. The initial *T* which stands at the upper left of the bottom sketch is short for *Takt*, meaning "measure." Measures 5-8 are omitted, as indicated by (*Wdh*) [*Wiederholung*], meaning "repetition". [Editor]

For the purpose of the present introductory explanation it would seem advantageous to begin with the level which contains the fewest elements and proceed from there to the level which contains the most—thus, reading from top to bottom or from background to foreground. By reading the sketches in this order we also gain a clear idea of Schenker's concept of *prolongation*: each subsequent level expands, or *prolongs*, the content of the previous level.

The background of this short song, and of all tonal works, whatever their length, is regarded as a temporal projection of the tonic triad. The upper voice projects the triad in the form of a descending linear succession which, in the present case, spans the lower triadic third. Schenker marks this succession, which he called the *Urlinie*, or fundamental line, in two ways: (1) with numerals (and carets) which designate the corresponding diatonic scale degrees, and (2) with the balken [i.e. beam] which connects the stemmed *open* notes (I shall explain the black noteheads shortly). The triad is also projected by the bass, which here outlines the triadic fifth, the tonality-defining interval. Schenker calls this fundamental bass motion *Bassbrechung*, or bass arpeggiation. Like the fundamental line, it is represented in open note-heads. The fundamental line and the bass arpeggiation coordinate, forming a contrapuntal structure, the *Ursatz*, or fundamental structure which constitutes a complete projection of the tonic triad.³ Thus, to Schenker, motion within tonal space is measured by the triad, not by the diatonic scale.

Observe that in this case the most direct form of the fundamental structure would be the three-interval succession in the outer voices:
 fundamental line, $\overset{\textcircled{3}}{3}-\overset{\textcircled{2}}{2}-\overset{\textcircled{1}}{1}$
 bass arpeggiation, I-V-I

The background sketch shows that this succession occurs consecutively only in the last part of the song. The song begins unambiguously with $\overset{\textcircled{3}}{3}$; however, it does not progress immediately to $\overset{\textcircled{2}}{2}$ and from there on to $\overset{\textcircled{1}}{1}$; instead, the first interval is *prolonged* as shown in the sketch: the upper voice C \sharp first receives an embellishment, or diminution, in the form of the third-spanning motion, C \sharp -B-A (represented in black noteheads), and then moves over a larger span (shown by the beam) to B on the last eighth-note of m. 8, where it is supported by the bass V. (This

3. Each tonal work manifests one of three possible forms of the fundamental line, always a descending diatonic progression: 3-1 (as in the present case), 5-1 and 8-1. Variants upon these forms arise when the bass arpeggiation disposes the fundamental line components in different ways.

V is not to be equated with the final V [m. 15], which effects a closure of the fundamental line.) Schenker then shows how this initial prolongation is followed by a restatement of $\overset{\textcircled{3}}{3}$ and the completion of the succession $\overset{\textcircled{3}}{3}-\overset{\textcircled{2}}{2}-\overset{\textcircled{1}}{1}$.
 I-V-I.

To recapitulate, there are two prolongational classes shown in this background sketch. The first includes diminutions, or prolongational tones of shorter span (represented by black noteheads); the second includes the larger prolongational motion from $\overset{\textcircled{3}}{3}$ to $\overset{\textcircled{2}}{2}$ (connected by the beam) which comprises the controlling melodic pattern of the first phrase. Schenker regards this larger prolongation motion as an *interruption* of the direct succession, $\overset{\textcircled{3}}{3}-\overset{\textcircled{2}}{2}-\overset{\textcircled{1}}{1}$, and represents it by placing parallel vertical lines above the staff following $\overset{\textcircled{3}}{3}-\overset{\textcircled{2}}{2}$. The fundamental structure, which is in this case the uninterrupted succession $\overset{\textcircled{3}}{3}-\overset{\textcircled{2}}{2}-\overset{\textcircled{1}}{1}$ therefore may be considered as the essential content of the background.⁴ In reading Schenker's analytic sketches a distinction must often be drawn between the background level *in toto*, which sometimes includes prolongations of primary order as in the present case, and the essential *content* of that level, the fundamental structure. Thus, "fundamental structure" designates a specific contrapuntal organization which assumes several possible forms, whereas "background" is a term which may include other events in addition to the fundamental structure, as in the present instance, where it includes two prolongations, each belonging to a different structural order. This distinction, not always clearly drawn by Schenker, is indispensable to the full understanding of his sketches and commentaries. In this connection I point out that within each of the three main structural levels several sub-levels are possible, depending upon the unique characteristics of the particular composition.⁵

The idea of the interrupted fundamental line provides the basis for Schenker's concept of form. For example, in the typical sonata-allegro form in the major mode, interruption of the fundamental linear progression at the close of the exposition normally gives rise in the

4. It should be apparent that Schenker's major concept is not that of the *Ursatz*, as is sometimes maintained, but that of structural levels, a far more inclusive idea.

5. Undoubtedly Schenker compressed many of his sketches in consideration of the practical requirements of publication. Mr. Ernst Oster, who has in his possession a large number of Schenker's unpublished materials—which he plans to present along with commentaries at a future date—has brought this to my attention. Schenker's unpublished sketches of Brahms' *Waltzes*, Opus 39, for example, are executed on several superimposed staves, so that each structural level is shown distinctly and in detail.

development section to a prolongation which centers on V. Of course, the prolonged fundamental line component varies, depending upon which form of the fundamental structure is in operation and upon which specific prolongation motions occur at the background level.

Before explaining the middleground, I should like to direct attention again to the diminution which spans the third below C# (black noteheads). By means of the numerals 3, 2, 1, enclosed in parentheses, Schenker indicates that the motion duplicates the large descending third of the fundamental line. This is an instance of a special kind of repetition which Schenker called *Übertragung der Ursatzformen* (transference of the forms of the fundamental structure). Throughout his writings he demonstrates again and again that tonal compositions abound in hidden repetitions of this kind, which he distinguishes from more obvious motivic repetitions at the foreground level.

We can interpret the content of the middleground most efficiently by relating it to the background just examined. The first new structural event shown at the middleground level is the expansion of the smaller prolongational third (black noteheads) by means of the upper adjacent tone,⁶ D, which serves as a prefix. The sketch shows how this prolongational element is counterpointed by the bass in such a way as to modify the original (i.e. background) third. That is, the figured-bass numerals in parentheses indicate that the second C# (black notehead) is a dissonant passing-tone, and therefore is not to be equated with the initial C#, which serves as the point of departure for the fundamental line. The adjacent tone D recurs in m. 14, where Schenker assigns more structural weight to it, as indicated by the stem. I reiterate that conventional durational values are used in the analytic sketches to indicate the relative position of a given component or configuration in the tonal hierarchy—the greater the durational value, the closer the element to the background.

In addition to the prolongation described in the preceding paragraph, the middleground contains the essentials of the prolongational middle section (mm. 9-12) which appears in more detail in the foreground sketch. Schenker regards this entire middle section as a prolongation of the background fifth formed by $\frac{5}{V}$. Its main feature is the inner voice which descends from G# to E, a middleground duplication of the fundamental line's third. The bass which counterpoints this inner voice arpeggiates the tonic triad, E-C#-A. Schenker shows how the

6. Schenker's abbreviation, "Nbn," stands for *Nebennote*, or in English, adjacent tone (not "neighbor tone").

arpeggiation is partially filled in by the passing tone, D, and by slurring E to A he indicates that he considers that motion to be the controlling bass motion, within which the C# functions as a connective of primarily melodic significance.⁷ Here we have an example of the careful distinction which Schenker always draws between major bass components or *Stufen*, which belong to the background level, and more transient, contrapuntal-melodic events at the foreground and middleground levels.

A brief consideration of three additional events will complete our examination of the middleground level. First, observe that the diatonic inner-voice descent in the middle section, G#-E, is filled in by a chromatic passing-tone, G. Schenker has enclosed this in parentheses to indicate that it belongs to a subsidiary level within the middleground. Second, observe that just before the inner-voice motion is completed on the downbeat of m. 12, the G#, its point of departure, is restated by an additional voice which is introduced above it. Schenker has pointed out that in "free" compositions, particularly instrumental works, the possibility of more elaborate prolongation is greatly increased by introducing additional voices, as well as by abandoning voices already stated. The final event to observe here occurs in the middle section: the motion from B, the retained upper voice, to C# on the downbeat of m. 12. This direct connection does not actually occur at the foreground level, but Schenker, feeling that it is strongly implied by the voice-leading context, encloses the implied C# in parentheses and ties it to the actual C#, thereby indicating that it is an anticipation.

In the foreground sketch Schenker represents for the first time the metrical organization of the song. As I have already mentioned, he shows there some of the actual durational values, in addition to using these as sketch symbols. This reveals the position assigned to meter and rhythm in his system: he considered them to be important structural determinants at the middleground and foreground levels but subsidiary to the fundamental tonal organization, which, he maintained, was arhythmic. * * *

Let us now examine some of the relationships which Schenker has shown in his sketch of the foreground, this time beginning with the bass. In m. 3 he encloses the bass-note A in parentheses and marks it with the abbreviation, *Kons. Dg.* (*Konsonanter Durchgang* or "consonant passing-tone"). By this he indicates that the tenth which the bass A forms with

7. The author adds here a footnote calling attention to Schenker's remarks, page 96 above, noting that this is one of Schenker's few comments upon this sketch. [Editor]

rhythmic
ss
secondary

the upper-voice $C\sharp$ transforms the latter, a dissonant passing-tone at the middleground level, into a consonance at the foreground level. In this way he also intends to indicate the function of the chord at that point. Since it supports a passing-tone in the upper voice it is a passing chord. In addition, it belongs only to the foreground and therefore is to be distinguished from the initial tonic chord, a background element. Two of Schenker's most important convictions underlie this treatment of detail: (1) that the study of strict counterpoint provides the indispensable basis for a thorough understanding of the details, as well as the larger patterns of a composed work, and (2) that the function of a chord depends upon its context, not upon its label. This can be seen in his notation of the chords in this sketch. Although he uses the conventional Roman numerals he provides them with slurs, dashes and parentheses to show their relative values in the tonal hierarchy. Thus, the long slur from I to I indicates that the IV and V chords lie within the control of that chord, while the abbreviation, *Vdg.* (*Vordergrund*) shows that the succession belongs to the foreground. And in the middle section, mm. 8-12, the parentheses show that the chords between V and I are subsidiary chords. These arise as part of the prolongational complex at that point and stand in contrast to the stable background chords I and V.

Now let us turn to the melody. We can most efficiently examine its structure by first comparing each foreground prolongation (slurred) with the larger middleground prolongation immediately above it, and then by relating both the foreground and middleground to the background. In this way we see that the foreground prolongation of the first section spans a descending third twice, thus duplicating the successively larger thirds at the middleground and background levels. In the middle section the melody undergoes more elaborate development. There, by means of connecting beams, Schenker shows how the upper voice skips down to the inner voice and back again. The ascending skips comprise a sequence of two fourths, which are marked by brackets and emphasized by a typically Schenkerian exclamation point. This sequence lends support to his reading of the implied anticipation of $C\sharp$ in the upper voice of m. 12, mentioned earlier.

The foreground of the middle section provides a good example of Schenker's concept of "melody" (he avoided the term in his writings) as a self-contained polyphonic structure. This valuable aspect of his theory,⁸

8. A highly interesting application of this concept is to be found in Schenker's essay, "Das Organische der Fuge" (*Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*, Munich, 1925-30,

which is absolutely indispensable to any kind of intelligent melodic analysis, is well substantiated by compositional practice. There are many passages in the literature where polyphonic melodies, implied at one point (often the beginning) are subsequently realized in full, for example in the first movement of Mozart's *Sonata in A minor*, or in Brahms' *Intermezzo in B \flat major*, Op. 76/4; and, of course, we find a special development of this concept in Bach's compositions for solo violin and for solo cello.⁹ Here, in the foreground sketch of the middle section the diagonal beams show that the vocal melody shifts back and forth between two lines, the lower of which belongs to the accompaniment. It is evident that this section contains the most intricate upper-voice prolongation.

It also contains the most elaborate bass motion. The sketch shows how the bass provides counterpoint to the upper-voice (foreground) prolongation of B, bass and upper voice comprising the interval succession 5-10-5-10-5, which is enclosed within the middleground outer-voice succession, $B-C\sharp$. Observe that the upper voice alternates between an upper adjacent-tone prolongation of B (marked *Nbn.*) and the skips into the inner voice which were explained in the preceding paragraph. The lowest voice in this passage is subordinate to the voice which lies immediately above it, $E-D-C\sharp$, the latter succession being the actual bass line (cf. middleground sketch). Nor does its registral position above the foreground bass lessen its importance as the main motion-determinant in the lower voices. Therefore, the foreground bass which displaces or covers it registrally might be termed a "pseudo-bass."¹⁰

One final aspect of the foreground-sketch deserves mention: the form. Schenker indicates this with the customary letters and exponents. The foreground form therefore corresponds to the form-generating interruption at the middleground and background levels as follows:

Statement	Interruption	Restatement and closure
A ¹	B	A ²

It should be apparent that an analysis of this kind embraces all the

Vol. II), where he employs his technique of synthesis, or reconstruction, to demonstrate that the subject of Bach's *C-minor Fugue* (WTC I) implies a complete, self-contained contrapuntal structure.

9. Cf. Johann David Heinichen, *Der General-Bass in der Composition*, Leipzig, 1728, pp. 558ff: "Das 2-stimmige Harpeggio," "Das 3-stimmige Harpeggio," etc.

10. Relationships of this kind occasionally cause students to be confused; by assigning a structural event to the wrong level they necessarily arrive at a misreading. The technique of reconstruction serves as a corrective in such instances.

information generally included under the heading "form and analysis" but that it goes far beyond to interpret the relationships to the background which are revealed during its initial phases, where the main concern is to achieve an accurate reading of foreground and middle-ground.

A summary of this analysis should properly include a classification of the chromatic chords in the middle section of the piece, and a more precise explanation of the coordination of linear intervals at the foreground level, the descending thirds and fifths (which latter take the form of diminished fifths and ascending fourths in the middle section). However, because of space limitations, I shall not undertake a summary here, but instead go on to discuss other aspects of Schenker's work. If the preceding commentary has succeeded in demonstrating some of Schenker's more important ideas, as well as clarifying some of the vocabulary and visual devices which he employs to express those ideas, it has fulfilled its purpose.

* * *

Schenker approached compositional problems mainly through the principles of strict counterpoint, in the conviction that these underlay the intricate works of the major composers. This belief was supported by his knowledge of the training received by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and others. Nowhere is this fundamental aspect of Schenker's thought more apparent than in the first and third sections of *Der freie Satz*, which comprise a condensed reinterpretation of principles formulated years earlier in *Kontrapunkt*.

With the aid of this methodologically valuable norm, Schenker was able to investigate many aspects of compositional technique which otherwise would have remained inaccessible. Again and again he demonstrated that foreground detail, with its multiple meanings, could be understood only in relation to the middleground and background, which provide definition in accord with the principles of strict counterpoint. As a study technique he occasionally considered alternate solutions in order to reveal compositional determinants more clearly. To illustrate this, I shall undertake to explain the structural factors which determined Schumann's choice of the secondary dominant (A_7) chord in mm. 12-13. * * * (To avoid misunderstanding, I point out that this discussion is not directly related to Schenker's sketch.) In view of the strong tendency of the preceding $C\sharp$ major chord to progress to an $F\sharp$ minor (VI) chord, the A_7 chord seems abrupt, has the effect of a discontinuous element,

and therefore requires special explanation. True, it leads to the upper-voice adjacent tone, D, an essential foreground element which, in accord with the rhythmic pattern already established, as well as with the consistent association of the adjacent-tone motive, $D-C\sharp$ with the verbs in the poem, must occur on the downbeat of m. 13. But, as shown in

Ex. 1



Ex. 1, the alternate solution, this tone could also be reached without the aid of the A_7 chord. This indicates that the upper-voice D on m. 14 lacks the support of the IV chord, which was impossible to reach logically beginning from the VI. But the most striking omission in the alternate version is the chromatically descending inner-voice, which, in the original version, begins with the $G\sharp$ carried by the $C\sharp$ chord, moves through A to $G\sharp$ in the A_7 chord, descends to $F\sharp-F$ over IV, and finally moves through E to $D-C\sharp$ over V^7I . Observe that this striking inner-voice line concludes in m. 15 with a statement of the characteristic upper-adjacent-tone motive.¹⁰ We can therefore infer that Schumann selected the A_7 chord in question not only because of its secondary-dominant relation to the IV at m. 14, but primarily because the A_7 chord carries $G\sharp$, an essential component in the long descending line just described. Using Schenker's concept of structural levels as a criterion we can therefore say that the contrapuntal-melodic reason for the A_7 chord

What features of the original passage are most noticeably missing from the alternate? First, it is apparent that the upper-voice D on m. 14 lacks the support of the IV chord, which was impossible to reach logically beginning from the VI. But the most striking omission in the alternate version is the chromatically descending inner-voice, which, in the original version, begins with the $G\sharp$ carried by the $C\sharp$ chord, moves through A to $G\sharp$ in the A_7 chord, descends to $F\sharp-F$ over IV, and finally moves through E to $D-C\sharp$ over V^7I . Observe that this striking inner-voice line concludes in m. 15 with a statement of the characteristic upper-adjacent-tone motive.¹⁰ We can therefore infer that Schumann selected the A_7 chord in question not only because of its secondary-dominant relation to the IV at m. 14, but primarily because the A_7 chord carries $G\sharp$, an essential component in the long descending line just described. Using Schenker's concept of structural levels as a criterion we can therefore say that the contrapuntal-melodic reason for the A_7 chord

10. As in mm. 3-4 (7-8) Schumann here requires the accompanist to interlock the hands in such a way that this motive is naturally stressed.

is more important here than the harmonic (fifths relationship) reason. Obviously, expression of the secondary-dominant relationship does not require the presence of the seventh, G; but by "more important" I mean here that G is a component in a configuration which belongs to a higher

Ex. 2



structural level than does the secondary-dominant relationship.¹¹ In amplification of this, Ex. 2 shows how the inner-voice component A is stated at the beginning of the song, prolonged by the lower adjacent 7 tone, G#, in the middle section, then in m. 12 begins the descent to C#. In Schenker's terms, this linear progression is the composing-out of an interval, not a random interval, but in this case the composing-out of the sixth, A-C#, the inversion of the triadic third which controls the upper-voice motion of the entire song. This third, stated vertically at the very outset of the piece, is also expressed in the bass succession, III-I, a means of associating the outer voices at all levels.

In attempting to ascertain the major compositional determinant in this instance, I do not disregard the influence of the form of the poem and its internal associations. Doubtless Schumann wanted to set the words, *und vor deinem*, which begin the last section, with the same C# used at the beginning with the words, *aus meinem*. Also I do not overlook the fact that the chromatic descent of the inner voice in the final measures repeats the inner-voice and bass diminutions of the middle section, an additional means of unification.

11. Here I disagree with Schenker's sketch, which shows the A⁷ chord supporting $\hat{3}$. In my opinion $\hat{3}$ is supported by the tonic triad in m. 14.

HEINRICH SCHENKER

[Song 3][†]

These previously unpublished sketches were made available by Ernst Oster, owner of a large collection of Schenker's unpublished sketches and analyses. The sketches were made in about 1925, and are included in a folder entitled $\hat{3}$, $\hat{5}$, or $\hat{8}$?, which contains several problematic examples regarding the choice of headnote. In Mr. Oster's view, the sketches were neither regarded as a complete analysis, nor intended for publication. Their inclusion here should be of interest mainly to Schenker aficionados.

GLOSSARY

$\hat{8}$ oder $\hat{5}$? raises the question of which scale degree, the octave or fifth, should be regarded as the main initial melodic note (headnote). Subsequent caretted numbers refer to other scale degrees in the melodic descent to 1 at the end of the song.

Slurs, note stems, diagonal lines, etc. generally signify structural relationships among non-adjacent notes in the score. (A few structural markings have been omitted where they appear to duplicate other markings.) However, note-heads and stems may also signify literal durational values, as in the case of eighth-note durational values and barlines throughout sketch [a].

Nbn signifies *Nebennote*, literally *adjacent-note*, although more often known as *neighbor-note*.

Gliederung refers to a structural division. In this case, the melodic descent, $\hat{5}$ - $\hat{1}$, is divided by $\hat{3}$, due to the support of that note (F#) in the tonic harmony. This is made particularly clear in sketch [c].

Wie übergreifend can perhaps best be rendered as *if superimposed*. This is a reference to the melodic importance of $\hat{5}$, which takes precedence over the culminating note of the foreground melodic descent, $\hat{2}$.

N.B. Schenker has indicated implied parallel fifths in m. 9, sketch [a]; however, the lower member of the second fifth, B, is not found in the score itself.

[†] Reprinted by permission of Ernst Oster.

[a]

rit.

Nbn 6 5 3 2 [1]

Gliederung

5 5 10 10 10 10

(V — 7) I — 7, () IV — (II) (V) I II V [I]

(II) V I II V I

[b]

wie übergreifend

8 5 (Nbn) 4 3

I IV

[c]

8 5 3 1

I IV

HEINRICH SCHENKER

[Song 4]†

m. 1 3 4 5 8 9 12 13 14 15 16

I (= III# - VI# - #) II V4 - 3 I

FELIX SALZER

[The Opening of Song 5]‡

Felix Salzer's *Structural Hearing* (first published in 1952) is the best-known extended treatment of Schenker's ideas in English. Salzer, presently Professor of Music at Queens College of the City University of New York, is co-author of *Counterpoint in Composition* (1969), which is also based on Schenker's teachings. He is the editor of Schenker's *Five Graphic Music Analyses* (2nd ed., 1969), and co-editor of the Schenker-oriented journal *Music Forum*.

† From *Der Freie Satz*, 2nd revised edition, *Anhang*, Fig. 152, 1, p. 110. Copyright 1956, Universal Edition, used by permission. The analysis is the first of several with which Schenker illustrates one-part form—cf. p. 200 ff. of the main volume.

‡ From *Structural Hearing*, Dover Publications, New York, 1962, v. 2, Fig. 287, p. 98. The commentary is from volume 1, page 154. Copyright 1952, 1962, Felix Salzer. Reprinted by permission.



incom-
. This
ension,
er the
in this
zed by
tes an
ent of

COMMENTARY