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ESSAYS FROM THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL SCHENKER SYMPOSIUM (PART II)

WILLIAM M. MARVIN

In this issue, we are pleased to present four more essays from the Fifth International Schenker Symposium, held at Mannes College of Music from March 15–17, 2013.¹ Our authors have provided technical studies of three topics within Schenker’s theory: leading linear progressions, Übergreifen, and sequences. A fourth essay addresses Schenker’s changing approaches to analysis as they relate to stylistic features of the works under consideration.

Stylistic differences between pieces within the so-called “common practice period” have received little attention to date within the Schenkerian community; indeed, the apparent flattening of the tonal music landscape that such a viewpoint seems to suggest is a common criticism of Schenker’s theoretical approach. Joseph Lubben offers a stimulating discussion of how specific features of individual works by J.S. Bach, Handel, and Schumann informed Schenker’s working methods in the 1920s, as he was developing the modes of representation for his analytic method. Lubben’s article corrects notions that Schenker was disinterested in stylistic distinctions, and also extends our appreciation of the early Tonwille analyses in their own right, as opposed to viewing them as preliminary efforts on the way to Der freie Satz.

Stephen Slottow explores one of Schenker’s “fallacious concepts” by discussing both Schenker’s and later authors’ approaches to sequences, furthering the discourse

¹ Two essays by John Koslovsky and Edward Klorman have already appeared in Gamut 7/1 (2014).
with two analyses from works by Scarlatti and Mozart. This article provides a helpful overview for students of Schenker’s technique on a topic that both exists, and does not exist, within Schenker’s work and Schenkerian theory.

Students of Schenkerian analysis will also find much of value in the articles by Peter Franck and Nicolaus Meeüs, which provide close readings and explication of two particularly complicated features of Schenker’s theory. Franck explicates Schenker’s distinction between leading and following linear progressions, explaining several of Schenker’s own analyses and offering three of his own. Meeüs provides careful readings of Schenker’s texts and analyses on Übergreifen (usually translated in English as “reaching over”), a topic that has remained confusing for students and scholars due to conflicting translations and explanations.

As with the two essays presented in Gamut 7/1 (2014), the four articles here gain by being read in dialogue with each other. Together they offer readers a better understanding of Schenker’s analytic practice, along with an understanding of how that practice is being applied today.
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