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Much has been done over the past thirty years to contextualize Schenker’s published theories and analyses. We have learned of Schenker’s intellectual debt to nearly every prominent strand of Western philosophy, stretching from his own era back to ancient Greece, and even looking forward beyond his lifetime to ideas he anticipated; we have been shown the centrality of Schenker’s legal studies for both the substance of his theories and the language in which they are expressed; we have debated when, how and if Schenker was or became organicist, or modernist, or what it meant for him to be a Galician Jew in fin-de-siècle Vienna, and later a monarchist in a defeated empire; we have in turn excused and excised, resurrected, refuted or claimed centrality for Schenker’s politics—this list could go on, and is likely still being written.¹

All of this has proven invaluable, particularly as a means of comprehending both apparent and real contradictions within Schenker’s writings. In some cases it has also helped us to interpret the stages of Schenker’s development, by framing them in

teleological terms with respect to philosophy, ideology, or politics. What has been missing from most of this body of work, however, has been an acknowledgement of the influence of idiosyncratic stylistic features on the development of Schenker’s theories and analytical practices. It is surely not coincidental that the progression of Schenker’s analytical foci—from harmony/motive to counterpoint/line, and from left-right surface process to top-down derivation—travels directly through important junctures that link an emerging analytical technique to a piece whose surface features are uniquely suited to its application.

It is possible that this oversight has stemmed in part from a desire to imbue the elements of Schenker’s mature theory with a universality—many Schenkerian scholars have emphasized the metaphysical properties of the Ursatz, or the reconstruction of an inexorable evolutionary path culminating in Der freie Satz in 1935. Schenker himself repeatedly fostered this attitude towards his theories by emphasizing the universality of his theoretical constructs, setting them against analytical approaches that he perceived as overly fixated on the identification of stylistic features. “In light of the Urlinie” Schenker wrote as early as 1921, “all the various divisions and classifications such as Classical, Romantic, programmatic, absolute, and the like disappear from view in the face of the Urlinie, since these are biased by personal feeling or historical understanding” (2004, 21–22). Yet however much can be gained from adopting Schenker’s own view of his mature

---

2 The teleological hermeneutic is employed, for example, in Pastille 1990a, Korsyn 1988, Cherlin 1988, Cook 2008, and Morgan 2014.
theory as universal, one should not overlook the fact that Schenker arrived at his unique ideas in part by applying general analytic principles to a very specific set of pieces. Features of those pieces had a marked effect on the shape of Schenker’s theoretical constructs—not just in the broad sense whereby a select set of central European tonal works were considered the only extant embodiment of universal musical principles, but also in a narrower sense, whereby a subset of stylistic features were privileged as representative of tonal processes overall.

Consider, for example, his statement above, and its clear implication that the Urlinie itself exists on a higher plane than the world of stylistic distinctions. If our interpretation is informed by the Urlinie forms of Der freie Satz, descending from $\hat{8}$, $\hat{5}$ or $\hat{3}$, then there is nothing unexpected about Schenker’s assertion. In fact it is a well known tenet of Schenkerian studies, one that sits comfortably in the crosshairs of post-modern critiques of Schenker. What is interesting here, however, is that at the time he wrote this encomium to the Urlinie, his analytical practice had not settled on such a limited set of possibilities, as it had not yet reified the Ursatz as the deep-level embodiment of tonality’s most fundamental principles. Instead, the Urlinien of 1921–22 were more like loosely abstracted upper counterpoints to the succession of bass notes generated by the Stufen. Their starting points, number of notes, and contours were as varied as the repertoire whose analysis yielded them—in essence, they were the embodiment of those stylistic distinctions that Schenker’s ideal Urlinie was purported to rise above.
The variety of Urlinie forms is most striking in Der Tonwille (1921–1924), published during a period marked by Schenker’s emerging focus on a singular linear background on the one hand, and his embracing of multiple analytical parameters on the other. The first Urlinie had appeared in 1920 in the Erläuterungsausgabe of Beethoven’s op. 101—and over the next five years the Urlinie gradually moved deeper into the background, was incorporated into an Ursatz, and took its place at the head of a series of voice-leading elaborations that led toward the musical surface.4

If one focuses on general themes, the analytical principles governing his practice in the early twenties are for the most part consistent with the principles we associate with Der freie Satz and Five Graphic Music Analyses. One of the most significant and familiar is a valorization of unity-within-variety (semper idem, sed non eodem modo). Another is an assertion of strict counterpoint as a foundation for effective tonal composition—both as arbiter of melodic fluency and as a guide to intervallic succession. A third is the idealised image of the composer as a clairvoyant transmitter of eternal musical truth, which seems to have taken root during the time Schenker himself ceased composing in the first decade of the twentieth century. One can see all of these premises clearly in his mature theory, manifested in the Ursatz and the diminutional relationships of successive prolongational layers.

However, in Der Tonwille, the reification of these principles was much less straightforward, less systematic, and less hierarchical. As has been explained elsewhere, the concept of Synthese—the successful integration of multiple parameters in a single

---

4 Details about the chronology of this development can be found in Pastille, 1990b and Morgan 2014. An excellent study of the unique characteristics of the Uurlinien found in Der Tonwille is in Clark, 2007.
artwork—was assigned the highest value in the early *Tonwille* analyses, and its enforcement was not yet delegated to a single harmonic-contrapuntal background structure.\(^5\) It also should not be overlooked that the focus of *Der Tonwille* was to elucidate masterworks by means of analysis, while *Der freie Satz* used examples from masterworks to illustrate a theory. One important consequence of the more inclusive Synthese-based approach, in the context of a series of pamphlets devoted primarily to analysis, was the heightened specificity of the analytical methods employed in *Tonwille*. This in turn provided an increased opportunity for surface features and genre-specific characteristics to make their mark on Schenker’s developing theories.

Examples drawn from three *Tonwille* analyses will help demonstrate how the application and subsequent evolution of Schenker’s analytical principles were dependant to a significant degree upon particular features of individual pieces. The first two examples engage the tension between the emerging concept of the Urlinie and the traditional unifying role assigned to motive. Schenker’s analysis of the E-flat minor prelude from Book 1 of Bach’s *Well-tempered Clavier*, published in *Tonwille* 1 (1921), features an early Urlinie that is the product of motivic repetition. His analysis of the Allemande from Handel’s Suite in G major, HWV 441, published in *Tonwille* 4 (1923), displays structural motives that connect only tenuously with the domain of the Urlinie. Both analyses illustrate a relative freedom and autonomy in Schenker’s motives, which operate only partially—and sometimes not at all—under the control of the Urlinie. The third example illustrates the emergence of structural voice-leading levels, and their consequent subsuming of motives, in the analysis of Bach’s Twelve Little Preludes, number 5, from *Tonwille* 5 (1923). The stylistic features of the Prelude are especially

well-suited to an analytical outlook that subordinates motives to layered structural voice leading. I conclude by discussing briefly the consequences of valorizing Schenker’s subsequent preference for the analytical worldview embodied in his analysis of the Prelude.

* 

At the beginning of the 1920s, Schenker’s writings manifest conflicting statements about whether the Urinline or a source motive represented the fundamental unifying element of a piece of music. As mentioned, Urinline of this period were not the succinct, deep-level proto-melodies of later Schenker. Instead, they were stepwise lines that spanned a composition from beginning to end, and bore more resemblance to what would later be considered middleground structures—though strictly speaking, they were more often concatenations of shorter linear progressions whose hypothetical origins would lie in distinct structural levels, related only by their contiguity and parallelism. Consider the Urinline for Bach’s E-flat minor Prelude from Book I of the *Well-Tempered Clavier* (Example 1, the music is given in Example 2). In his commentary, Schenker defines this Urinline as the linked progeny of a single three-note motive, each instance of which he indicates by brackets above the staff:

> It is immediately evident here that the Urinline has the form of what is in essence a three-note motive, whose reproductive urge . . . gives birth to countless repetitions. (2004, 34)

The motive in question is a descending third-span that not only saturates the immediate surface, but also represents in reduction a significant number of the discrete melodic gestures that segment the music. Schenker’s Urinline is produced entirely from the single
source motive, the surface links between successive motives are primarily by step or octave transfer, and the resultant line spans the entire length of the composition.

In terms of the analytic premises listed earlier, the third-span provides the basis for “unity within variety,” and its self-generated reproduction represents a quasi-natural impulse untainted by the composer’s will. All the while, the resulting Urlinie and the bass notes of the accompanimental Stufen attend to melodic fluency and intervallic succession, respectively.
EXAMPLE 2. The E-flat minor Prelude from Book 1 of The *Well-Tempered Clavier*
That Schenker assigns the motive a role in shaping the Urlinie may seem peculiar in light of his enshrinement of the Urlinie as a more fundamental creative source and oracle, and in light of the specific statement in the same volume of Tonwille that “It is the Urlinie that also gives life to the motive and to melody…” (21). This is of course not the
first instance of dueling linear and motivic premises in Schenker's work. Allan Keiler and Scott Burnham have demonstrated the influence of Beethoven's overtly motivic surfaces in shaping the *Ton-Urreihe* in Schenker's analysis of op. 101 (1920) and the Uirlie of the Fifth Symphony (also in *Tonwille* 1, originally 1921), to cite just two examples.\(^6\) The presence of traditional motivic premises in those analyses should not be too startling, given the prominence of motivic analysis in Schenker's earliest theoretical writings.\(^7\) In the case of the E-flat minor Prelude, the music is particularly conducive to a motivically conceived analytical approach. The melody contains clear gestural repetitions and a developmental blossoming of the basic third-span, while the piece’s straightforward rhythm of harmonic cycles encourages a time-span segmentation that is nicely congruent with the closed consonance-dissonance-consonance trajectory of the third-span. Schenker can hardly be faulted on musical grounds for adopting this analytical approach. An inconsistency arises only with respect to the general claims he makes—here and elsewhere—regarding the generative primacy of the Uirlie.

On the other hand, Schenker’s claim that the Uirlie generates motives is in fact plausible when applied to contexts involving the more traditional surface entities that in the same analysis he also labeled with the term “motive.” For example, Schenker identifies the arpeggiation motive first heard in m. 1 as generated from the first note of the Uirlie:

The first note of the Uirlie in bar 1 gives life to an arpeggiation that also puts in a claim for individual motivic status; this claim stems not only from its repetition in bar 2, but even more from its subsequent use—see the inversion in bars 4, 6, etc., and the variation in bar 3 . . . (2004, 34)

\(^7\) Morgan (2014, 60–76) notes that motivic entities were some of the first means by which Schenker was able to move towards an understanding of music as intrinsically organic.
He then goes on to describe the descending third-span followed by an ascending tenth leap in m. 4 as motivated by a need to transfer the continually descending Urlinie to a higher register:

In bar 4, the line arrives at g-flat\(^1\). Had a repetition of the motive of the Urlinie been joined to this very note, it would have forced the Urlinie down (since the motive always falls) to a register in which the two outer voices, on account of their excessive proximity, would hardly have admitted further diminution . . . The Urlinie is therefore moved up to the register of the two-line octave, by a simple but ingenius gesture . . . Because the same danger and necessity subsequently return, and are treated in the same manner, this gesture appears to be raised to the status of an independent motive . . . (35)

Faced with these discrepancies, it is tempting to think in later Schenkerian terms and divide the concept of motive into two classes, one at the deep middleground—still competing, however, with the Urlinie for generative primacy in 1921—and another on the musical surface that elaborates tones belonging to the Urlinie.\(^8\) If we are to trust his metaphors and his analytic practice alike, then it stands to reason that Schenker himself, at the time of this analysis, recognized that both of these motive types were essential to a thorough analysis. The gestural eruptions of this prelude on the one hand, and the reiterated ornamented lines that span its regular harmonic cycles on the other, together make this two-class motivic system plausible. Further, despite the questionable logic of having the Urlinie and motives each as generative agent of the other, the overall outlook keeps all motives connected to the Urlinie in one manner or another.

However, aspects of Schenker’s analysis of a Handel Allemande from *Tonwille* 4 (1923) illustrate the practical limits even of tempered claims for the Urlinie’s role in guiding motivic deployment. (2004, 146–147) Examples 3, 4, and 5 reproduce a brief sketch, the Urlinie-Tafel and the music, respectively.

\(^8\) This is the approach adopted in Cadwallader and Pastille 1992.

Schenker’s analysis touches on multidimensional aspects of two distinct motives:

The motivic life [of this piece] is governed by arpeggiations, and by the figure that likewise appears in m. 1, on the second beat.

He identifies the second-beat motive in rhythmic terms:

Although it appears as three sixteenths . . . it nevertheless takes the place of an eighth note. As such, it is generally associated with the eighth-note upbeat [of an Allemande] . . .

He begins by demonstrating how this rhythmic motive serves to create formal parallelisms:

. . . in bars 1 and 8 at each second and fourth beat; in bars 2–4 and 11–13 at each fourth beat (how significantly the parallelisms of these bars serve the form!)

He then shows how the rising or falling configuration of the motive can foreshadow the direction of successive melodic segments:
In addition, its rising or falling often prefigures the course of things to come. Compare the rising version: in bar 1 \( g^1 - a^1 \), in bars 2—4 \( d^2 - e^2 - f^2 \), across bars 4/5 \( a^1 - b^1 \) etc; and the falling: \( c^2 - b^1 \) across bars 1/2. (146)

Schenker has now taken the motivic discussion implicitly along multiple dimensional planes: the associational, form-defining surface and the foreshadowing-in-time from the surface to its subsequent deep-level version. In the second instance, the deep-level version attaches in no place to the Urlinie. What follows compromises even further any notion that the Urlinie, or any other deep-level entity, is exerting control over motivic status or motivic processes. Schenker describes how the surface motive maintains its essential identity even when the structural hierarchy of its component pitches is permuted:

Where, however, both versions follow one another immediately, as in bar 2, the falling one may be interpreted as a neighbor note (see the Urlinie-Tafel [Example 4]), in order to avoid a note repetition. Hence at the second and third beats it is better to hear the succession as \( b^1 - c^2 - a^1 \) than as \( b^1 - b^1 - a^1 \). The same applies to bar 5, where four falling versions follow one after another. In bar 6 the Urlinie runs straight through the rising version. (146–147)

Not only are these processes demonstrably independent from the Urlinie, some of the motives do not contain a single pitch belonging to the Urlinie.

The arpeggiation motive that Schenker mentioned at the outset is a different animal altogether. Here is part of Schenker's description of its function:

The arpeggiations are also used in the right hand, where, concealing their origin better than in the left hand (in the lower register), they make an exquisite impression. The course of the arpeggiations in mm. 12–15 takes shape in the most secret way. If one knows how the eighth-note arpeggiations at the downbeat of m. 12 (see the Urlinie-Tafel) increase to
arpeggiation in quarter notes and half notes in mm. 13, 14, and 15, then one grasps why this very place breathes forth such expression \ldots (146)\footnote{The Ernst Oster collection in the New York Public Library contains Schenker's personal copies of the \textit{Tonwille} booklets, in which he sketched revisions to the Händel Urlinie-Tafel that made it conform more closely to his later theories. The revisions superimpose an Ursatz with a $\hat{5} - \hat{3} - \hat{1}$ line, eliminate the arpeggiation motives of mm. 12–15, and indicate instead a pervasive upper-neighbor motive attaching to the Urlinie and deep-middleground diminutions. The Oster collection [microform] : papers of Heinrich Schenker, Music Division, The New York Public Library: Reel 35, Item 11.}

The right-hand arpeggiation that Schenker refers to are indicated in Example 4 by descending stems in m. 12, and by ascending stems in mm. 13–15. It should be clear just how loosely they relate to the Urlinie itself. The first is a pair of descending chordal skips from a tone of the Urlinie, the second is abstracted from a filled-in chordal skip in a covering voice and an implied tone in the Urlinie itself, and the third is a $\hat{5} - \hat{3} - \hat{1}$ abstracted from a premature structural descent. This motive is neither a source for nor a product of the Urlinie, but exists in a separate realm that contacts the Urlinie only incidentally.\footnote{A separate question is why Schenker chooses not to include a motive that meets his requirement and clearly prepares the first motive in the series that he describes, namely, the filled in arpeggiation in the right hand of mm. 10–11. One possible explanation is that they do not participate in the process of augmentation, and that they move in a contrary direction in the process of diminution, which otherwise proceeds from the unadorned arpeggio of m. 12 to the completely filled in descent of mm. 14–15.}

I presume Schenker's motivations for highlighting this obscure motive to be twofold: first, arpeggiations saturate the surface of the entire piece, thus this motive is an apt agent of unity; second, the motivic augmentation that Schenker points out is partially suggested by the sentence-like rhythmic shape of the passage, which consists of two one-measure gestures followed by a two-measure group that leads to the final cadence. Again, however on-target these observations may be, the processes of rhythmic or motivic augmentation have little to do with the linear trajectory represented by the Urlinie.
Further, any claim that the arpeggiation motive is somehow generated by the Urlinie would not be terribly meaningful, given the inconsistent manner in which each arpeggio in Schenker’s motivic narrative connects—or fails to connect—to an Urlinie pitch.

* 

These two analyses illustrate a significant discrepancy between Schenker's contemporary claims about the generative function and primacy of the Urlinie, and the analytical reality in which motivic associations and processes often took precedence. In order for the contradictions to be reconciled, either the claims about the Urlinie’s generative primacy would have to be retracted, or the role of motives in the analytical machinery would have to be altered. Schenker of course chose the latter route, abstracting the Urlinie to the deepest background, making it the generative source of melodic content, and largely restricting motivic analysis to what could be found in the relationships between diminutions.

The one element of Schenker's mature theory that was most crucial for subsequently ensuring the control of the Urlinie over motive and melody was the system of voice-leading transformations that proceed from the Urlinie or Ursatz to the foreground. To be sure, some form of layered voice-leading representation had been present to a certain extent as far back as the first volume of Counterpoint.11 In the earliest Tonwille analyses, the few examples of layered voice-leading transformations that can be found clearly fulfill the function of demonstrating the underlying contrapuntal models inherent to Der freie Satz, and in the process provide an explicit manifestation of the laws

11 See Morgan 2014, 84–89.
that Schenker asserted as essential for tonal masterworks.\footnote{Examples can be found in analyses of development sections from the second movement of Mozart’s A minor Piano Sonata and the first movement of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony, both of which are in Tonwille 1; the first movement of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata op. 2 #1 in Tonwille 2; and the first movement of Haydn’s Piano Sonata #52 in Tonwille 3. Schenker 2004, 32, 60, 75 and 105.} However, through the first three issues of Tonwille these types of derivations did not encompass entire pieces or movements. They were used only to explicate harmonically unstable transitional passages, places in the music where Schenker chose to emphasize the continuity and coherence provided by a contrapuntal trajectory that spanned the spaces between stable harmonies, key areas, and periodic phrases (places where the logical consecution of Stufen was not necessarily operative). Further, what Schenker identified as the Urlinie in these passages was never given as the source for the upper voice of the derivations. Instead, it appeared at some subsequent level, as a product of the transformational process. At this point, then, voice-leading transformations were not a means by which to enact the control an Urlinie exerts over compositional processes. On the contrary, they provided another challenge to its purported role as the unique generative source of musical content.

Several fundamental changes in Schenker’s theoretical outlook seemed to take place all at once with his publication of a series of analyses of the first five of Bach’s Twelve Little Preludes in Tonwille 4 and Tonwille 5 (1923). The first of these introduced voice-leading transformations that were comprehensive, spanning the entire piece. In the second, an abstracted Urlinie took its place at the head of the series of transformations—and in the analysis of the fifth prelude it was joined to a bass line to form what Schenker called for the first time an Ursatz (180–181). The graph is shown in Example 6, the score in Example 7. Further, in the analysis of the fifth prelude, the motives Schenker identified
were limited to voice-leading diminutions. Thus in these few analyses, nearly all of the earlier inconsistencies in his treatment of motives, the Urlinie, and voice-leading were resolved. The generative role that Schenker had claimed for the Urlinie from its earliest inception now had a technical means of being enacted, and motives not generated by these means were excluded from discussion.

**Example 6.** Schenker’s graph of the d-minor “Little Prelude” (2004, 180)
As momentous as these changes may have been for the development of Schenker’s analytic methodology, it is important to recognize that to a large extent they were not the result of a seismic shift in methodology and outlook. Rather, they are
contingent upon the specific musical features of the pieces being analyzed. These Bach preludes are relatively brief pieces that feature repetitive figuration on the surface, non-periodic phrasing, and extended passages of continuous contrapuntal trajectory. Comprehensive voice-leading derivations were possible because the character of entire pieces matched the character of the selected passages in other pieces that Schenker had previously chosen to depict by these means. The harmonic structures consist of a few closed cycles, often above tonic or dominant pedals, and connected by modulatory or sequential transitions. The simple harmonic structure and contrapuntal continuity of the pieces facilitated the placement of the Urlinie at the head of the voice-leading derivations, providing only a few points of relative stability at which Urlinie pitches might be stationed, thus making it not only possible but plausible to abstract simple 3-lines and to coordinate them with the abstracted bass notes of the most prominent Stufen.

A further feature of this music that makes it responsive to the later Schenkerian methodology is the absence of motives in the traditional sense. Since these musical surfaces were comprised mainly of repeated figuration patterns, the unifying role of motive could be limited to the diminutions that emanated from the Urlinie in a tightly controlled series of prolongational levels. A case in point is the analysis of the fifth prelude. Schenker begins his analysis with a paragraph defending the choice of ³ over ⁵ as the “starting point of the Urlinie” (what would later be called a “Kopfton”), before turning to the layered graph of Example 6. He then describes the series of diminutions that lead from level a) to level f) in the graph, citing the Terzzug at three different
structural levels and at four different starting pitches. Immediately afterward, Schenker
draws the following conclusion: “the Terzzug serves as a motive.” What follows that
remark is a more diachronic discussion of motivic processes, nonetheless limiting the
players to just one, the Terzzug in all its manifestations.

Just how dependent these developments in methodology were upon the specific
features of these pieces can be seen by examining Schenker's contemporary analyses of
music of the Viennese classicists. The three analyses of piano sonatas by Mozart, Haydn,
and Beethoven which occupy the second and third issues of *Tonwille* feature free
discussions of traditional motivic processes, and Urlinien that are essentially maps of
melodic fluency segmented according to the periodic phrasing of the surface. Further,
within *Tonwille* 4 and 5, the analyses of music by Beethoven, C.P.E. Bach, Mozart, and
Haydn employ none of the new features from the contemporary analyses of the Bach
preludes—there are no comprehensive voice-leading derivations; the Urlinien meander
through a multitude of pitches and continue to be divided largely according to the
periodic phrasing of the surface; and a variety of diminutional and non-diminutional
motives are described. The same is true of the analysis of the Appassionata in *Tonwille* 7.
It was not until “Vom Organischen der Sonatenform” in *Meisterwerk II* (1926), that
Schenker began applying comprehensive voice-leading derivations, and simplified
abstract Urlinien that transcended traditional formal boundaries, to analyses of classical
sonata-form movements. From that point on the principle of a singular Urlinie trajectory from ̂8, ̂5, or ̂3 became the norm in analyses of complete pieces. 

*

Twenty years ago, perhaps the greatest challenge involved in assigning a central role to surface features in the trajectory of Schenker’s development would have been how to spin it. I hope to have demonstrated here that analytical devices first developed by Schenker to elucidate music whose specific formal and stylistic features suited them well later became foundational for his analyses of tonal music in all styles and forms. I hope also to have shown that other techniques, mostly associated with motivic analyses, were jettisoned in later Schenker, excluded even from analyses of pieces where they had seemed well-suited and had proven to be quite fruitful in the early 1920’s. On the one hand, this could lead one to conclude that the later Schenker was guilty of monolithic insensitivity to stylistic distinctions, perhaps distorting musical evidence in order to limit motivic processes to those arising from layered voice-leading diminutions, and forcing pieces to fit the singular tonal trajectory represented by the Ursatz. On the other, one might praise Schenker’s power of abstraction, point out his gift for discerning general

13 The analyses of Scarlatti sonatas in Meisterwerk I provide an interesting bridge, worthy of further investigation. A different sort of intermediate stage may be found in Schenker’s analysis of the theme from Brahms’s Handel Variations in Tonwille vols. 8–9 ([1924] 2005).
14 Any explanation of why Schenker chose the analytical conceit best embodied in the D minor Prelude as foundational for his later practice should include—in addition to a technical discussion of the mature methodology’s practicality, insight, and resonance with other contemporary forms of structural analysis—a close reading of the “Miscellanea” section of Tonwille 5. In it, Schenker includes a more detailed encomium to the voice-leading derivations of the Bach Prelude. A few pages later he titles a section devoted to the demonstration of German virtue and cultural superiority “A Seb. Bach Prelude,” in which he references the earlier analysis in a now famous diatribe. Schenker 2004, 212–225.
principles from disparate individual cases, and celebrate the value of looking at periodic
music through the lens of continuous contrapuntal writing.

I am more inclined to side with the second response, so long as one important
concession to the first is made: one needs to discard Schenker’s later monist tendencies in
order to reap the full benefits of his methodology. I will conclude with one brief example
appropriate to promoting this caution. Example 8 reproduces Schenker's graph of
Schumann’s “Träumerei” from Tonwille 10.15 The music is given in Example 9.

15 The original graph contains a partial third level dedicated to voice-leading details of mm. 5–8 and 14–16.
EXAMPLE 8. Schenker’s graph of “Träumerei” (2005, 156)

From background to foreground the path runs as follows:

Fig. 1. T. 1 5 9 13 17 21
EXAMPLE 9. Schumann’s “Träumerei,” op. 15 no. 7
In his analysis, Schenker describes the form as tripartite, with each section corresponding to a cyclic rise and fall of the Urlinie—first from \( \hat{1} \) to \( \hat{3} \) to \( \hat{1} \), then from \( \hat{1} \) to \( \hat{4} \) to \( \hat{1} \), and finally from \( \hat{1} \) to \( \hat{3} \) to \( \hat{1} \) again. He thereby outlines a series of large-scale melodic arches which resonate with the foreground arches indicated at level b) of the graph in Example 8. Schenker makes this relationship a central feature of his interpretation of the music. He writes: “Just as the path of the Urlinie in itself stretches calmly and patiently upwards—first to \( \hat{3} \), then to \( \hat{4} \), and finally to \( \hat{3} \) again—so this effect is made even stronger by the diminution that, constructing arches above the Urlinie, similarly appears to be reaching for something. Is it dreaming in general, or the content of a specific dream?” In other words, Schenker paints an evocative analysis, linking the extramusical title of the piece to the affect suggested by the music’s cyclic, wavelike melodic contours. The gestural parallelism at different structural levels (as envisioned in 1924) which Schenker makes the centerpiece of his interpretive remarks would clearly not survive a translation of this analysis into the terms of an Urlinie or Ursatz predicated on a singular, or singularly interrupted, contrapuntal trajectory.\(^{16}\) In pointing this out I do not mean to condemn Schenker’s mature methodology, only to illustrate the contingency of its results. The mature Ursatz provides a powerful metaphor for the notion of a singular tonal trajectory spanning entire pieces, but many of Schenker’s most compelling

\(^{16}\) In fact, it did not survive. Schenker revised the reading to an interrupted \( \hat{3} \)-line with an upper neighbor in an unpublished graph, and superimposed that reading on the Urlinie-Tafel in his personal copy of *Tonwille* 10. The Oster collection [microform]: papers of Heinrich Schenker, Music Division, The New York Public Library: File 35, item 19; Books and Pamphlets, item 17).
analytical insights were obtained only by attending to non-diminutional segmentations of that trajectory.
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