

*To the memory of Erez Rapoport*

Then and Now: Schenker's Analysis of the Sarabande

from Bach's E minor English Suite

Channan Willner

At first blush, the words “archive” and “manuscript” conjure the excitement and mystique of far-flung adventures in foreign lands: The crumbling paper, the indecipherable hand, and the impenetrable intellectual content that mark many archival manuscripts bring an aura of romantic adventure to their contemplation.<sup>1</sup> Even a brief encounter with the analytical papers of Heinrich Schenker, preserved in the Oster Collection at the Music Division of the New York Public Library for the Performing Arts, will quickly dispel such impulsive notions.<sup>2</sup> To the great challenge of reading Schenker's analytical notation and keeping up with the ever-changing meaning of its verbal accompaniments, one must add several hidden but equally daunting difficulties. Of these, two are particularly acute: Our confrontation, as practicing analysts brought up in the now well-entrenched North American Schenkerian tradition, with the distinctly European legacy and with the spirit of pioneering enquiry embodied in Schenker's work;<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper was originally presented under the title, “Austrian Collections in the New York Public Library: Heinrich Schenker's Manuscripts in the Oster Collection,” at the conference, *Austria 996-1996: Music in a Changing Society*, in Ottawa, during January 1996. Plans to publish the conference proceedings, to have been edited by Walter Kreyszig, have been abandoned. A similar recent paper is Beach 2008.

<sup>2</sup> *The Oster Collection: Papers of Heinrich Schenker*. Classmark JOB 89-25 (restricted access), microfilm \*ZB-2237 (unrestricted access).

<sup>3</sup> For an introduction to this confrontation (if from a somewhat different vantage point), see Rothstein 1986/1990.

and our confrontation, again from our vantage point as practicing analysts, with the work of a musician who, when all is said and done, was primarily a theorist, one perennially engaged in the formulation of a methodological apparatus. Any extended study of the first confrontation would require, among other things, a detailed consideration of the “hereditary” conflicts so brilliantly captured (in another context) by Kevin Korsyn in his adaptation of the ideas expressed by Harold Bloom’s in *The Anxiety of Influence*, and must therefore await another occasion.<sup>4</sup> It is on the second, more immediately experiential confrontation, vis-à-vis my own modest experience with Schenker’s manuscripts, that I should like to focus in this essay.

\* \* \*

The papers of Heinrich Schenker are divided between two locations. Most of his correspondence and the editions of music he owned are housed at the Oswald Jonas Memorial Collection in the University of California at Riverside;<sup>5</sup> and several analyses formerly owned by Mrs. Hedi Salzer are now at the New York Public Library for the Performing Arts, nestled among the Felix Salzer Papers.<sup>6</sup> But the bulk of Schenker’s analyses and analytical sketches resides in the Oster Collection.<sup>7</sup> Among several analytical sketches of Baroque suite movements in binary form at the Oster Collection is a series of five informal background and middleground graphs of the Sarabande from J.S.

---

<sup>4</sup> Bloom 1973/1997, Korsyn 1991.

<sup>5</sup> Lang and Kunselman 1994.

<sup>6</sup> *The Felix Salzer Papers* are currently being cataloged; classmark JPB 07-1. Their study requires an appointment; parts of the collection may be unavailable during processing.

<sup>7</sup> See Kosovsky 1990 and 1999.

Bach's E minor English Suite, quoted in Example 1. These five sketches—which must be regarded as rough working drafts, not as finished analyses—are reproduced in Example 2.<sup>8</sup> Example 3 comprises a transcription of Schenker's sketches; my own middleground reduction of the Sarabande and additional foreground sketches appear in Examples 4 and 5, and my durational reduction of several passages appears in Example 6. While an undergraduate at the Mannes College of Music, I studied the Sarabande in class under Ernst Oster; as I remember it, his reading followed Schenker's closely.

A brief overview of Schenker's sketches and comparison with the music itself reveal four major features: Schenker's dual concern with uncovering and exemplifying a number of theoretical issues that have to do with the *Ursatz* and with the tonal space it encompasses; Schenker's focus on the descent and on the articulation of the fundamental melodic line from  $\hat{5}$  to  $\hat{1}$  in the one-line octave; Schenker's depiction (through rising and falling arrows and slurs) of important events in the two-line octave as mere embellishing excursions; and Schenker's silence regarding the rhythmic and durational design of the piece. A similarly brief overview of the analytical sketches I have added will disclose that I plan to address precisely those registral and rhythmic issues that Schenker sidesteps. The reasons I choose to do so—and they are not as obvious as they might appear to be—will become clear as we proceed.

\* \* \*

Schenker's first sketch (Examples 2a and 3a) concerns a background issue exemplified in the second part of the Sarabande, namely the dissonant state of the fourth

---

<sup>8</sup> *The Oster Collection*, File 70, pages 26 recto – 29 recto. I thank the New York Public Library for the Performing Arts, Astor Lenox, and Tilden Foundations, for permission to reproduce and transcribe these sketches here.

degree of the scale—a passing tone—during the descent of the fundamental melodic line.

The essential (if not immediately apparent) dissonance of  $\hat{4}$  is depicted by the arabic numerals 8-7 under the bass to the left of the equal sign. The two numbers signify the movement of B to A in the upper voice over the sustained B in the bass. Seldom is the fourth degree allowed to retain its dissonance at levels closer to the surface. Here it is transformed into a consonance by a supporting subdominant—the ‘Kons.’ under the bass to the right of the equal sign—and the subdominant is in turn tonicized at the close of the Sarabande’s second phrase, in bar 16.

Schenker’s second sketch (Examples 2b and 3b) places these observations and notational symbols within the framework of a complete analysis of the piece (they reappear at the center of the sketch). The bold arrows and slurs over the staff at the upper left show an excursion to  $f\#^2$  in the two-line octave (bars 5-7), the principal event in the first of the Sarabande’s three eight-bar phrases. (The sketches that follow will present two additional excursions, one in each of the two remaining phrases.) The substance of this first excursion is the transposition of the fifth progression that falls by step from  $b^1$  to  $e^1$  in bars 1 and 2 up a third across bars 3 and 4 and, then, expanded, up a further third across bars 5-8. Schenker’s outline of the bass in these measures offers, at most, a rough summary (as does, to a lesser extent, his depiction of the upper voice, which downplays the significance of the arrival at  $g^2$  in bars 6 and 7).

At the comprehensive level of this second sketch, Schenker concerns himself mainly with a succession of two large-scale I-V-I bass arpeggiations. These support the two-stage descent of the fundamental melodic line from  $\hat{5}$  to  $\hat{3}$  and from  $\hat{3}$  to  $\hat{1}$  over the span of the entire Sarabande: See the note ‘2 Brech’ and the lower left corner and the

circled numbers 1 and 2 as well as the slurred numbers 5-3-1 at the lower right corner of the sketch.<sup>9</sup> We can now see why it is that scale degree  $\hat{4}$  is essentially dissonant at a very deep level of structure and why it needs the support of a subdominant (shown, unstemmed, as ‘Kons.’ right in the middle of the sketch) if it is to be prolonged. In the second part of the sketch (to the right of the arrows), Schenker shows the conclusion of the first bass arpeggiation under the upper-voice  $\hat{3}$ , followed by the second bass arpeggiation and the close of the descent (which includes a last-minute, parenthetical addition of  $\hat{5} - \hat{4} - \hat{3}$  ( $b^1 - a^1 - g^1$ ) in the upper voice as a thematic reminiscence of bars 1 and 2).

Some of Schenker’s annotations are clearer than others. Under the sketch he indicates that the subdominant supporting  $\hat{4}$  also acts as a lower neighbor charged with introducing the first structural dominant from below. Above the sketch, to the right and to the left, Schenker points to the strong presence, through arpeggiation, of the tonic triad, in its role as the provider of musical space. Even in such a case, despite the tonal definition afforded by scale degrees  $\hat{5}$  and  $\hat{3}$ ,  $\hat{4}$  requires substantial consonant support (though Schenker does seem to consider it a borderline case, in view of the clarity of the tonic’s outline).

In the third, largely theoretical sketch Schenker appears to portray the abstract progression that underlies the first bass arpeggiation, spanning the entire Sarabande up to the tonic of bar 23 (really in first inversion), and omitting, so it seems, the dominant at

---

<sup>9</sup> Schenker discusses double bass arpeggiations in Schenker 1935/1956/2001, p. 34, paragraph 77 (supplement, Fig. 19).

the double bar. Yet elsewhere, Schenker attaches considerable significance to this dominant, allowing for its prolongation through the tonic of bar 23. Here, by contrast (if my interpretation is correct), he indicates through its omission that this dominant is only an applied divider -- a subservient back-relating V -- that prolongs the opening tonic without participating in the background structure. (As it happens, I believe that this V is in fact a back-relating dominant, and I depict it as such in my graphs.)

Schenker's rather obscure concern in this elusive sketch, though, appears to be the sharp subdominant listed the right ( $\sharp$ IV), and its relation to similarly chromaticized subdominants that appear in *Jahrbuch I* of his *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*<sup>10</sup>; save for a passing A# in the bass at the close of bar 19, the Sarabande contains no such subdominant. The subdominant in the sketch itself is of course diatonic; the tied bass G that Schenker shows appears to extend from the tonic sixth chord at the close of bar 4 to the first entrance of A in bar 15, taking in the bass G# of bars 13 and 14. (The prolongation of the subdominant proper begins with its tonicization in bar 16.)

Turning to the fourth sketch (Examples 2d and 3d), we see summarized on the first upper system all the features that we have already observed: The fall from  $\hat{5}$  to  $\hat{3}$  and  $\hat{1}$  in the upper voice, the two bass arpeggiations (confusingly enough indicated by the roman numerals I and II at the bottom of the upper system), and the introduction of the

---

<sup>10</sup> Schenker 1925 and 1925/1994. There are several such subdominants in *Jahrbuch I* (Schenker 1925), on pp. 22-23 and 32-37. Schenker is probably referring, though, to the *Urfinie-Tafel* of the Largo from Bach's Sonata in E for Solo Violin, folded between p. 62 and p. 63. See also Schenker 1925/1994 (*Yearbook I*), pp. 8-9 and pp. 14-17, and the *Urfinie-Tafel* at pp. 32-33.

fourth degree of the scale, represented by the arabic numbers 8 7, now sandwiched between the two roman numerals I that refer to the tonic.

The second, lower system summarizes the excursion to the higher register in the first phrase and employs similarly rising and falling arrows and slurs to depict excursions to and from  $a^2$  and  $f\#^2$  in the second and third phrases. While obviously attaching a good deal of significance to these rising and falling motions, Schenker sees them entirely as offshoots of the more structural, more organically conceived events in the one-line octave: They appear to be what he calls *boundary play* (*Ränderspiel*).<sup>11</sup> In any case, Schenker makes little attempt to formalize them as, say, unfoldings, voice exchanges, or similarly structured events.<sup>12</sup> The bass line and the annotations below the second system cover, in somewhat greater and more florid detail, the same ground as did the previous, more succinct sketches (arabic 1 and 2 now standing for the two bass arpeggiations).

The fifth and last sketch (Examples 2e and 3e)—on a portrait of the musicologist Max Friedlaender that appeared in 1912 in *Die Musik*—offers Schenker's most detailed view of the Sarabande. Up to the double bar and through the large black dot under the high A it retraces the territory already mapped in the second and fourth sketches. Its main interest lies in Schenker's apparent uncertainty over the role of the fifth degree of the scale, the  $b^1$  in bar 23. At some point, so the slurs and capped arabic numbers as well as the question marks above the staff seem to indicate, Schenker considered the possibility that the upper voice  $\hat{5}$  extended through bar 23 before falling to  $\hat{3}$  (note the capped  $\hat{4}$  crossed out to the left of the high A, and the question mark at the end of the parentheses

---

<sup>11</sup> Schenker 1935/1956/2001, pp. 103-5, paragraph 260; supplement, Fig. 124.

<sup>12</sup> Samarotto 2006 provides an insightful discussion of similar procedures.

comprising  $\hat{5}$  and  $\hat{4}$ , as well as the questioned  $\hat{5}$  to the left of the black rectangle at the top of the page). But Schenker then relegated any such extension to a lower level of structure, decidedly keeping the arabic  $\hat{3}$ ,  $g^1$ , under  $b^1$ .

\*       \*       \*

Although my own tonal analysis, presented in Example 4, looks drastically different from Schenker's, it in fact preserves much of his reading, especially the descent of the fundamental line in the one-line octave from  $b^1$  to  $e^1$  (now stemmed downward, its constituent notes not connected by either slur or beam). My reading differs from Schenker's in several important respects. It relegates the dominant at the double bar to the status of a back-relating dominant (as I have already pointed out), linking all later events directly back to the tonic of bar 1; it describes only one bass arpeggiation, interpreting Schenker's second arpeggiation as an ancillary harmonic progression—as an auxiliary cadence—that ushers in the closing tonic and the closing segment of the descent within the time span of the structural dominant; and it depicts the events in the two-line octave not as registral excursions from below but as the primary events of the piece, structurally as well as registrally. In retaining Schenker's one-line octave descent and presenting an additional descent in the two-line octave, my reading calls on David Neumeier's notion of the *three-part Ursatz* to account for the registral duality that marks the Sarabande (and, indeed, a good deal of Baroque music, as Christopher Wintle once noted).<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Neumeier 1987b, pp. 3-29, especially pp. 14-17, Examples 10 and 11; Wintle 1982, pp. 29-69. For a thoughtful and articulate critique of Neumeier's approach see Larson 1987, pp. 11-31; Neumeier's rejoinder, "Reply to Larson" (Neumeier 1987d) appears in



Within this alternative framework, Schenker's descent from  $\hat{5}$  in the one-line octave is complemented by a descent from  $\hat{3}$  in the two-line octave, to which it is somewhat subservient. The two descents don't appear at quite the same level of structure.<sup>14</sup> The opening phrase of the Sarabande (bars 1-8) ascends gradually from the lower to the upper fundamental melodic line; the second phrase (bars 9-16) centers on the upper line, returning to the lower line only at the subdominant cadence in bar 16; and the third phrase (bars 17-24), imitating the first, again ascends from the lower to the upper line before allowing the lower line to close. The completion of the upper line remains implicit.

As we shall see, the two ascents from the lower to the upper line in the first and the third phrase contain the Sarabande's principal rhythmic peculiarities, and it is these quirks, more than anything else, that occasion the difference between Schenker's analysis and mine. Before discussing rhythmic issues, however, I should like to note that among the hallmarks of the *three-part Ursatz*, at least in Baroque style, is the frequent absence of a genuine counterpoint between the two fundamental lines. Each might be silent when the other moves forward. Nonetheless, as middleground and background harmonic movement takes place, the temporarily silent line's implicit forward movement must be both inferred aurally and represented notationally, since it will serve as the point of

---

the same issue, pp. 33-37. (But see Brown 2005, p. 75). Throughout, I have substituted  $\hat{3}$  -  $\hat{2}$  -  $\hat{1}$  for Neumeyer's  $\hat{10}$  -  $\hat{9}$  -  $\hat{8}$ .

<sup>14</sup> Inner voices operate at a level lower than that of the outer voices; see Rothstein 1990b, pp. 87-113. For a detailed discussion of this issue in direct reference to the three-part *Ursatz* see Larson, *Ibid.*, with further references.

departure for later events in that line's register. Hence the proliferation of implicit structural tones, shown as half notes in parentheses, throughout my tonal reductions.

\*       \*       \*

To get closer to the Sarabande now, let us examine its rhythmic structure, and in particular the striking durational parallelism between the sequential ascent from  $e^2$  to  $g^2$  (bars 4-7) in the first phrase, and the corresponding ascent from  $a^1$  to  $f\#^2$  (bars 17-21) in the third phrase. (See Example 6, which offers a durational reduction of the passages in question and compresses two measures of the score into one; a detailed tonal reduction of these passages appears in Example 5.) The Sarabande, as one might expect, does emphasize the second beat in many measures throughout, motivically as well as texturally, but—more important—it establishes a characteristic hemiola formation right at the outset (bars 1-2), through the cadential progression of its bass. This hemiola formation, slightly varied, is immediately repeated in bars 3 and 4. The ascent from  $e^2$  to  $g^2$  begins dramatically on the third beat of bar 4, establishing a new hemiola that overlaps the hemiola in bars 3 and 4.<sup>15</sup> The new hemiola, however, does not immediately conclude—the ascent continues right on, introducing a new, higher tone on the third beat of each of the two following bars ( $f\#^2$ , bar 5;  $g^1$ , bar 6). Only at the turn of bar 7 does this new, overlapping hemiola continue and close.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> On overlapping hemiolas see my “More on Handel and the Hemiola: Overlapping Hemiolas” (Willner 1996c).

<sup>16</sup> Such disruptions in the course of the hemiola and the consequent metrical displacements are described by Vincent Corrigan in “Hemiola in the Eighteenth Century” (Corrigan 1992), pp. 23-32. For particularly striking examples of displaced hemiolas see the opening measures of the second movement, Andante, from Telemann's A minor Violin Concerto, TW 51: a2, also known as the Overture to Telemann's opera, *Emma und Eginhard* (1728), TW 21:25.

That each principal tone of the ascent falls on the third beat of the measure in which it appears suggests that the entire sequential ascent enclosed by the hemiola is metrically displaced by one quarter note to the left. But because each of these principal tones also serves as the consonant preparation for a dissonant suspension on the following downbeat, the displacement appears to be more suggestive than real, perhaps an example of what Frank Samarotto has called *shadow meter* (an unnotated, competing meter that tugs at the regularity of the notated meter without overturning it).<sup>17</sup> Other things being equal I would argue that the notated meter is paramount, but in this instance I shall make a case for genuine displacement. A glance at the detailed tonal reduction of the passage in Example 5a will disclose that it is not only the principal tones of the ascent that fall on the third beat: The bass tones D and E, which support the  $f\sharp^2$  and  $g^2$  of bars 5 and 6, help outline an auxiliary cadence that introduces the key of B, the dominant. (The gradual establishment of the dominant, confirmed only at the double bar, takes place within the time span of the opening tonic.)<sup>18</sup> The sequential progression overhead (an elaborate version of a rising 5-6 suspension series, whose exchanges of fifths and sixths is depicted by the diagonal lines in Example 5a) centers on these same displaced bass tones. The point at which the hemiola began in bar 4 is finally allowed to continue coincides with the arrival of  $g^2$ , at the third beat of bar 6, lending the arrival of the high  $g^2$  still more emphasis. (It is this G that Schenker all but ignores in his sketches.)

The Sarabande's second phrase (bars 9-16) spans the area from the double bar to the tonicization of the subdominant, and corresponds to Schenker's second registral

---

<sup>17</sup> Samarotto 1999a and 1999b.

<sup>18</sup> On auxiliary cadences see Schenker 1935/1956/2991, pp. 88-90, paragraphs 244-46.

excursion. The first four bars of the phrase center on the motive that brought the hemiola to a close in bar 7, a motive comprising four sixteenths and four eighths. Coupled with further motivic fragmentation at the same register in bars 13-16, these measures help substantiate the primacy of the two-line octave. The lower register is touched only once, as the phrase comes to rest on A. It is at this point that the movement of the upper melodic line—to a neighboring  $a^2$ —becomes purely conceptual, but the high A is clearly implied by the preceding and following movement of the line.<sup>19</sup>

The bulk of the Sarabande's third phrase—Schenker's third registral excursion—is taken up by our second ascent and by an extended reenactment of the broken hemiola and metrical displacement of bars 4-7 (see the detailed tonal reduction in Example 5b). Beginning on  $c^2$  in bar 17, the displaced line rises through a large-scale sequential progression essentially to  $f\#^2$ .<sup>20</sup> The ascent here is more complex, though, and the hemiola (which does not overlap with any previous hemiola) remains fragmented for an additional measure (vestiges of the original progression's rising 5-6 suspension series appear as diagonal lines in Example 5b). Not only is each principal tone of the ascent delayed for one measure by a formation of reaching-over figures.<sup>21</sup> These diminutions are sufficiently elaborate for the actual statement of the tone to remain implicit at the “structurally assigned” moment of its arrival (see Example 5b; I refer to the  $b^1$ ,  $c\#^2$ , and

---

<sup>19</sup> See Rothstein 1991, pp. 289-328.

<sup>20</sup> Technically, the ascent culminates in bar 21 on  $e^2$ , owing to the disposition of the reaching-over figures it comprises; but there is little doubt it leads to an implicit  $f\#^2$  at the turn of bar 22, an  $f\#^2$  to which the dissonant seventh  $g^2$  of bar 21 surely leads.

<sup>21</sup> For an account of reaching-over figures see Schenker 1935/1956/2001, pp. 47-49 and 83, paragraphs 129-134 and 231-21, and especially Ernst Oster's comments following paragraph 134.

d<sup>2</sup> in bars 18, 19, and 20). Similarly, although the entire passage serves to introduce its high point, f<sup>#2</sup>, from below, the harmonically supported statement of f<sup>#2</sup> in bar 22 is left implicit as well. (The imaginary high A of bar 16 materializes during the ornamental movement around f<sup>#2</sup> in bar 21; both the explicit and implicit A's of bar 16 are suspended through to the subdominant of bar 21; and the bass progression in these measures is governed by a purely contrapuntal movement of inner voices within the subdominant, which is sustained from bar 16 to bar 21.)

Most important here is the parallelism between the two metrically displaced hemiolic ascents. Just as the first ascent, in bars 4-7, introduces the high g<sup>2</sup>, namely the  $\hat{3}$  of the upper line, the second brings in f<sup>#2</sup>, the  $\hat{2}$ . In Baroque style, such parallelisms often underscore the articulation of the three-part *Ursatz* at levels quite close to the foreground.

The closing two-bar segment, which follows, is unusual in that it reintroduces the material of bars 1 and 2 in the manner of a nineteenth-century summation *qua* reminiscence. It is, on the other hand, quite “normative” structurally in that it brings the Sarabande to a close in the one-line octave, the same register at which the piece began. The auxiliary cadence it describes introduces the lower fundamental line's  $\hat{3}$  in the bass (to which  $\hat{4}$  was transferred at the very end of bar 22), before bringing in  $\hat{2}$  and  $\hat{1}$  in the one-line octave. It is up to us to imagine the close of the upper descent in the two-line octave, a task commonly entrusted to the listener in Baroque style.

\* \* \*

Looking back at Schenker's sketches, we can see how the reading they portray, with its overriding emphasis on the lower register, explores, elucidates, and exemplifies a

single well-defined theoretical concept -- at the expense, perhaps, of depicting the piece as it really goes. It is not that Schenker tailors his analysis to fit a preconceived notion of the fundamental structure. Rather, Schenker tries to link the piece to other tonal compositions by seeking—by insisting on—a common thread that runs through them all. Schenker's preoccupation with one aspect of the piece—the descent in the one-line octave and its support by two bass progressions—stems from his perpetual attempt to distill more or less neutral (for want of a better word) theoretical phenomena from a large repertory of contrapuntally sophisticated pieces spanning the entire common practice era. As a theoretically motivated endeavor, his analysis does demonstrate a vested interest in the results. Without determining them in advance, it nonetheless attempts to line them up with similar analyses of similar tonal structure.

My latter-day approach to Bach's Sarabande is, by contrast, more closely oriented towards the norms of Baroque style as such. Although it follows the classification of background phenomena laid out by David Neumeier, it relies to a rather greater degree on the observation and interpretation of thematic, rhythmic, and registral idioms (at the surface, and below) to formulate and to substantiate the tonal reading it offers. Its focus is not the exemplification of the three-part *Ursatz* as such but on the realization of a tonal context within which the Sarabande's most conspicuous foreground feature—the parallelism between its two instances of hemiolic fragmentation and delay in the high register—can be explained as persuasively as possible.

If Schenker's analysis is in any way truly problematic, that is due to its implicit assumption that the structure of a Baroque composition will resemble that of later works. My experience, having undertaken many tonal and durational reductions of Baroque

pieces in conjunction with my doctoral dissertation, indicates that the background structures one finds in Baroque music *are* fundamentally different in some ways from those of later styles. Quite aside from the wide prevalence of the three-part *Ursatz*, Baroque structures support compositions of great brevity and small scale. Consequently, these structures reside much closer to the surface than do the structures of later pieces. And therefore the deeper, long-span implications of their realization at the foreground often need to be taken at something close to face value (a good example is the motivic articulation of the upper *Urfinie* which we have just observed). Yet just because these very same structures tend to be so very compressed, even saturated, it is impossible for all their tones to be explicitly stated. As a result, the upper *Urfinie* (in particular) is often apparent at neither the beginning nor the end of the piece. As I pointed out, it is the listener who must supply the missing register and the missing tones at the end (and often retrospectively, at the beginning as well). There are, in fact, many Baroque masterworks that leave things undone or incomplete.<sup>22</sup> Their unity—their coherence—is not thereby compromised, but it is not quite the organicism Schenker demands of them.<sup>23</sup>

The difference in vantage point that the present analytical stance offers is significant because it allows for substantial interpretative freedom. (It also requires a good deal of traditional, stringent discipline.) It replaces the emphasis on theoretical discovery and conformity with an emphasis on stylistic rigor as well as analytical

---

<sup>22</sup> While many structural elements may be left incomplete, the evasion of bass tones is particularly common; see Rothstein 2006b, p. 254, with further references, as well as my “Bach, Handel, and the Hidden Bass,” forthcoming at this Site.

<sup>23</sup> One must bear in mind that most Baroque compositions are occasional pieces—artful to be sure, but created for functional or didactic use rather than for permanent display in Lydia Goehr’s *Imaginary Museum of Musical Works* (Goehr 1992).

creativity, permitting us to make each piece our own within the contrapuntal and harmonic boundaries defined by Schenker's apparatus. I believe we should try to maintain this equilibrium between stylistic and tonal norms as we retrace the theoretical trail blazed by Schenker's manuscripts at the Oster Collection. Indeed, only by maintaining this equilibrium can our analyses—and our interpretation of Schenker's legacy—sustain relevance during the next millennium.



WORKS CITED

- Beach 2008. Beach, David. "Bach's partita no. 1 in Bb, BWV 825: Schenker's Unpublished Sketches with Commentary and Alternative Readings," *Music theory spectrum* 30/1 (Spring 2008): 1-34.
- Bloom 1973/1997. Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973; second ed., revised and expanded, 1997.
- Brown 2005. Brown, Matthew. *Explaining tonality : Schenkerian theory and beyond*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2005.
- Corrigan 1992. Corrigan, Vincent. "Hemiola in the Eighteenth Century," in *Johann Sebastian: A Tercentenary Celebration*: 23-32.
- Essays from the Third International Schenker Conference*, edited by Allen Cadwallader. Hildesheim: Olms, 2006.
- Johann Sebastian: A Tercentenary Celebration*, edited by Seymour L. Benstock. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1992.
- Goehr 1992. Goehr, Lydia. *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Korsyn 1991. Korsyn, Kevin. "Towards a New Poetics of Musical Influence," *Music Analysis* 10/1-2 (March-July 1991): 3-72.
- Kosovsky 1990. *The Oster Collection: Papers of Heinrich Schenker, A Finding List*. New York: Music Division, The New York Public Library for the Performing Arts, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1999. "Levels of Understanding: An Introduction to Schenker's *Nachlass*," in *Schenker Studies* 2: 3-11.
- Lang and Kunselman 1994. Lang, Robert, and JoAn Kunselman. *Heinrich Schenker, Oswald Jonas, Moriz Violin: A Checklist of Manuscripts and Other Papers in the Oswald Jonas Memorial Collection*. Berkeley: University of California Press, c1994. online at <http://www.oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/tf4j49n9zc>
- Larson 1987. Larson, Steve. "Questions about the *Ursatz*: A Response to Neumeyer," *In Theory Only* 10/4 (December 1987): 11-31.
- Neumeyer 1987a. Neumeyer, David. "The Ascending *Urlinie*." *Journal of Music Theory* 31/2 (Fall 1987): 275-303.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1987b. Neumeyer, David. "The Three-Part *Ursatz*." *In Theory Only* 10/102 (August 1987): 3-29.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1987c. Neumeyer, David. "The *Uralinie* from  $\hat{8}$  as a Middleground Phenomenon," *In Theory Only* 9/5-6 (January 1987): 3-25.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1987d. Neumeyer, David. "Forum: Reply to Steve Larson's Response to Author's 3-part Model," *In Theory Only* 10/4 (December 1987): 33-37.

*The Oster Collection: Papers of Heinrich Schenker*, at the Music Division of the New York Library for the Performing Arts, Special Collections. Classmark JOB 89-25 (restricted access), microfilm \*B-2237 (unrestricted access).

Rothstein 1986/1990a. Rothstein, William. "The Americanization of Heinrich Schenker," *In Theory Only* 9/1 (1986): 5-17; reprinted with emendations in *Schenker Studies*: 193-203.

\_\_\_\_\_ 2006a. Rothstein, William. "Ernst Oster (1908-1977)," in *Schenker-Traditionen*: 121-135.

\_\_\_\_\_ 2006b. Rothstein, William. "Transformations of Cadential Formulae in the Music of Corelli and His Successors," in *Essays from the Third International Schenker Symposium*: 245-278.

Salzer 2007. Salzer, Felix. *The Felix Salzer Papers*, at the Music Division of the New York Public Library for the Performing Arts, Special Collections; classmark JPB 07-1. "Requires appointment; parts of collection may be unavailable during processing."

Samarotto 1999a. Samarotto, Frank. "Strange Dimensions: Regularity and Irregularity in Deep Levels of Rhythmic Reduction," in *Schenker Studies 2*: 222-238.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1999b. Samarotto, Frank. "A Theory of Temporal Plasticity in Tonal Music: An Extension of the Schenkerian Approach to Rhythm with Special Reference to Beethoven's Late Music." Ph.D. dissertation, CUNY, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_ 2006. Samarotto, Frank. "Plays of Opposing Motion: Contra-Structural Melodic Impulses in Voice-Leading Analysis," paper read at the Fourth International Schenker Symposium, Mannes College, New York, 2006

Schenker 1925. Schenker, Heinrich. *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik; Ein Jahrbuch* Vol. 1. Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1925.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1925/1994. Schenker, Heinrich. *The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook*, Vol. 1, edited by William Drabkin, translated by Ian Bent, William Drabkin, Richard Kramer,

John Rothgeb, and Hedi Siegel. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1935/1979/2001. Schenker, Heinrich. *Free Composition (Der freie Satz)*. Volume 3 of *New Musical Theories and Fantasies*, translated and edited by Ernst Oster. New York: Longman, 1979; reprinted Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2001. "Text based mainly on the 2nd German edition (ed. Oswald Jonas, Vienna: Universal, 1956), but the first edition (Vienna: Universal 1935) was also consulted."

*Schenker Studies*, edited by Hedi Siegel. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

*Schenker Studies 2*, edited by Carl Schachter and Hedi Siegel. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

*Schenker-Traditionen: eine Wiener Schule der Musiktheorie und ihre internationale Verbreitung = A Viennese School of Music Theory and Its International Dissemination*, edited by Martin Eybl and Evelyn Fink-Mennel. Vienna: Böhlau, 2006.

Willner 1996a. Willner, Channan. "Austrian Collection in the New York Public Library: Heinrich Schenker's Papers in the Oster Collection," paper presented at the Millenium Conference, Ottawa, 1996. Publication plans by the Editor of the conference proceedings, Walter Kreyszg, have been abandoned. This was the original version of the present paper.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1996b. Willner, Channan. "Bach's Periodicities Re-Examined," in *The Maynooth International Musicological Conference 1995: Selected Proceedings*, Vol. 1: 86-102.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1996c. Willner, Channan. "Beethoven and Handel: The Significance of a Borrowing," paper presented at the Millenium Conference, Ottawa, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1996d. Willner, Channan. "Handel, the Sarabande, and Levels of Genre: A Reply to David Schulenberg," *Music Theory Online* 2/7 (November 1996), at <http://smt.ucsb.edu/mto/issues/mto.96.2.7/mto.96.2.7.willner.html>

\_\_\_\_\_. 1996e. Willner, Channan. "More on Handel and the Hemiola: Overlapping Hemiolas," *Music Theory Online* 2/3 (March 1996), online at <http://smt.ucsb.edu/mto/issues/mto.96.2.3/mto.96/2.3.willner.html>

Wintle 1982. Wintle, Christopher. "Corelli's Tonal Models," in *Nuovissimi Studi Corelliani: atti del terzo congresso internazionale: Gusignano, 4-7 settembre 1980 (= Quaderni della Rivista Italiana di Musicologia 4)*: 29-69.