Today it would hardly raise an eyebrow to hear the words “tonality” and “Heinrich Schenker” uttered in the same breath, nor would it startle anyone to think of Schenker’s theory as an explanation of “tonal music,” however broadly or narrowly construed. Just about any article or book dealing with Schenkerian theory takes the terms “tonal” or “tonality” as intrinsic to the theory’s purview of study, if not in title then in spirit.¹ Even a more general book such as The Cambridge History of Western Music Theory seems to adopt this position, and has done so by giving the chapter on “Heinrich Schenker” the final word in the section on “Tonality,” where it rounds out the entire enterprise of Part II of the book, “Regulative Traditions.” The author of the chapter, William Drabkin, attests to Schenker’s culminating image when he writes that “[Schenker’s theory] is at once a sophisticated explanation of tonality, but also an analytical system of immense empirical power. Schenker’s ideas and work touch on, or have implications for, virtually every topic addressed in this volume.”² In other words, studies of “tonal music” and explanations of “tonality” have become synonymous with Schenker studies.

Strange as it may sound, Schenker never described his work as a theory of tonality, nor did he ever attempt any kind of categorical distinction between “tonal” and “non-tonal”

---


musics (whether “pre-tonal,” “post-tonal,” or “a-tonal”). In fact, he placed only a mild emphasis on the word “tonality” in his writings, preferring instead to develop and promote his own terminology. Rather, it was his disciples who transformed the term “tonality” into a concept of a higher order, and they did so with two basic aims: first, to allow Schenker’s ideas to be understood by a wider public, knowing that many would find Schenker’s neologisms difficult to penetrate; and second, to challenge competing uses of the term by other theorists, either those who attempted to expand the concept’s application to new music or those who developed approaches to common-practice repertoire that were antithetical to a Schenkerian one.

Oswald Jonas, Felix Salzer, and Adele Katz—household names amongst Schenkerian scholars—were no doubt the three most influential promulgators of Schenker’s teachings in the twenty years following Schenker’s death, and all three positioned the “concept of tonality” as the central concern of the Schenkerian enterprise. Even a superficial glance at some of the titles to their articles and book chapters captures their affinity for the expression: Jonas’s 1932 article for the Allgemeine Musikzeitung, “Zum Begriff der Tonalität;” Katz’s first chapter to her 1945 book Challenge to Musical Tradition, “The Concept of Tonality;” and Salzer’s culminating chapter to Part II of his 1952 book Structural Hearing, “The Concept of Tonality.” Beyond such a superficial observation, it would not take a reader long to conclude that this phrase formed an indispensable part of the Schenkerian lexicon from roughly 1930 to 1960. It has certainly left its mark today.

A number of factors make a comparison between Jonas, Salzer, and Katz useful. For one thing, they all studied with Hans Weisse, considered by many to be Schenker’s most eminent pupil, and one whose untimely death in 1940 prevented him from having an even
greater impact than he had. For another, Jonas, Salzer, and Katz were the first to write about Schenker’s ideas in book-length format, many of the ideas for their works having been developed before the publication of Schenker’s own Der freie Satz in 1935. And finally, these authors coordinated their efforts at one time to disseminate Schenker’s ideas: Jonas and Salzer in the 1930s, and Salzer and Katz in the 1940s and 50s. All this is to say that it is hardly a coincidence that these authors would occupy themselves with a number of common concerns, ones that were linked to an ambitious agenda of dissemination and promotion of Schenker’s work. This paper will first situate the concept of tonality in the early writings of these three authors. It will then go on to examine two analyses, one by Jonas and one by Salzer: both were used to demonstrate the concept and, coincidentally, both made their first appearance in the 1930s and then re-surfaced in the 1950s.

Building a framework: Schenker’s “Elucidations” essay and the Five Graphic Analyses

Given the commonalities between Jonas, Salzer, and Katz, it is not surprising that many of the same writings from Schenker’s oeuvre would form the basis of their thought. Two publications in particular stand out. The first of these is Schenker’s “Elucidations” essay (Erläuterungen), a collection of thoughts that accompanied successive issues of Der Tonwille (8/9-10) and Das Meisterwerk in der Musik (1-2) between 1924 and 1926. Central to the Elucidations essay is Schenker’s discussion of Tonraum (literally, “tonal space”). As shown
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in Figure 1, *Tonraum* demonstrates how the triad, generated from the chord of nature up to the fifth tone of the overtone series, is collapsed into octave space and filled in with passing tones—it horizontalizes the chord of nature through the octave, delimits the space of the *Urlinie*, and opens up the possibility for the composing-out of linear progressions (*Auskomponierungszüge*). The *Elucidations* essay also incorporates a number of Schenker’s core transformations, including register transfers, reachings-over, parallel tenth strings, 5-6 shifts, neighboring progressions, and unfoldings. As Schenker’s most concise theoretical formulation before the publication of *Der freie Satz*, the *Elucidations* essay would have been the standard reference for anyone seeking a digest of Schenker’s ideas before 1935.

![Figure 1](image_url)

**Figure 1.** Heinrich Schenker’s *Tonraum* as found in his “Elucidations” essay (Der Tonwille 8/9-10; Das Meisterwerk in der Music 1-2; 1924-26)

The other publication to mention is Schenker’s analysis of Bach’s C-major prelude from the first book of the *Well-Tempered Clavier* (BWV 846), published in the *Fünf Urlinie-Tafeln* of 1932. While the *Elucidations* essay offered a clear demonstration of Schenker’s *Tonraum* and of various voice-leading techniques, the analysis of the C-major prelude provided the most succinct graphic demonstration of Schenker’s analytical method and his understanding of the *Ursatz*. As Schenker made clear in a 1930 letter to another pupil, Felix-
Eberhard von Cube, the C-major prelude analysis was intended to be distributed amongst music teachers who wished to acquaint themselves with the basics of his theory without the need of textual comment.\(^6\) Schenker’s C-major prelude analysis was thus the ideal model to show the effectiveness of his approach to music. Together, the Elucidations essay and the analysis of the C-major prelude formed a didactic core for the early Schenkerians.

*Jonas and the essence of the musical artwork*

More than anyone else, Oswald Jonas advocated a concept of tonality based on Schenker’s *Tonraum* and on the technique of *Auskomponierung*. After giving a lecture in Berlin in November of 1930, Jonas wrote the following to Schenker about his experience:

And thus I could speak at first above all of that which appears to me at the outset as the most important idea (and as the fundamental contrast to every other “theory”): the concept of *Auskomponierung*, the reproduction of the vertical (naturally-given) chord in time through horizontalization corresponding to the playing-out of music through time, from which the new and true tonality-concept emerges: staking-out of the tonal space (whereby temporal succession is conquered, so to speak).\(^7\)

Not long after his Berlin lecture Jonas published a series of articles on Schenker for the *Allgemeine Musikzeitung*. The first of these, mentioned above, was entitled “Zum Begriff der Tonalität.” Just two pages in length, this article was in fact a rebuttal to a 1931 article by the composer Bruno Stürmer entitled “Die Neue Tonalität.” In it Stürmer advocated a turn away from functional harmonic thinking and towards a type of pure “melodic tonality,” which opened up the possibility for non-functional harmonies. Jonas found arguments like
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\(^7\) Jonas, letter to Schenker (November 28, 1930), translated by John Rothgeb. *Schenker Documents Online*, http://www.schenkerdocumentsonline.org (accessed May 6, 2014). I have altered the translation of the last parenthetical remark, which in German reads “wodurch der Zeitverlauf gleichsam nun überwunden ist.”
Stürmer’s nothing more than dilettantish modernism, and used his rebuttal as a means by which to position his own thoughts on tonality:

[Tonality] does not mean that only certain chords in a work can appear or that melodic constructions move within a certain interval of the scale. Rather, tonality manifests itself in our masterworks as the fulfillment of a single chord, which through horizontalization is stretched across the entire work; it does not suffice merely to mark the beginning and end with the same chord, rather it is dependent upon the complete direction of its path.\(^8\)

In other words, Jonas was responding not only to what he saw as an ill-informed understanding of tonality but also to Stürmer’s attempt to redefine tonality to accommodate new music.

Jonas followed up his critique of Stürmer with a two-part article entitled “Heinrich Schenker,” his first published attempt to lay out the basic tenets of Schenker’s ideas. Not only did Jonas provide an introduction to Schenker’s core notions—of Stufe and Stimmführung, of the Urlinie and the Ursatz, and of free and strict composition—but he also offered the reader a listing of Schenker’s principal works. While citing a number of essays throughout the Tonville and Meisterwerk volumes, he positioned the Elucidations essay as the most fundamental of Schenker’s writings, and he recommended the study of Schenker’s analyses of Bach preludes.

These articles set the stage for Jonas’s 1934 book, The Essence of the Musical Artwork: An Introduction to the Teachings of Heinrich Schenker (Das Wesen des musikalischen Kunstwerks: Eine Einführung in die Lehre Heinrich Schenkers).\(^9\) In this work Jonas took Tonraum as the key ingredient to his second chapter, “The Artistic Formation of

---


the Chord.” It not only framed the entire chapter, but it also provided him with the conceptual basis for introducing the various Auskomponierungszüge that make up the next and largest chapter of the book, “Voice Leading and the Unfolding of the Triad.”

Schenker’s analysis of the C-major prelude also makes an appearance in Jonas’s book. Jonas mentions the prelude and Schenker’s analysis of it on at least four occasions. He notes, for instance, the use of the opening octave progression in parallel 10ths (c1/e2 - c/e1 mm. 1-19) and the regaining of the obligatory register of the upper voice through the use of an octave coupling (d1 - d2, mm. 24-34).\textsuperscript{10} He also takes note of the superposition of the inner voices that conceal the initial stepwise descent in the upper voice (mm. 5, 7, and 12-15) and of Bach’s manner of avoiding parallel fifths in these opening measures through the use of a descending 5-6 progression.\textsuperscript{11} Jonas’s distillation of this opening passage, given in Figure 2a, even bears a resemblance to Schenker’s own abstraction of descending 5-6 motion as found in the Elucidations (Figure 2b).

\textbf{Figure 2A.} Oswald Jonas’s distillation of mm. 1-19 of Bach’s C-major Prelude, found in \textit{Das Wesen des musikalischen Kunstwerks} (1935), Fig. 191.


\textsuperscript{11} Jonas, \textit{Introduction to the Theory of Heinrich Schenker}, 87; 122.
But Jonas goes a step further: he sees the C-major prelude analysis as the purest expression of Schenker’s theory of the *Ursatz*, as it renders the composing-out of a single and undivided chord across an entire piece. For Jonas, the play of octaves is key to bringing about the three-line *Ursatz*. He writes: “Now if the e₂, the first fundamental-line tone of the original third-progression, is prolonged by an octave progression (a downward coupling e₂-e₁), and if d₂, the first passing tone, is prolonged by an upward coupling d₁-d₂ in order to return to c₂, then we obtain the outline of Bach’s Prelude in C major. [This is how the prelude becomes] extended through time from the primal womb of the triad, timeless above all temporal process.”¹² This observation brings Jonas to the revelation that “the fundamental structure is the guardian and bearer of tonality. Indeed, only through the fundamental line does the concept of tonality acquire its higher and true meaning as demanding a temporal realization of a single sonority.”¹³ In sum, Jonas posits a concept of tonality that brings together *Tonraum*, with its unfolding through octave space, and the *Ursatz*, the final arbiter of musical coherence.

---

¹² Ibid., 148.
¹³ Ibid., 149.
Salzer also found *Tonraum* and the analysis of the C-major prelude to be of fundamental import, and in large part he followed Jonas’s lead. But while Jonas brought Schenker’s ideas to the attention of the public through an introductory guidebook, Salzer did so through an investigation of the history of Western polyphony. This was the goal of his 1935 book, *Sinn und Wesen der abendländischen Mehrstimmigkeit (The Meaning and Essence of Western Polyphony)*. While tracing the notion of *Auskomponierung* across the spectrum of Western music from the twelfth- to the eighteenth centuries, Salzer used *Tonraum* and the C-major prelude analysis to frame the entire book.

As his first example of *Auskomponierung* Salzer drew on a twelfth-century “Benedicamus Domino” from the School of St. Martial. Salzer’s analysis is reproduced in Figures 3a-e. Based on a composed-out D sonority, Figure 3a shows the polyphonic structure derived from the two-voice melismatic organum, whereby the duplum traverses the space of lower, middle, and upper voice; figure 3b gives a further clarification of the way the D chord is extracted from the melismas. Figure 3c then demonstrates the three-part process by which the D chord unfolds in ascending motion: an initial linear motion from D to A, a neighboring motion around A, and a final ascent from A to D, thus completing the octave progression. Figure 3d Salzer calls the “Ursatz,” as it gives the “final meaning” (*letzte Sinn*) to this passage of music. Finally, Figure 3e provides the underlying theoretical model explaining the expansion of this *Ursatz* over the course of the music, namely *Tonraum*. In the course of his analysis Salzer also alludes to the concept *Auskomponierung* and to voice-leading levels, and

---

14 Felix Salzer, *Sinn und Wesen der abendländischen Mehrstimmigkeit* (Vienna: Saturn Verlag, 1935). Incidentally, this book was first published by the same publisher as that of Jonas’s book, Saturn-Verlag. This could account for the similarity of their titles. A more detailed discussion of this book and the context in which it was written can be found in John Koslovsky, “From *Sinn und Wesen* to Structural Hearing: The Development of Felix Salzer’s Ideas in Interwar Vienna and their Transmission in Postwar United States” (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Rochester, 2010), 158-260.
he refers the reader to Schenker’s Elucidations essay. In analyzing this “Benedicamus Domino,” then, Salzer wished to bring the reader in closer contact with Schenker’s writings and also use those writings to analyze the earliest forms of Western polyphony.

![Figure 3](image)

**Figure 3.** Felix Salzer’s analysis of a twelfth-century “Benedicamus Domino” from the School of St. Martial, found in *Sinn und Wesen der abendländischen Mehrstimmigkeit*, Figs. 4-8.

Like Jonas, Salzer regarded the analysis of the C-major prelude as the quintessence of Schenker’s ideas in graphic form; his aim in showing this analysis in *Sinn und Wesen*, however, was deeply woven into his agenda of tracing an overarching development of

---

15 Salzer, *Sinn und Wesen*, 34.
Western polyphony. His citation of this work and its analysis comes at the very end of "Sinn und Wesen," in a section entitled “The Creation of the Totality of a Work.” He describes Schenker’s analysis as follows: “The sketches show the entire art of synthesis and of the organic process of coherence in all its clarity. We recognize how meaningful and connected everything is constructed...and how all the prolongations represent a conscious organic extension of the Ursatz.” He concludes that “it appears that one has recognized in Bach’s work not a new style but much more a high point, a piece of accomplishment in the organic development of the Western Style.” In short, Salzer embraced the very elements that Jonas did but then adapted them to his historical investigations.

Writing in the same year as Salzer, Katz made her début in a 1935 article entitled “Heinrich Schenker’s Method of Analysis.” While summarizing a number of Schenker’s ideas, Katz offers almost a direct translation of Schenker’s Elucidations essay in the first formal section of her article, which she entitled “Tonality.” Here, she defined the Ursatz as “the elemental structure out of which the composition evolves. It is the perfect realization of tonality expressed through the horizontalization of the tonic triad in two voices.” This definition of tonality was not her own—as Hedi Siegel has pointed out, it was borrowed almost verbatim from the definition of the Ursatz in a typewritten sheet inserted into the first edition of the Five Graphic Analyses, which is presumed to have been prepared by Hans
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17 Ibid., 236. “Es ergibt sich nun konsequenterweise, und es erscheint uns von besonderer Wichtigkeit, daß man in einer derartigen Komposition Bachs keinen neuen Kunststil, vielmehr jedoch einen Höhepunkt, ein Stück Vollendung des sich organisch entwickelnden abendländischen Stils zu erkennen hat.”


Weisse.\(^{20}\) And, while Jonas and Salzer merely intimated the connection between the concept of tonality and the concept of the *Ursatz*, Katz (following Weisse’s lead) made it unequivocal.

Just as she had made use of the Elucidations essay to explain the nature of Schenker’s basic ideas, so too did Katz draw on the analysis of the C-major prelude to further elucidate Schenker’s concept of the *Ursatz* and the concept of tonality. Figure 4a represents Katz’s distillation of Schenker’s analysis. Katz isolates a number of elements from Schenker’s graph: the upper-voice motion ˆ3-4-4-3 of the opening and closing measures (a framing neighboring motion, the same one Schenker shows in the Elucidations essay; see Figure 4b); the octave couplings of the upper voice; and the underlying harmonic framework: I-(V-I)-IV-II-V-I. But her citation of Schenker’s analysis is motivated not only by her attempt to demonstrate the concept of tonality but also to show the deficiencies of a competing analysis by Hugo Riemann (reproduced in Figure 5).\(^{21}\) Among other things, Katz objects to Riemann’s literal reading of the upper voice, and she takes the German theorist to task for his groupings of notes and measures.\(^{22}\) Just like Jonas, then, Katz sought to correct a “wrong” concept of tonality in order to show the “right” one.


\(^{21}\) As William Drabkin has shown, Schenker also had Riemann’s analysis in mind when publishing the *Fünf Urlinie-Tafeln*—Schenker made this clear in a letter to Felix-Eberhard van Cube from January 1930. Above all, it is Schenker’s hypermetrical analysis that is intended to counter Riemann’s own metrical interpretation. See Drabkin, “A Lesson in Analysis from Heinrich Schenker,” 246-247.

**Figure 4A.** Adele Katz’s distillation of Schenker’s analysis of Bach’s C-major Prelude, found in “Heinrich Schenker’s Method of Analysis,” Ex. 14C.

**Figure 4B.** Schenker’s example of the 3-4-4-3 framing motion as found in the Elucidations essay, Fig. 7.
Two analyses: Bach’s Little Prelude in F major and Schubert’s Waltz in B minor

The four years following Schenker’s death in 1935 saw the Schenkerians making a concerted effort to disseminate Schenker’s teachings to a wider audience. Jonas and Salzer did this by starting a Schenker Institute in Vienna and by giving lectures across Austria, Germany, and elsewhere in Europe. In addition, they co-founded a journal, Der Dreiklang, which was published in nine volumes between 1937 and 1939. A look at two articles from Der Dreiklang is instructive in showing how Jonas and Salzer expressed the concept of tonality through their own analyses.²³

Jonas contributed more articles than anyone else to Der Dreiklang. The very first article he published there was an analysis of J.S. Bach’s Little Prelude in F major, BWV 927; he entitled the article “A Bach Prelude: A Path to Organic Hearing” (Ein Bach-Präludium:

²³ Katz did not publish any analysis of her own in the 1930s, and her analyses as presented in Challenge to Musical Tradition of 1945 already represent a shift in thought (discussed briefly in the final portion of this article).
Ein Weg zum organischen Hören). Schenker was equally fond of drawing upon Bach’s “little” preludes to demonstrate organic coherence—such analyses are scattered across the pages of Der Tonwille and Das Meisterwerk in der Musik. For Schenker, as for Jonas, Bach’s little preludes encapsulated in miniature the work of musical genius. Figure 6 reproduces Bach’s prelude, and Figures 7a-g show the first seven sketches of Jonas’s analysis.

**Figure 6.** J.S. Bach’s Little Prelude in F major, BWV 927
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24 As has been pointed out elsewhere, Schenker first used the term *Ursatz* in connection with an analysis of Bach’s Prelude in D minor (BWV 926), found in issue five of Der Tonwille. See William Pastille, “The Development of the Ursatz in Schenker’s Published Works,” in Trends in Schenkerian Research, ed. Allen Cadwallader (New York: Schirmer, 1990), 71-86.
**Figure 7.** Jonas’s analysis of Bach’s Little Prelude in F major, found in “Ein Bach Präludium: Ein Weg zum organischen Hören,” Figs. 1-7.

In Figure 7a, Jonas constructs an overtone series on F and then derives the *Ursatz* of Bach’s prelude from the precise registers of this series. He explains: “Figure [7a] shows the F triad in such a position that the intervals follow the order of the partials: first the octave, then the fifth, and, uppermost, the third. This is the tonal space (*Klangraum*) which is expressed by this prelude.”

In Figure 7b, Jonas horizontalizes the F chord and then adds the passing tone G and two inner voices in parentheses. In doing this, Jonas seeks to make as literal a connection as possible between the chord of nature and the *Ursatz*.
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25 The English translation of this analysis is given in the 1954 English translation of Schenker’s *Harmonielehre*, which will be discussed in the last portion of this essay. See Heinrich Schenker, *Harmony*, ed. by Oswald Jonas, trans. by Elisabeth Mann-Borgese (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), 349.
Having derived the underlying third progression from the chord of nature, Jonas then draws attention to a neighboring figure, B♭-A. Figures 7c-e show how the neighbor motion, first heard in m. 4, results from a two-part ascent to the Kopfton A (C-F; F-A) and combines with an inner voice projected into the soprano. Figure 7f compares this with the final measures of the piece, where the neighbor motion B♭-A is reiterated just before the structural descent. For Jonas, this motivic parallelism represents the very essence of the prelude and demonstrates Bach’s ability to hear across large spans, hence the article’s title.

Also crucial to Jonas’s analysis are the various linear progressions that take place over the course of the prelude. In Figure 7g Jonas sketches a descending octave progression from a2 to a1, which is counterpointed in parallel tenths between the outer voices and includes a descending 5-6 motion between the inner voice and the soprano—remarkably similar to both Jonas’s distillation of the C-major prelude in Das Wesen and to Schenker’s own model in the Elucidations essay. The goal tone of this initial descending linear progression, a1, gives rise to an ascending line, A-B♭-C, from where it leaps to f2 (mm. 8-10); this f2 then spins out a second descending linear progression back to a1 (mm. 10-13), the ending of which creates a parallel with the ending of the initial linear progression to a1. A quick upward arpeggiation leads to a restatement of the salient neighbor figure B♭-A, thereby regaining the Kopfton in the obligatory register and bringing the prelude to a close. This synthesis of neighboring motion and linear progression brings Jonas to the conclusion that “[t]his is artistic formation, this is true tonality, the representation of a single chordal, of a tonal space in time.”

Salzer published just one article in Der Dreiklang, which he entitled “The Historical Mission of Heinrich Schenker.” This article was the result of a lecture Salzer had first given
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at the Salzburg Mozarteum in the summer of 1935. Part One of Salzer’s lecture outlined what he saw as Schenker’s importance to the history of music theory, specifically his revelations about the composing-out of the triad and their ramifications for the teaching of harmony and counterpoint. Salzer sought to show how Schenker’s ideas, while supplanting those of nineteenth-century pedagogues such as Richter, Bellerman, Bussler, and Louis and Thuille, also proved superior to the more “progressive” ideas of Kurth, Riemann, and Schoenberg. For Salzer, Schenker’s mission was not only to provide a new method for teaching harmony and counterpoint, but to reawaken a lost tonal musical instinct.

Part Two of Salzer’s lecture, however, was not included in the published Dreiklang article. It presents two musical analyses: one of a Schubert Waltz in B minor, from the D. 145 collection of “Walzer, Ländler, und Ecossaisen” (no. 10); and the other from the opening twenty-seven measures of Chopin’s Polonaise-Fantasie, Op. 61. The analysis of the Schubert waltz in particular reveals how Salzer sought to introduce Schenker’s basic concepts to the uninitiated. Salzer was not alone in his affinity for Schubert waltzes: Schenker had made use of the composer’s D. 365 collection to demonstrate various voice-leading principles in his “Further Considerations of the Urlinie” in volume two of Das Meisterwerk in der Musik. Like the little preludes of Bach, Schubert’s waltzes are compact tonal organisms, replete with both simple and complex voice-leading procedures. And just like Jonas, Salzer cast his analysis as an explanation of the concept of tonality:

Through discussions of key relations the concept of tonality has reached a false meaning. The scope of tonality is far too narrowly delineated; one hasn’t recognized that only the background progression of composing-out decides on the question of the existing tonality, and that where the composing-out of a chord exists in the fundamental structure of the background, that there too the greatest amount of chromaticism and apparent non-tonal chordal progressions

27 The manuscript for the lecture survives in the Felix Salzer Papers of the New York Public Library for the Performing Arts (box 31, fols. 5-6).
are possible, without abolishing the effect of the composing-out of the chord, without breaching or dissolving the tonality.²⁹

The Mozarteum lecture thus represents one of Salzer’s earliest attempts at bringing Schenker’s analytical approach and the concept of tonality to a wider audience.

Salzer offers his analysis in four levels (see Figure 8). At level a, Salzer posits an Ursatz derived from ^3. This Ursatzform is prolonged at level b through a stepwise rising bass from the tonic to the dominant (B-C#-D-E-F#) and at level c through an upper-voice neighbor motion (D-E-D), which is now counterpointed in the bass through a 10-10-8 progression. This contrapuntal progression is then transformed at the foreground: that is, the bass note A at m. 7 takes the place of the implied C#. In his text Salzer stresses the middle- and foreground motivic parallelisms with the background third progression. In the first part (mm. 1-4) the descent from D is quickly interrupted at C#, and in the second part (9-11) the Kopfton D undergoes a subsidiary third progression (D-C♯ -B), involving the chromatic alteration of C# to C♯ (m. 12).

While he divides his discussion of the waltz between its first and second parts, Salzer gives far greater emphasis to the latter owing to the way it demonstrates Schenker’s more penetrating insight of “musical meaning.” Two aspects are noteworthy about Salzer’s analysis of this second part. One is the handling of the surface motivic material of the upper voice at mm. 9-12 (F♯-C♯, D-A); the other is the treatment of the accompanying chromatic

²⁹ Felix Salzer, “Vortrag über Schenker” (New York Public Library for the Performing Arts, box 31, fol. 5-6), 33. “So hat der Begriff Tonalität aber eine ganz falsche Bedeutung erlangt. Der Rahmen der Tonalität wurde viel zu eng gesteckt; man hat nicht erkannt, daß nur der hintergründige Verlauf der Auskomponierung über die Frage der bestehenden Tonalität entscheidet und, wo ein auf Auskomponierung eines Klanges gegründeter Satz im Hintergrund besteht, daß dort auch das größte Maß von Chromen und scheinbar nichttonalen Klangfolgen möglich ist, ohne das die Wirkung des zur Auskomponierung gelangenden Klanges dadurch aufgehoben, ohne daß die Tonalität dadurch durchbrochen oder zersetzt wird.” In transcribing Salzer’s text I have taken into account all of Salzer’s handwritten annotations and have reproduced them here as faithfully as possible. I have also tacitly corrected any typos.
ascending line in the tenor voice (A-A#-B-C). For Salzer, these elements effect an essential stepwise voice-leading progression behind the surface of the music. He explains it as follows:

If we wish to understand the voice-leading [of this passage], the initial question arises: does the goal tone D at the end of the first part actually move to F# and from there down to A [at m. 12], while the lower middle voice moves from A via A# and B to C? You will probably tell me: [“"]yes, that is what is stated there, so the tone succession must also be so.[”"] Of course it is stated there, but the question is whether or not something else is stated at the same time, something that is concealed through the motives and which results in the actual sense of the passage.

One can describe the succession of tones—and here we are touching on something essential—in the way they appear [erscheinen] or in what they mean [bedeuten]. Schenker’s teaching is based on the meaning of tonal motion, this is what characterizes its essential foundation.30

So instructive was this distinction between the “appearance” (Erscheinung) of the music and its “meaning” (Bedeutung) that Salzer goes on to describe it as one of Schenker’s most fundamental observations about music. He does so by offering his audience a simple analogy from psychology:

Suppose you encounter someone; that person appears tough to you, unfriendly and arrogant. If you were to form a judgment according to this impression, it might be that you characterize only the manner of that person’s appearance, but such a judgment hardly applies. If you really try to understand the person, you will hit on the fact that the reason for the toughness and arrogance lies in an inner weakness, a feeling of minority, such that the person attempts to hide behind toughness and arrogance. Certainly the person appears the way one knows, as arrogant, but does this arrogance not mean very little, after one has discovered its cause, the organic connection from the background, the feeling of minority, and the foreground, the arrogant appearance?31
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30 Ibid., 18. “Wenn wir die Stimmführung uns vergegenwärtigen wollen, so ist zunächst die Frage: Geht das am Schluss des 1. Teils erreichte D wirklich nach Fis und von dort abwärts bis A und die untere Mittelstimme von A über Ais-H nach C? Sie werden mir vielleicht darauf sagen: nun ja, das steht ja da, so wird der Tonverlauf auch so sein. Freilich steht es so da, die Frage ist nur, ob nicht gleichzeitig etwas da steht, was durch die Motivik verschleiert wird und den eigentlichen Sinn dieser Takte erst ergibt.”

“Man kann nämlich—and hier berühren wir etwas Wesentliches—die Tonvorgänge beschreiben nach dem, wie sie erscheinen oder nach dem was sie bedeuten. Die Lehre Schenkens geht nun, damit ist ihr Grundwesen charakterisiert, aus die Erkenntnis der Bedeutung einer Tonbewegung.”

31 Ibid., 19. “Nehmen wir an, Sie begegnen einem Menschen; er erscheint Ihnen hart, unfreundlich und arrogant. Beurteilen Sie ihn nun nach diesem Eindruck, so kann es sein daß Sie damit eben nur die Art seines Auftretens charakterisieren, den Menschen selbst aber mit diesem Urteil kaum betreffen. Wenn Sie aber versuchen ihn wirklich zu verstehen, so werden Sie daraufkommen, daß der Grund für seine Härte und Arroganz vielleicht in einer inneren Schwäche, einem Gefühl der eigenen Minderheit liegt, das er durch Härte und Arroganz zu
With this analogy Salzer returns to the waltz: “The problems of appearance-as-foreground and meaning-as-background and their interdependence also arises in music. Examining more closely the events of the second part [of the Schubert waltz], we recognize that behind the motivic appearance the meaning lies in the background, the true sense of the situation.”

Looking behind the appearance of Salzer’s own graph we find a concealed affinity for Schenker’s analysis of Bach’s C-major prelude. In the first place, Salzer’s decision to draw on the inner voice C♯ of m. 12 in Schubert in order to trace the stepwise progression D-C♯-B resembles the same technique that Schenker employed in connecting the upper-voice B of m. 11 chromatically to G of m. 15 in Bach. In the second place, and much more subtly (perhaps even unconsciously), Salzer extracts from Schubert’s waltz a procedure that Schenker observed in the Bach prelude: the use of two superimposed leaps of a fourth in the upper voice that anticipate metrically and motivically a cadential gesture in the bass (compare Salzer’s analysis of mm. 9-12 in the Schubert waltz with Schenker’s analysis of mm. 4-11 in the Bach prelude). In Salzer’s case, it involves two descending leaps of a fourth (F♯-C♯, D-A) followed by the cadential bass motion F♯-B; in Schenker’s case, the fourths are ascending (E-A, D-G), as is the cadential bass motion D-G. Both, however, fit into the same hypermetrical grid; both happen while concealing linear motion by third in the upper voice; and both follow a kind of “rule of three” in the sense that a parallelism is brought to bear on the surface of the music (Schenker notes this as “(1),” “(2),” and “(3)” on his graph).

---

verbergen bestrebt ist. Freilich erscheint er auch nachdem man das weiss, arrogant, bedeutet aber diese Arroganz nicht ganz etwas Anderes, nachdem man ihre Ursache, sozusagen den organischen Zusammenhang vom Hintergrund, dem Gefühl der Minderheit, und dem Vordergrund, dem arroganten Auftreten erkannt hat.”

**Figure 8.** Salzer’s analysis of Franz Schubert’s Waltz in B minor, D. 145 (no. 10).
Located in the Felix Salzer Papers of the New York Public Library for the Performing Arts (box 31, fols. 5-6).
In sum, Salzer’s and Jonas’s analyses offer a test case for examining the ways in which Schenker’s ideas were interpreted and disseminated shortly after his death. From a study of their work we learn three things. First, Schenker’s immediate disciples drew on many of the same texts and analytical examples from Schenker’s writings to explain the essence of his approach, and sought in numerous instances to link their own graphs with his. Second, Jonas’s and Salzer’s efforts to disseminate Schenker in the 1930s contained not only pedagogical aspects but also a residue of Schenker’s musical polemics, through rhetorical gestures to organic hearing, attacks on proponents of new tonality, and dismissal of “progressive” theories of harmony—the titles to both their respective books and articles themselves have an air of polemic about them. Third, and most important for the present study, Salzer and Jonas used their analyses to locate the essence of tonality in the deepest recesses of the musical artwork, whether through appeals to nature and the overtone series or by tapping into subconscious psychological processes. Schenker’s notion of the background proved crucial in this regard.

A brief look at the concept of tonality after the war

Amidst the turmoil that ensued during the first half of the 1940s, Jonas, Salzer, and Katz continued their quest to disseminate Schenker’s ideas and to promote the concept of tonality. While Jonas became committed to bringing Schenker’s own writings into public view, Katz and Salzer had shifted their attention to reformulating their ideas and to broadening the scope of Schenker’s teachings. Katz, for instance, defined tonality in Challenge to Musical Tradition as “the expression of a single key through the prolongation of a primordial
**Figure 9.** Salzer’s analysis of Schubert’s Waltz in B minor as found in Structural Hearing, Exs. V and VI
framework instead of the expression of various keys through the techniques of modulation.\textsuperscript{33} Salzer would even more boldly proclaim in \textit{Structural Hearing} that “[t]onality is synonymous with chord prolongation,” even if that meant uncovering unconventional deep-level prolongations and/or prolongations in music of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{34}

Not only did Salzer broaden his perspective of tonality, but he also applied that broader perspective to the very work he had used to demonstrate the concept of tonality in 1935, Schubert’s waltz in B minor. Figure 9 reproduces Salzer’s Examples V and VI in \textit{Structural Hearing}, the first analysis of a complete composition and the way Salzer introduces the concept of tonality in his book. As the figure shows, Salzer’s analysis of the waltz changed radically both in form and in aim in \textit{Structural Hearing}. To begin, two of the most crucial factors of his 1935 analysis have been removed: the rising bass line in part I (B-C#-D-E-F#) and the chromatic descending upper line in part II (D-C♮-B). With respect to the former, Salzer simply indicates a passing motion B-B♭-A (level a); in the latter case, he prefers to sketch a type of unfolding: D-A followed by B-D (level b). This produces the undesirable effect of parallel fifths from the D chord to the E chord, which Salzer himself readily acknowledges. And though Salzer’s Example VI (and Example VII, not shown) might seem to acknowledge a deeper I-V-I progression, Salzer in fact uses this example simply to describe the opening harmonic prolongation of B in mm. 1-5.

Why the changes? Upon closer inspection, one observes that Salzer’s analysis in \textit{Structural Hearing} becomes much more geared towards the salient aspects of the surface and less towards a transformational prototype, even if it grounds itself in a basic structural framework I-III-V-I (what Salzer now describes at the piece’s deepest level, as opposed to

\textsuperscript{34} Felix Salzer, \textit{Structural Hearing} (New York: Charles Boni, 1952), 232.
simply I-V-I). By doing so, Salzer has eroded his own distinction between *Erscheinung* and *Bedeutung*, the concepts he went to such great lengths to explain in his Mozarteum lecture. And while he follows Schenker in rejecting any genuine notion of modulation, he envisioned a new concept of tonality that would have gone beyond Schenker’s wildest dreams. Clearly, a metamorphosis in Salzer’s thoughts on Schenker had taken place in the seventeen or so years separating these analyses.

While Salzer and Katz had taken their inquiries in new directions, Jonas committed himself to republishing Schenker’s own work. The first to come out was the 1954 English translation of Schenker’s *Harmonielehre*, which Jonas edited and annotated.35 Jonas’s introduction to the book is everything but in name another essay on “The Concept of Tonality.” Jonas gives particular emphasis to the issues of prolongation and *Auskomponierung*, and across the text he invokes what he sees to be the crux of tonality. When he arrives at the notion of the *Ursatz* (given simply in its 3-line form), Jonas writes: “This ultimate and supreme unity, which sustains the unity of the whole, represents, in its *Ursatz* form, the *Auskomponierung* of one single chord, the bearer of tonality. It is obvious that Schenker’s concept of tonality differs widely from the customary one. For Schenker, tonality is in the fashioning and expression in time of one single chord as given by Nature and extending in space.”36 Jonas even takes the opportunity in his introduction to criticize Salzer’s expansions in *Structural Hearing*, arguing that “such an attempt was possible only through misinterpretation of Schenker’s basic theories, first of all his concept of tonality, and therefore is doomed to fail.”37

---

35 The translation itself was done by Elizabeth Mann Borgese.
37 Ibid., viii, fn. 2.
While casting aside Salzer’s attempt to broaden the scope of tonality, Jonas took the opportunity in the 1954 translation of Harmonielehre to republish his own analysis of Bach’s Little Prelude in F major, in the appendix. Like Salzer, Jonas made changes to both the text and to the analytical examples. However, Jonas’s analytical observations are far less divergent from his earlier analysis than Salzer’s; in fact, he even clarified his initial analytical position by offering an additional graph (see Figure 10). This shows a middleground sketch that further elucidates the motivic repetitions of the B♭-A neighbor and the contrapuntal spans that help prolong the Kopfton throughout the prelude. Figure 10 also draws attention to the surface sixteenth-note rhythmic motive F-C-A-C in m. 4, which Jonas sees as confirming the arrival of the Kopfton and its registral coupling.

**Figure 10.** Jonas’s added middleground sketch to Bach’s Little Prelude in F major, found in Appendix II to the 1954 English translation of Schenker’s Harmony (Fig. 7).
But while the analytical changes are mainly refinements to the 1937 analysis, Jonas’s text underwent noticeable revisions. Most conspicuously, Jonas removed the title to his essay (“A Path to Organic Hearing”) as well as the opening and closing sections to the text. In this way, he stripped away much of his earlier polemic, just as he had stripped away much of Schenker’s polemic for the second edition of Der freie Satz in 1956. Nonetheless, Jonas continued to describe the tonality of the work along the lines he did in 1937; that is, as synonymous with Auskomponierung: “The prelude is the artistic elaboration of one single chord, projected in time. It is the expression of true tonality. Such a creation is conceivable only if it is drawn from a unitary background.”38 In sum, while all three Schenkerians continued to adhere to a concept of tonality based in Schenker’s notion of Auskomponierung, they began to diverge with respect to its application and hence to tonality’s underlying meaning: Salzer and Katz by experimenting with new types of composing-out in the music of the twentieth century; and Jonas by reiterating its sole application to the tonal masters of the eighteenth- and nineteenth centuries.

Conclusion

Of course, the elephant in the room has been Schenker all along. What exactly did he say about the word “tonality,” and how does that relate to Jonas’s, Salzer’s, and Katz’s use of the term as described in the foregoing essay? A full study of Schenker’s own use of this term is beyond the scope of this paper, but it is worth noting a few instances of Schenker’s thought on the matter. Unlike his disciples, Schenker was not quick to equate the concept of tonality with Auskomponierung or with the Ursatz, even if it is intimated at certain points in his

38 Ibid., 352.
At least in his mature works, notably in Der freie Satz, Schenker explained that “tonality” was the mechanism for controlling the surface of the music through all its chromatic twists and turns—above all, this enabled Schenker to write-off modulation as simply an effect of the “illusory keys.” But even his the analyses from Das Meisterwerk in der Musik, where “Tonalität” is often indicated at the deepest analytical level, Schenker uses the term to demonstrate the governing function of the arpeggiated triad in the bass and the music’s subsequent tonicizations (i.e., chromaticisms) at more local levels, what he calls the “Stufen der Tonalität als Tonarten.” And, in one of his early unpublished writings, “Von der Tonalität,” Schenker even preferred to describe tonality in a purely psychological fashion: as a central pitch (a “tonic”) that grounds composer and listener alike through their hearing of a musical work, no matter how harmonically complex it may become.41 In other words, Schenker hardly aspired to the kind of grandiosity that his disciples had intended in using the term.

In fact, the sheer insistence of Jonas, Salzer, and Katz in promoting the concept of tonality is better understood largely as a separate issue. Because, in contrast with Schenker, the Schenkerians made it their aim of doing battle with proponents of “new tonality,” particularly Jonas—the fact that Salzer appeared to be joining the new tonality camp after WWII could only have been seen by Jonas as treason of the highest sort. But despite his insistence on remaining faithful to Schenker’s own ideas, Jonas too set about altering the

39 Jonas, for instance, cites a passage from the second issue of Der Tonwille, where Schenker writes: “The liaison between the horizontal version of tonality through the fundamental line and the vertical through the scale degrees is voice leading.” See Jonas, Introduction to the Theory of Heinrich Schenker, 146. Schenker goes on, however, to discuss tonality within the context of harmonic progression; the Urlinie’s elaborations, by contrast, are seen through the process of diminution. See Schenker, Der Tonwille vol. 1 (issue 2), 53.

40 See Heinrich Schenker, Free Composition (New York: Longman, 1979), 5, 11, 112. As Carl Schachter has put it, “[t]he term ‘tonality’ is applied to the enriched tonal contents of the foreground, unified, like the simple elements of diatony, through their relation to the tonic; these contents may include both local chromaticism and modulation to illusory keys.” Carl Schachter, “Analysis by Key: Another Look at Modulation,” in Unfoldings: Essays in Schenkerian Theory and Analysis, edited by Joseph Straus. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 149-150.

work of his teacher, even where no overt polemical content is to be found—for instance, when he replaced Schenker’s Figure 1 from Der freie Satz with a 3-line Ursatzform in the second edition of 1956 (see Figure 11). The original figure (Fig. 11a), which shows a non-musical representation of Schenker’s theory of levels, transformations, and prototypes, presents “tonality” at the foreground and “diatony” at the background. Schenker’s discusses the matter as follows:

I call the content of the fundamental line, counterpointed by the bass arpeggiation, diatony. This is the fundamental, determinate melodic succession, the primal design of melodic content. In contrast, tonality, in the foreground, represents the sum of all occurrences, from the smallest to the most comprehensive—including the illusory keys and all the various musical forms.

Within the poles of fundamental line and foreground, of diatony and tonality, the spatial depth of a musical work is expressed—its distant origin in the simplest element, its transformation through subsequent stages, and, finally, the diversity of its foreground.

The goal and the course to the goal are primary. Content comes afterward: without a goal there can be no content.

While in their final reading diatony and tonality are virtually inseparable from one another, Schenker makes it clear that they nonetheless occupy distinctive moments of compositional space: the one fulfilling music’s basic origins and goals at the background, the other expressing the diversity of musical content at the foreground. It hardly makes the type of case that his disciples sought to make: that tonality was synonymous with Auskomponierung and ultimately with the Ursatz (Fig. 11b).

---

42 See Brown, Explaining Tonality, 68-69.
43 Schenker, Free Composition, 5.
44 In fact, Schenker’s Figure 1 had already been replaced by the 3-line Ursatzform as early as 1937, when Schenker’s own paragraphs on the Ursatz from Der freie Satz (“Vom Ursatz als Inhalt des Hintergrundes in der Musik”) was republished in the first volume of Der Dreiklang—here, it immediately precedes Jonas’s analysis of the Bach F-major prelude and makes reference to that analysis in an editorial footnote. Given its proximity and reference to Jonas’s analysis, and given Jonas’s adherence to the replacement in 1956, it is presumed that Jonas was the one to decide on the change. Even more remarkably, the passage in the portion of Der freie Satz pertaining to Schenker’s concept of tonality is skipped over without comment in the Dreiklang issue. Compare Heinrich Schenker, Der freie Satz (Vienna: Universal Ed.), 16-17 with Oswald Jonas and Felix Salzer, eds., Der Dreiklang: Monatschrift für Musik, 12-13.
That said, however, Jonas, Salzer, and Katz were certainly aligned in their aim to debunk theories of tonality that were not only spreading to academic circles but also finding their way into the classroom, particularly the ideas of Riemann, Schoenberg, and Kurth—unlike Schenker, such authors were obsessed with laying claim to the concept of tonality, and many (particularly Schoenberg) had done so as a way of promoting their own compositional agenda. It is no wonder, then, that Schenker's early disciples would find their rallying call around this concept, since that word was under constant threat of misappropriation—they
thus considered it their mission to give proper definition to the concept of tonality, even at the risk of over-simplification. How their perspectives further evolved in the post-war years is crucial to understanding how later generations have come to interpret the concept. But that is better left for another time.
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