

Example 6

In addition to the deep middleground motive A—Ab—G (see Ex. 5), these graphs take special note of: the tetrachord motive (marked with a black asterisk) and the octave motive.

Symphony VI: Adagio (Foreground)

The drawn-out A major dominant of bars 9–10 and pervasive half-step upper neighbors of bars 5–10 lead me to hear bar 11 as an implied D minor and the top-voice Bb as an appoggiatura.

Whereas Example 5 shows A as the top voice for this passage, more locally this A arpeggiates up to a high F. After a two-octave descent (to m. 21, through a neighbor G) F is chromatically altered to F# in bar 24, where it leads to G#.

1 2 3 4 3̂ 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17

A. *Arp.*, *octave motive*, *CS*, *Parallel 10ths*, *octave motive*

F: I tetrachord motive (*) Bb minor momentarily tonicized. () I VI I

D: V (I) III⁶ (IV⁷) V⁶/₄

The oboe's A[♯] in this bar (see the score) stands for a B[♭] (the analogous spot in m. 8 clarifies), which continues the parallel tenths beyond those shown here.

At the arrival of 2̂, the deep middleground motive is climactically rectified to a diatonic step, A[♯]—G.

This G, 5̂ in C major, sets in motion a fifth progression (as is typical in Schenker's sonata form) that ends in bar 54.

17 18 19 20 21 23 24 25 26 27 31 33 35 36 37 39 40 41

dux, *comes*, *gezogen*, *A-G#*, *A-G*, *A-G*

D: V⁶/₄ 7 E: VII⁴/₃ I C: III# F: VII (III#) I (VI#) bVI I⁸ IV⁵⁻⁶ V⁶/₄

On this level the approach to E major appears plagal; but see Example 5, where the real bass is shown to be D# (a chromatic inflection of bar 11's D minor).

Figures B–G clarify bars 5–9 (see Fig. A). Figures C–G focus on bars 5–7, which are then sequenced.

Bars 31–35 cast Ab/G# as root, third, and fifth (see Ex. 5).

Ab replaces A[♯] as a chromatic passing tone, yielding a (dissonant) diminished third chord.

Here Bb is subordinate to Gb: the exact opposite of bar 2! (See Fig. A.)

5 6 7 8 9 5 6 7 5 6 7 5 6 7 5 6 7

B. **C.** **D.** **E.** **F.** **G.**

Parallel octaves mitigated by reaching over in the top voice. The bass ascends F—G—A, with semitones in between.

F# anticipation provides enharmonic consonant support for upper voice Db and Bb.

A lower neighbor F# in the bass allows for the dissonant Ab of Figure E to be prepared as a consonance. The neighbor figure also mitigates the enharmonic succession Gb—F#. Schenker introduced this principle in *Der freie Satz* §249 and Fig. 114.2.

44 45

H. Vln. I *cresc. sempre* *pp*

The passage quoted in Figure H makes the A[♯]—Ab—G motive explicit. For the remainder of the exposition, the Ab—G connection predominates.

49 50 51 52

I. Cl. Vc. *p* *dim.*

Figure I marks a turning point in the motivic life of the piece: here the tetrachord figure appears in both descending and ascending forms. This signals the onset of the development's voice leading (Figs. J–L).

The development's voice leading reverses the course of the exposition's motivic descending tetrachord on a large scale. Figures J–L summarize; Figures N and O provide detailed voice leading. (See Ex. 5 for deeper layers.)

Figure M gives an example of octave-play (perhaps related to the octave displacement in Figure L) from the development's climax. Notice too the invertible counterpoint here, which also begins the development (mm. 69 ff.).

Fig. J shows the motivic inner-voice fourth progression—the same pitches as m. 1! In Fig. K, the bass motion duplicates: in Schenker's terms, an unfolding. At this stage the fourth C—F is no longer strictly a linear progression, but it is still understood to resemble one. See *Der freie Satz* §141 and Fig. 43. The motivic fourth's identity is further clouded by the twin octave displacements of Fig. L. One might relate these octaves to the octave motive of the opening, whose downward direction is reversed in the development—just like the tetrachord's. Indeed, I feel a palpable upwards pull over the course of the development (see Fig. O in particular). (For a more local use of melodic inversion, see mm. 77–80.)

Figure N is a foreground sketch of the third theme (which belongs, however, to the development's voice leading in a Schenkerian sense). At first the third theme's key is uncertain. Is m. 53 a deceptive cadence in C minor or are we to hear an A \flat major tonic here? I favor the former; thus the tonic at m. 54 closes the fifth progression that began in m. 39. However, the rest of the theme discourages a C minor interpretation, and so I hear the A \flat tonic emerge over the course of the antecedent as an auxiliary cadence. The G major at the end of bar 56 serves as a clever sort of misdirection. This A \flat soon yields to D \flat major and its melodic descent (mm. 59–61) is not supported harmonically.

The structural D \flat I show in bars 65–66 is merely putative—this is not the C \sharp sixteenth note of m. 65. More literal readings are certainly possible. These would most likely take A \flat as the main tone across mm. 61–67. However, this feels overly static to my ear: bar 65 is the theme's climax, approached with a build-up and reached with a discharge of energy. For this reason, I take bar 65 as the point at which the ascending tetrachord's C resolves to D \flat ; accordingly I read bars 61–64 as prolonging dominant, not tonic, harmony. Note that, in my reading, the D \flat splits: on a deeper level it ascends to E \flat , but locally it descends into an inner voice (mm. 67–68).

Figure O gives a detailed middleground graph of the development proper (mm. 69–92). The central feature of its voice leading is the ascending ninth from E \flat (m. 70) to F (m. 81). Note the incredible motivic reworking Bruckner achieves in the coda (Figure P), where the violas are given the last word in the movement: E—F—A—C—E—F.

- ✓ 1. V I III
- X { 2. III(VI) I
- 3. III V I

Figure Q provides three interpretations of the harmony at the start of the development. I choose the first (which, in my view, makes for the most convincing middleground), despite the fact that these local tonics exist for just a single eighth note each. In this reading, each two-bar unit arpeggiates its local tonic (also true for Reading 3) and the final chords of bars 70 and 72 act as applied dominants: a 5–6 sequence.

Figure R demonstrates how a descending tetrachord is registrally concealed within the clarinet and oboe lines during the retransition.

Bruckner's coda is a masterful example of motivic synthesis. I provide but one (very simple) illustration of this in Figure S. Here, both the descending and ascending forms of the tetrachord—crucial engines of the movement's motivic growth—are made to sound simultaneously.

Symphony III: Finale

Figured Bass Reduction of Second Theme: Chorale Element

The measure numbers correspond to the 1873 version. Those in **bold** mark beginnings of Bruckner's periods, as indicated in the autograph of the 1877 revision, Wn. Mus. Hs. 19.475.

A. 69 ← 73 77 81 85

mm. 69-134

F# major $\frac{4}{3}$ 6 $\frac{\#6}{4} \frac{3}{3}$ $\frac{6}{5}$ 7 $\frac{4}{3}$ $\#5$ $\frac{\#6}{4}$ $\frac{\#7}{5}$ 8-7 $\frac{4}{3}$ * $\frac{7}{5}$ 6 $\frac{*6}{4} \frac{3}{3}$ **D# minor** $\frac{4}{2}$

III#

91 97 101

$\frac{4}{2}$ 7 $\#$ $\frac{7}{7}$ 6 7 $\#$ 6 $\frac{\#7}{5}$ 5-#6 $b7$ 6 7 7 **C major** $\frac{\#6}{4} \frac{3}{3}$ 7 $\frac{4}{2}$ 4 b 5 b

107 115

$\#$ $\#$ **A major** 7 $\#$ **G# major** 7 $\#$ $\#$

119 123 127 131 134

$\frac{7-6}{4} \frac{4}{3}$ $\frac{6}{5}$ 6 $\frac{\#6}{4}$ 6 $\frac{6}{4} \frac{2}{2}$ $\frac{6}{4} \frac{2}{2}$ $\frac{7}{5} > 6$ $\frac{7-6}{4} \frac{4}{3}$ $\frac{4}{3}$ $\#5$ * $\frac{7-6}{4} \frac{4}{3}$ $\frac{6}{5}$ 6 $\frac{*6}{4}$ 6 $\frac{6}{4} \frac{2}{2}$ $\frac{6}{4} \frac{2}{2}$ $\frac{7}{5} > 6$ $\frac{7-6}{4} \frac{4}{3}$ $\frac{7-6}{4} \frac{4}{3}$ **E# minor** **F# major** **G# minor** **E major** **A major**

II# **V#**

This represents, in my reading, the structural dominant of the movement, which Bruckner removed from the 1877 revision. (!) It is followed by a repeat of the second theme in F major, which I read as belonging to the development's voice leading. For a history of Bruckner's revisions of this movement, see Gault 2011, 51-53 and 82; and Röder 2001.

Figures B–D, E–H, and I–L feature elaborations by stages, from foreground to surface. Note how Bruckner elaborates all three passages to incorporate bass motion in half steps.

The tenor's chromatic passing tone C \flat creates parallel fifths between the chorale-melody instruments and the 2nd clarinet and 3rd horn. Bruckner mitigates these fifths with surface-level voice leading in the violins.

B. **C.** **D.**

D \flat replaces D \sharp in the alto as a chromatic alteration.

On the surface, a G \sharp anticipation in the cellos sounds together with the A \flat .

Figure H is in 4-voice free composition.

Figures E–G are in strict counterpoint.

B \flat neighbor note harmonizes passing tone in the bass.

E. **F.** **G.** **H.**

Bruckner transposes these two progressions (to A \flat minor and E major respectively) in mm. 127–134.

E \flat avoids downbeat diminished fifth.

This chromatic passing tone is forbidden in strict counterpoint, but is conceptually active on the layers represented in Figures F–G.

Figures K–L are in free composition.

Figure L adds a fourth voice.

Figures I–J are in strict counterpoint.

This added rhythmic activity motivates the metrical displacement of Figure L.

I. **J.** **K.** **L.**

Figures M and N show the motion from the raised mediant that begins the second theme to the dominant at bar 134. The diminished seventh chord at mm. 85–107 does not appear as a verticality on the surface, but rather is delineated in the middleground by a series of foreground key areas: F \sharp major (m. 65), D \sharp minor (85), C major (97), and A major (107). (The procedure of arpeggiating chords, including diminished ones, in the middleground is quite common. These chords usually appear as surface verticalities, but there is no theoretical problem presented by their absence on relatively foreground layers. It is by no means rare for the “invisible hand” of middleground voice leading to guide foreground events without appearing literally. I give a list of Schenkerian precedents in Example 2b, first footnote.)

M. **N.**

O.

Figure O shows more detailed voice leading for the end of the passage.

Symphony IV: Finale

mm. 49-58

A. 49 51 58
5—#5—6

B. 49 50 51 58

C. 49 50 51 58
Also heard on the surface as G \flat major, \flat VI of B \flat .

D. 49 50 51 57 58

E. 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58
4-Prg.

F. 55 56 57 58
4-Prg.

The D major of Figure C yields here to D minor, allowing the F—F \sharp —G motion (see Fig. A) to be retraced at a more foreground level.

The top voice 4th-Progression of Figure E is altered in Figure F; the bass's 4th-Progression in turn is given a follower a third higher: A—B \flat —(C)—D.

The A \flat of this chord becomes a lower neighbor G on the surface. The resulting chord can be heard locally as either a diminished third chord leading to F \sharp , or as a "leading-tone dominant seventh chord" (for which see my comments on the Fifth Symphony) resolving to A \flat .

Figures G through H depict the arduous attainment (mm. 59–63) of a local V in A \flat major. In Figs. G and H, a structural #IV (m. 62) is gradually subsumed into a filled-in ascending fifth in the bass. The parallel fifths of Fig. H are mitigated by means of a 5–6 sequence in Fig. I. However this voice leading may seem somewhat fastidious since the progression is deployed in first inversion on the surface (Fig. J). But this maneuver has its basis in deeper voice leading: Example 4 suggests that the real bass in m. 59 is C, part of a larger-scale 5–6 sequence than the one shown in Fig. I.

mm. 59-63

G. 59 61 62 63

H. 59 60 61 62 63

I. 59 60 61 62 63
5—6 5—6 5—6 5 b7 6(=3/4)

J. 59 60 61 62

Figures K through O concern a very complex cadential approach. Fig. K shows the basic outline to consist of two large voice exchanges, the first diatonic, the second chromaticized and leading to an augmented sixth. The first is in fact a double voice exchange; in addition to the exchange between C and A \flat , note also the exchange between the inner voices: A \flat —G—F \sharp (not indicated for reasons of legibility). Fig. L gives the motivation behind this interior voice exchange: a chord with a seventh more organically generates a German augmented sixth than a chord without a seventh. Figs. M–O show only the first voice exchange. Fig. M includes the lead-in to the passage (see Figs. G–I) and shows that the first voice exchange takes place over a putative E \flat bass, which then materializes forcefully in bar 71. This powerful orchestral unison on E \flat (Fig. N) arpeggiates the A \flat triad, which becomes a local tonic in bar 72. (I hear the G in m. 71 as instrumental in this tonicization, and thus read the six-four as cadential rather than arpeggiating. However, one can hardly consider this G to constitute a resolution; I consider the resolution solely conceptual, as in Beethoven, Symphony No. 9, i, m. 34.) Figure O gives the final picture, in which m. 67 is made to sound like a D dominant ninth chord. Note how this neighbor-note D helps to articulate the arrival of E \flat as the real bass in m. 71.

Another, in my view less convincing, reading of this passage (mm. 63–71) is possible, in which the chord at m. 63 with F \sharp in the bass functions as an unfolding of D (m. 67). Study of the score will reveal the structural ramifications of this interpretation.

mm. 62-76

K. 63 71 73 74 76

L. vs. 5/3 It.+6 b7 Ger.+6

M. 62 63 67 71 73 71 72 73 63 67 70 71 73

N. 3 3 3 3

O. 6(=3/4) Ab: V $\frac{6}{4}$ (=3/4) I $\frac{8}{8}$ —b7 6(=3/4)

P. 113 114 115 116 117

Q. 113 114 115 116 117 121 123 125

Fifth arises as D asserts itself (momentarily) as the real bass.

Symphony V: Finale

A. mm. 47-57

I

Soprano follows bass in parallel 10ths, mm. 47-53; Figure B shows the diatonic underpinning.

bVI

Ab: 6 — 5

V

B. mm. 47, 50, 53, 57

6-Prg.

6-Prg.

I

VIV

Unusual tenor voice (vla.) conceals underlying fifths: B \flat —C \flat , F—G \flat .

Whole-tone ascent by 5-6 sequence (mm. 48-52) broken by half step F—G \flat .

Diminished chord displaced on surface to m. 54.

The enharmonic change (also notated as such in Bruckner's score) from C \flat to B—Example 4 provides more context—is a small but necessary corrective: the same kind required by a complete traversal of the circle of fifths. However, it is not a real enharmonic shift, for the change presents no chromatic disjunction in the linearity of the ensuing music.

C. mm. 67-83

D. mm. 67, 71, 74, 76, 81

E. mm. 74, 75, 76, 81

b5 b5 b6 b6 b7

b5 b5 b6 b6 6 b6 b7

b6 6 6 b6 b6 b7

F. mm. 67, 69, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 81, 83

b5 b b5 b6 b5 b6 6 6 b6 b6 b7 b6 b7

b5 = 7 b5

The middleground dominant seventh chord concluding Figures C-E undergoes an unusual transformation as it passes through the structural layers. Figure F shows how a six-three chord built on C \flat becomes a diminished seventh chord built on A \sharp through a chromatic voice exchange. Another voice exchange returns the bass to C \flat , but the top voice keeps the A \sharp , producing an augmented sixth. This augmented sixth was a dominant seventh on the preceding layer (and this reinterpretation is a fairly common procedure in Schenkerian terms; see my Example 2 above for relevant figures from *Der freie Satz* where Schenker shows this voice-leading event). However, what happens next is not common: the augmented sixth reverts to a dominant seventh, in E major. (There is no Schenkerian precedent for this maneuver, probably because it is not a scenario often found in the repertoire. The closest analogue of which I am aware—thanks to David Loeb—comes in the Finale of Brahms' Piano Quintet, Op. 34, mm. 26-29—indeed, even in the same key! For a far more local example, see Mozart's G major Piano Concerto, K. 453, ii. mm. 74-81. I would imagine that its scarcity stems from its inherent deflation of chromatic tendency; the opposite transformation, of a dominant seventh into an augmented sixth, brings about an inflation of chromatic tendency. However, this example poses no theoretical problems under rigorous Schenkerian theory and thus cannot be deemed a heterodox element.)

The chord at bar 92 (see score) requires some explanation. It has the appearance of a dominant seventh chord built on F \sharp , but leads to G major in bar 93 as if it were a deceptive cadence in B minor. Indeed, the voice leading is exactly the same as a deceptive cadence to bVI, except that the chord of resolution functions as a local tonic. The progression takes advantage of the premise that the dominant chord's "business end" is the leading tone, which can in turn be unfolded or even abstracted from the dominant (see Example 2b, first footnote). Thus I call it a "leading-tone dominant seventh" chord. Bruckner was hardly the first to avail himself of this voice-leading opportunity; as Burstein observes (1998, 302-3), composers as early as Haydn occasionally used a VII \sharp chord to lead to I, as in the first movement of the E \flat Piano Sonata, Hob. XVI:25, mm. 50-51 (a reference I owe to Cody Franchetti). In Bruckner's treatment, the leading-tone chord is given a seventh, for which reason I regard it as an altered diminished seventh chord. Such chords become an important fixture of Bruckner's late harmonic language, although they can be found in early symphonies as well; a very exposed case is the retransposition of the Seventh Symphony's first movement (mm. 277-281). Bruckner's leading-tone dominant sevenths are not at all troublesome from a Schenkerian perspective, which ascribes great importance to the leading tone. Indeed, the figure from *Der freie Satz* cited in my Example 2b, third footnote gives a near-exact Schenkerian analogue (from the retransition of Haydn, Symphony No. 104 in D, iv)! Kevin Swinden discusses the chord (2004, 206-15), providing several Brucknerian examples (some not entirely convincing).

G. mm. 97-131

97 99 101 102 103 107 110 111 113 115 121 125 129 131

5 5 4 3 b3 b2 2 1

F: V 8 — 7 I bIII bII 6 V I 6_4 = 5

Symphony VI: Finale

On the surface, this half cadence is given a $\frac{5}{3}$ chord.

mm. 65-97

It is certainly no coincidence that the extended third divider that occupies the consequent of the second theme rests on the (locally tonicized) harmony of E, the eventual dominant of the symphony. Although this E has no prolongational relation to the structural dominant at m. 139 (not shown here, but see Example 4), it functions as a sort of “resonance frequency” as I exerts a pull on III: yet another form of tonal agency inherent in the work’s voice-leading fabric (which I discuss in [5.2], footnote 30). Furthermore, Bruckner denies C major tonal stability by withholding a V—I cadence into m. 97. Instead a bass motion in thirds yields to a wandering passage (mm. 81–89) that ultimately regains the tonic plagally (mm. 89–97). Figures C through F show this “wandering” section in greater detail. Recall (from [5.3] above) that none of the finales discussed here contains a firm cadence in the key of the second theme, a fact which further underlines the second theme’s intermediate status in the overall key profile.

The unusual sequence of foreground keys in mm. 85–89 must attenuate our sense of tonal cohesion. Figures D and E show how I believe the tonal governance of these bars operates. Figure F shows the compositional basis for the seemingly directionless harmonies: they allow Bruckner to quote more or less exactly the start of the melody in Isolde’s *Liebsted* (here transposed down a major third to better illustrate the relation) in the second violins.

Note in Fig. F the vast differences between the composers’ harmonizations. In Bruckner’s treatment, each bar comprises a local tonic and its dominant, whereas in the Wagner the tonics and dominants come at half the rate, and structural harmonies come on beat three (with the downbeats containing passing or appoggiatura chords).

F.

mm. 97-113

Reaching over in top voice smooths parallel fifths.

Figures H through L show the derivation of the striking passage that connects bars 104 and 109. Bruckner’s harmonic language here exhibits a porous boundary between dominant and diminished seventh chords (see especially Fig. L).

These intervals show the basic motion over these bars: G# moving to A with a 5-6 exchange to mitigate the resulting parallel fifths.

Bars 85-88 feature a string of deceptive cadences in which the old VI becomes the new I.

mm. 65-93

Y.

Brief F# minor improves voice leading by introducing a strong contrary-motion bass and also softens the shift in key center to A major.

D major here provides consonant support for the seventh of m. 89's local V. The upper voice D is prolonged by neighbor E (mm. 87-88).

This important preparatory dominant (prolonged for four bars) is couched within a descending arpeggiation of the A minor triad.

mm. 93-117

Z.

In Figures Ee-Jj (showing the cadential approach to C major), each quarter note represents two bars of music, unless bar numbers indicate otherwise.

This middleground diminished arpeggiation (originating in Figure Aa) does not appear as a surface verticality. See my comment in Appendix, Symphony III, Figs. M-N.

This F major becomes minor on the surface, giving the impression that the progression is locally 3-4 in F minor.

Ee. 101 105 116 117 Ff. 101 105 115 116 117 Gg. 101 105 111 115 116 117 Hh. 101 105 109 111 115 116 117

Ii. 101 105 109 111 115 116 117 Jj. 101 105 109 111 115 116 117 Kk. 111 113 115 Ll. 111 113 114 115

Soprano given chromatic upper neighbor; bass syncopates to avoid parallel fifths between alto and bass (A-Bb, D-D#).

Upper voices anticipate, while the upper neighbor Db shifts to a new inner voice. This disposition avoids parallel fifths with the bass.

The voice exchange of Figures Kk and Ll is a transposition of the earlier exchanges of Figures G-H and R-S.

Foreground sketch of the second theme's voice leading.
Double bars indicate periodic divisions (mine, not Bruckner's).

Symphony VIII: Finale

Anticipation breaks up fifths between soprano and alto (F—G, B♭—C).

Anticipation breaks up fifths between alto and bass (A♭—G, D♭—C).

mm. 69-135

A.

F: III I III⁶ I V VII⁷ I V III I V

A♭ held as pedal.

The theme's key (at least until m. 78) is ambiguous : F minor or A♭ major?

Note the pervasive top-voice motive $\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{1}-\hat{2}$, often coupled with a descending tetrachord in the bass. The motive first appears in mm. 76-77.

7-6 suspension breaks up fifths between soprano and alto (G—F, C—B♭).

Elaborated on the surface through a voice exchange.

Bars 94 through 96 quote the first movement of Bruckner's own Seventh Symphony, mm. 197-200.

D♭: I F: VI I V VI⁵ V III/V bII⁶ V C: VII I V VI V

Anticipation breaks up fifths between soprano and bass (C♭—B♭, F♭—E♭).

Although this progression is an exact transposition of mm. 93-94, its Neapolitan has a different function than that of m. 93: to prepare the more structural #IV chord in the second half of the bar. Figure F explains the voice leading more fully.

C♭: I VI IV⁸ III D♭: I^b bVI bIV(!) bIII V

Ab: bIII I bVI V bVI I

bIV arises here as bVI of bVI. Thus mm. 105-110 end a half step lower than mm. 99-104, enabling a b6-5 motion over A♭.

Figures C–E clarify the 6th Progression and auxiliary cadence that lead to $A\flat$. The bass note C starts out as a shared tone between the keys F and $A\flat$. In relation to $A\flat$, it begins a 6–5 motion over V ($E\flat$) that initiates the auxiliary cadence. In Fig. D, the C splits into two parts, one governed by each harmony. F minor exerts its influence by causing C's third to be raised to the leading tone $E\sharp$ (Fig. D), and $A\flat$ pulls its mediant down to $C\flat$ (Fig. E). Because the two tones represent the same scale degree, they are slurred together.

Figure B summarizes Figure A, clarifying the relation of the outer voices to the two governing keys: F minor and $A\flat$ major. Note that, beginning in m. 99, the top voice descends from $\hat{5}$ in $A\flat$ major. Bars 105 to 110 accomplish a plagal motion whose goal is a $b6-5$ motion over $A\flat$ ($F\flat-E\flat$).

B.

69 85 96 99 105 111

F: $\hat{3}$ $\hat{5}$ $\hat{8}$ $\hat{b}7$ $\hat{6}$ $\hat{b}5$ $\hat{4}$ $\hat{3}$

F: I VI V Aux. Cad. III

$A\flat$: III b III V (Plagal) I^{b6-5}

C. **D.** **E.**

69 96 103 111 69 96 99 103 111 69 96 99 103 111

F: I V $A\flat$: V^6-5 I III V I $A\flat$: I V b III V I

F.

85 90 95 96

DN

Neapolitan mitigates augmented second $A\flat-B\sharp$.

G. **H.** **I.**

111 113 115 111 113 115 111 113 115

5 7 5 7 5 4-Prg. 4-Prg. $A\flat$: I $C\flat$: I $II^4_3 V^{b6}$

The bass progression here is controlled more by $C\flat$ than by $A\flat$ (hence $G\flat$ and $F\flat$). Note how the augmented sixth resolves to the third rather than the fifth of its goal (similar to the famous chord in *Till Eulenspiegel*). However, the tone of resolution is still $\hat{5}$ in the original key, as is typical.

I.

113 115

$A\flat$: I $C\flat$: I $II^4_3 V^{b6}$

Despite being heard locally as a $G\sharp$, this $A\flat$ serves to expand an inverted diminished seventh chord leading to b III.

J.

115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123

6—5

Figure J shows the expansion of $E\flat$ (spelled here as $D\sharp$ for convenience) and its preparation of $G\flat$ major through a $b6-5$ motion.

Figures K and L give the overall voice leading from the second to the third theme group. Fig. L includes the motion from F minor to $A\flat$ major.

This diminished chord is similar in origin to the verticality shown in Appendix, Symphony III, Figs. M–N.

$C\flat$ does not appear in the inner voices because of a $B\flat$ pedal in the 2nd horn and violas (running from bar 127 to 130). Note the especially telling slur in bar 130 of the viola part.

An excellent example of what Schenker called “the freest form of interruption.” (*Der freie Satz*, §217 and Fig. 91)

K.

69 111 113 115 123 127 130 131 135

C: $\hat{4}$ $\hat{3}$ $b\hat{2}$ $\hat{3}$

$E\flat$: II $II^{b7}_5 b$ III b VI V $I\flat$

L.

69 78 83 85 96 99 100 103 111 113 115 123 127 131 135

C: $\hat{4}$ $\hat{3}$ $b\hat{2}$ $\hat{3}$

$E\flat$: II b III V $I\flat$

Symphony VI: Adagio, Opening (Alternate Reading)

The chromatic alteration of Figure A is counterpointed in Figure B by the fifth progression C—D—E—F—G, a motion from an inner voice. The change in the top voice from A to A \flat provides a point of articulation that subdivides the inner-voice fifth into a fourth (C to F) plus a step (F to G).

Figure C adds to Figure A a chromatic passing tone in an inner voice. Figure D shows this F \sharp in the context of Figure B's fourth and fifth progressions. Because the boundaries of the C-to-F \sharp fourth outline a larger middleground harmony (in this case, an augmented sixth), the fourth progression remains a valid *Zug*. (*Der freie Satz* §205 and Fig. 87,1 are relevant in this connection.)

A. $\hat{3}$ $\hat{b}\hat{3}$ $\hat{2}$

B. $\hat{3}$ $\hat{b}\hat{3}$ $\hat{2}$

C. $\hat{3}$ $\hat{b}\hat{3}$ $\hat{2}$

D. $\hat{3}$ $\hat{b}\hat{3}$ $\hat{2}$

Figure E reminds us that the fifth progression and augmented sixth of Figure D are common fixtures of classical sonata expositions. Bruckner's voice leading differs only in that his augmented sixth resolves to the fifth of V, rather than to the root of II \sharp . Bruckner uses this more traditional voice leading in the finale of the same symphony. See my Example 4 and footnote 30, as well as Schachter 1983, 62–68.

Each of the foregoing figures has featured the direct chromatic succession A—A \flat . Schenker noted that composers sometimes allow such direct chromaticism, but on other occasions attempt to soften its effect, thereby adding to the voice-leading content: "The prohibition of chromatic steps in strict counterpoint no longer holds in free composition. However, since in free composition direct chromatic successions are generally avoided (thus affording the possibility of more abundant prolongations), the prohibition is in a certain sense reestablished" ([1935] 1979, 91, §249). Figure F shows how Schenker illustrates this concept, reproducing a sketch of the *Eroica* Symphony (*Der freie Satz*, Fig. 115,2, which in turn copies *Meisterwerk III*, Figs. 2 and 3). Note the unavoidable prolongational conflict—surely intentional—in Schenker's reading: G \flat is read at once as an alteration of the *Kopft*on (G \sharp) and as a structurally subordinate passing tone between A \flat and F. He explains the contradiction as follows: "The A \flat major chord in bar 43...is an interpolation whose sole purpose is to rectify the hidden false relation 'g \sharp —G \flat ; E \flat —e \flat '... by setting it in a diatonic context, as is the custom when rectifying direct chromatic progressions" ([1930] 1997, 14–15). Subsequent analysts have questioned the wisdom of Schenker's contradictory *Eroica* sketches (see Laufer 1980, 167–71); but it cannot be denied that such eccentricities are a real feature of Schenker's own analytic practice—as opposed to its more systematic American progeny.

E. $\hat{3}$ $\hat{b}\hat{3}$ $\hat{2}$ $\hat{2}$

F. Beethoven, Third Symphony, 1st mvt. m. 1 15 43 44 45 (57)

Figure G posits that Bruckner's passage performs a similar sort of chromatic mitigation, but using a different interpolation than Beethoven's IV chord. Instead, the E of the ascending inner-voice fourth is harmonized with a VII harmony, representing an unfolded third of V. The resulting top voice A—G—A \flat thus softens the direct chromaticism of A—A \flat . Notice that the E chord and the augmented sixth are now each interpreted as belonging to two separate and contradictory prolongational spans: that of the opening tonic (and the fourth progression it deploys) and that of the goal dominant (composed out through its upper third).

G. $\hat{3}$ $\hat{2}$ $\hat{b}\hat{3}$ $\hat{2}$

H. $\hat{3}$ $\hat{\#}\hat{2}$ $\hat{b}\hat{3}$ $\hat{2}$

I. $\hat{3}$ $\hat{\#}\hat{2}$ $\hat{b}\hat{3}$ $\hat{2}$

1 9 11 23 25 36 37

Figure H provides further rationale for this unusual voice leading: when the unfolded third of Figure G's dominant becomes, in Figure H, E major instead of E minor, contrapuntal support is provided for the top-voice A \flat in the form of G \sharp . The enharmonic equivalence allows for the augmented sixth's dissonant A \flat to be prepared as a consonance and thereby composed out. But the chromatic mitigation that brought about the interpolated VII chord in the first place stands in contradiction to this equivalence, for the unfolding in the bass demands that we treat G \sharp and A \flat as *different* notes.

Figure I shows the fleshing out of the inner-voice fourth progression, as D minor and E major are tonicized locally.

Perhaps the reader will find this analysis unconvincing—or worse, a wanton abuse of the theoretical apparatus. Nevertheless, long deliberation has led me to find it a better analysis than that of Example 5, more faithful to the music and to Schenker's methods, and it is for that reason that I deemed its inclusion necessary. I urge its serious consideration, and provide the following explanation:

If one does not agree with Schenker's contradictory *Eroica* graphs, then this reading of Bruckner will likely seem equally unsatisfactory. But if one does accept Schenker's reading, the serious question emerges: if we allow such an analytic license for Beethoven, why precisely would we disallow it for Bruckner? I regard such an impulse as the legacy of the double standard in analysis, fostered by the canon's sorting of music into good vs. bad, unified vs. incoherent. Second, by including this extravagant reading I hew closely to Schenker's Schenker—not a sanitized modern version. When we restrict ourselves only to the prim, proper basics of Schenker's thought, we do ourselves and the music a disservice. Finally, despite the controversy of its contradiction, I believe the reading I present here to be, in fact, more *conservative* than the one I show in Example 5. There the deep middleground progression is: F major—E major—C major. To be sure, the guiding middleground motive A—G \sharp —G provides some coherence, and the VII \sharp harmony is incorporated into the approach to the dominant (as III of V). But even so, the voice leading of this reading seems to me haphazard, as if appearing by fiat rather than evolving out of forethought. Such readings make the music seem quite radical—to my mind, more radical than it is. By contrast, the reading I offer here provides a clear rationale both for the E major (to mitigate a direct chromatic succession and introduce the dissonant A \flat as a consonance) and for the augmented sixth (to connect the opening tonic with the structural dominant through an inner-voice progression). Because it explains more, I consider it the better reading; and in terms of voice leading, it is surprisingly the less avant-garde. I do not believe in introducing contradictions indiscriminately into the Schenkerian framework. But they deserve not to be brushed aside when they appear the most musically sensitive solutions in certain analytic situations, especially when such situations were foreseen by Schenker himself.