**MTO 24.1 Examples: Pell, Key Profiles in Bruckner’s Symphonic Expositions**

(Note: audio, video, and other interactive examples are only available online)


---

**Example 1. Key Schemes of the Expositions**

**First Movements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symphony</th>
<th>Tonic:</th>
<th>Key of Second Theme:</th>
<th>Arrival of Structural Dominant:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>E♭ major</td>
<td>D♭ major</td>
<td>bVII 3rd THEME (m. 119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>B♭ major</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td>V♭ 2nd THEME (m. 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>E minor</td>
<td>V♭ 2nd THEME (m. 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>B major/minor</td>
<td>V♭ 2nd THEME (m. 51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>V♭ 2nd THEME (m. 51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>V♭ 2nd THEME (m. 97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fourth Movements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symphony</th>
<th>Tonic:</th>
<th>Key of Second Theme:</th>
<th>Arrival of Structural Dominant:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>F♯ major</td>
<td>↑II♯ Within 2nd THEME (m. 134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>E♭ major/min</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>VI♯ 3rd THEME (m. 155)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>B♭ major</td>
<td>D♭ major</td>
<td>bIII Just before 3rd THEME (m. 131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>bIII 3rd THEME (m. 139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>G♯ major</td>
<td>III♯ 3rd THEME of (reversed) RECAPITULATION (m. 191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>F minor</td>
<td>IV End of Development (m. 333)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Slow Movement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symphony</th>
<th>Tonic:</th>
<th>Key of Second Theme:</th>
<th>Arrival of Structural Dominant:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>F major</td>
<td>E major</td>
<td>VII♯ Climax of 2nd THEME (m. 37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Editions Used:** III, 1873 Version, Nowak; IV, Haas; V, Nowak; VI, Nowak; VII, Haas; VIII, 1890 Version, Nowak; IX, Orel
Example 2a. Formal Precedents for Bruckner’s Key Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bruckner Symphony:</th>
<th>1st Theme:</th>
<th>2nd Theme:</th>
<th>Works with Analogous Key Schemes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner IV, i:</td>
<td>Major tonic</td>
<td>Major subtonic</td>
<td>Mendelssohn, Symphony No. 2 in B♭ major, op. 52, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner V &amp; VI, i:</td>
<td>Major tonic</td>
<td>Minor dominant</td>
<td>Beethoven, String Quartet in A major, op. 18, no. 5, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner VII, i:</td>
<td>Major tonic</td>
<td>Major dominant</td>
<td>Movements in Traditional Sonata Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner VIII-IX, i:</td>
<td>Minor tonic</td>
<td>Major dominant</td>
<td>Mendelssohn, Piano Trio in D minor, op. 49, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner III, iv:</td>
<td>Minor tonic</td>
<td>Raised major mediant</td>
<td>Brahms, Academic Festival Overture in C minor, op. 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner IV, iv:</td>
<td>Major tonic</td>
<td>Major submediant</td>
<td>Beethoven, String Quintet in C major, op. 29, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner V-VI, iv:</td>
<td>Major tonic</td>
<td>Lowered major mediant</td>
<td>Schubert, String Quintet in C major, D. 956, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner VII, iv:</td>
<td>Major tonic</td>
<td>Major mediant</td>
<td>Beethoven, Sonata in C major, op. 53, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner VIII, iv:</td>
<td>Minor tonic</td>
<td>Minor subdominant</td>
<td>Chopin, Cello Sonata in G minor, op. 65, iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruckner VI, ii:</td>
<td>Major tonic</td>
<td>Major leading tone</td>
<td>Chopin, Bolero in A major, op. 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Like Bruckner's Third Symphony, Brahms's overture features a middleground ambiguity between $b$ and $b^6$. In both works, the major mode wins.

† Not an exact analogy, since the Bolero's theme in the key of the leading tone is the B section of an ABA form rather than a sonata's second theme.

Example 2b. Schenkerian Precedents (from Der Freie Satz) for Bruckner’s Voice Leading

**Unusual Arpeggiation:**
*Figures:* 30.b, 62.10, 62.11, 100.2b, 100.3f, 100.4a, 100.4b, 100.4c, 104.1, 113.2, 114.7

**Augmented Register Transfers:**
*Figures:* 100.6c, 100.6b, 100.6c, 114.8

**VII as Dominant Unfolding:**
*Figures:* 111.a, 111.a2, 111.d1, 113.1b, 114.1a, 114.2b

**Generation of Augmented Sixth Chords & Avoidance of Cross-Relations:**
*Figures:* 114.9, 115.1a, 115.1b, 115.1c, 115.2
**Example 3**

**Bruckner VIII: Finale Opening**

On this level, the fourth progression is subdivided to the extent that its identity as a fourth diminishes. Schenker discusses this phenomenon in *Der freie Satz* ([1935] 1979, §212 and Fig. 87,4). This subdivision allows for the reinterpretation of several elements: the B♭ (once a passing tone) becomes a neighbor tone, and the G recedes beneath the B♭ in structural importance. Reinterpretation of this kind is implicit in several of Schenker's concepts.

---

**Middleground:** measures 1-31

A. 4-Prz  B.  C.  C'.  D.  E.  1  11  17  25  31

The A♭ of mm. 17-24 is composed out in the same way as G♭ in the foreground.

**Foreground:** measures 1-9

F.  G.  H.  I.  J.

Diatonic

F'.  G'.  H'.  I'.  J'.

Chromatic

**Surface:** measures 3-9

K.

K'.

etc.

**Notes:**
1. Diatonic G becomes G♭ in the middleground.
2. G♭ major becomes F# minor in the foreground.
3. F# minor reverts to F# major at the end of the passage.
Bass-Line Sketches of Bruckner's Finale Expositions

III

IV

V

VI

VII

VIII

see Example 3

Example 3

Detailed Graphs
= Third Theme
* = See Appendix for Detailed Graphs

1 = First Theme
2 = Second Theme
3 = Third Theme
Symphony VI: Adagio (Foreground)

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

In addition to the deep middleground motive A–A–G (see Ex. 5), these graphs highlight the tetrachord motive (marked with a black asterisk) and the octave motive.

The tetrachord’s A♭ in m. 6 (see the score) stands for a B♭ (the analogous spot in m. 8 clarified), which continues the parallel tenths beyond those shown here.

At the arrival of 2, the deep middleground motive is climactically rectified to a diatonic step, A♭–G.

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

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 m. 11’s D minor.

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

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 D♭ and B♭.

A lower neighbor F♯ in the bass allows for the dissonant A♭ of Figure E to be prepared as a consonance. The neighbor figure also mitigates the enharmonic succession G♯–F♯. Schenker introduced this principle in *Der freie Satz* ([1935] 1979, §249 and Fig. 114:2).

Example 5 shows A as the top voice for this passage. More locally, this A apoggiaturas up to a high F. After a two-octave descent (mm. 13–21, through a neighbor G) F is chromatically altered to F♯ in m. 24, where it leads to G♯.

The passage quoted in Figure H makes the A♭–A–G motive explicit. For the remainder of the exposition, the A–G connection predominates.

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).
Figures J–L illustrate how the development’s voice leading reverses the course of the exposition’s motivic descending tetrachord on a large scale. Figures N and O provide a more detailed account of this voice leading. (See Ex. 5 for deeper layers.)

### Notes

- **J:**
  - Shows the motivic inner-voice fourth progression—the same pitches as m. 1! In Fig. K, the bass motion duplicates what Schenker would call, in Der freie Satz, an unfolding. At this stage the fourth C–F is no longer a linear progression, but still understood to resemble one. See Schenker (1935) 1979, §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 from 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.)

- **N:** Figure N is a foreground sketch of the third theme (which, though formally part of the exposition, belongs 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 minor or are we to hear an A minor cadence 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 minor to emerge over the course of the antecedent as an auxiliary cadence. The G major at the end of m. 56 serves as a clever sort of misdirection. This A minor yields to D♭ major, and its melodic descent (mm. 59–61) is not supported harmonically.

- **O:** Figure O gives a detailed middleground graph of the development proper (mm. 69–92). The central feature of its voice leading is the ascending tetrachord’s C resolves to D♭; accordingly I read m. 65 as the point at which the ascending tetrachord’s C resolves to D♭ and its melodic descent (mm. 59–61) is not supported harmonically.

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

- **Q:** 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 (as well as in Reading 3), each two-measure unit arpeggiates its local tonic, and the final chords in mm. 70 and 72 act as applied dominants within a 5–6 sequence.

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

- **S:**
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.

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.
The tenor’s chromatic passing tone C₅ 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.

Bruckner transposes these two progressions to A♭ minor and E major respectively in mm. 127–134.

On the surface, a G♯ anticipation in the cellos sounds together with the At.

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

Figures M and N show the motion from the raised mediant that begins the second theme to the dominant at m. 134. The diminished seventh chord of mm. 85–107 does not appear as a verticality on the surface; rather it is delineated in the middleground by a series of foreground key areas: F♯ major (m. 65), D♯ minor (m. 85), C major (m. 97), and A major (m. 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.)
Gœœœj
34. to 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’s Ninth Symphony, i, m.

Figures K through H depict the arduous attainment (mm. 59–63) of a local V in B♭ 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. 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.

The D major of Figure C yields here to Dminor, allowing the F–F# motion (see Fig. A) to be retraced at a more foreground level.

The D major of Figure C yields here to Dminor, allowing the F–F# motion (see Fig. A) to be retraced at a more foreground level.

Also heard on the surface as G♭ major, V VI of B♭.

The D major of Figure C yields here to Dminor, allowing the F–F# motion (see Fig. A) to be retraced at a more foreground level.

The D major of Figure C yields here to Dminor, allowing the F–F# motion (see Fig. A) to be retraced at a more foreground level.

The top-voice fourth progression of Figure E is altered in Figure F. The bass’s fourth progression in turn is given a follower a third higher: A–B♭–(C)–D.

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

Fifth arises as D momentarily asserts itself as the real bass.
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 resolves to a diminished seventh chord built on F, through a chromatic voice exchange. Another voice exchange returns the bass to C, but the top voice keeps the F, producing an augmented sixth. This augmented sixth is a dominant seventh on the preceding layer, and this reinterpretation is a fairly common procedure in Schenkerian terms; see Example 2 for relevant figures from Der freie Satz (1935) 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 that I am aware of (thanks to David Loeb) occurs in the finale of Brahms's Piano Quintet, Op. 34, mm. 26–29—indeed, even in the same key! Very local instances are more common; see for example Mozart's G-major Piano Concerto, K. 453, ii, mm. 74–81. I would imagine that the scarcity of this voice leading on a larger scale 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 from a Schenkerian view, and thus cannot be deemed a heterodox element.

The chord at m. 92 (see score) requires some explanation. It has the appearance of a dominant seventh chord built on F, but leads to G major in m. 93 as if it were a deceptive cadence in B minor. Indeed, the voice leading is exactly the same as a deceptive cadence to vi, 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 this chord a “leading-tone dominant seventh.” Bruckner was hardly the first to avail himself of this voice-leading opportunity; as Burstein (1998, 302–3) observes, composers as early as Haydn occasionally used a VII 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 retransition of the Seventh Symphony’s first movement (mm. 277–281). Bruckner’s leading-tone dominant sevenths are not troublesome from a Schenkerian perspective, which ascribes great importance to the leading tone. Indeed, the figure from Der freie Satz cited in Example 2b, third footnote gives a near-exact Schenkerian analogue ([1935] 1979, Fig. 114.2b, sketching the retransition of Haydn, Symphony No. 104 in D, iv)! Kevin Swinden discusses the chord (2004, 206–15), providing several examples from Bruckner (some not entirely convincing).
On the surface, this half cadence is given a $\frac{3}{4}$ chord.

Symphony VI: Finale

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 of m. 139 (not shown here, but see Example 4), it functions as a sort of "resonance frequency" as it exerts a pull on III: yet another form of tonal agency inherent in the work's voice-leading fabric (which I discuss in footnote 28). 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–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 voice-leading fabric (which I discuss in footnote 28). 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 the passage 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 from Isolde's Liebestod (here transposed down a major third to better illustrate the relation) in the second violins.

Reaching over in top voice smooths parallel fifths. Figures H–L show the derivation of the striking passage that connects mm. 104 and 109. Bruckner's harmonic language here exhibits a porous boundary between dominant and diminished seventh chords (see especially Fig. I).
Symphony VII: Finale

In Figures A–S, each quarter note represents one measure of music, unless measure numbers indicate otherwise. Figures A–W explain the voice leading of mm. 1–35 by stages.

Anticipation breaks up parallel fifths between soprano and tenor (C♯–B–F♯–E).

Anticipation in inner voices responds to dissonance between upper voices.

Soprano's chromatic passing line C♯–B–F♯ moves with alto A–G♯–G♯.

Figures G and H show how a voice exchange elaborates mm. 5–7.

Figures I–S show how the first eleven measures are transposed and elaborated.

In Figures T–W, each quarter note represents one measure of music.

In the horns.

F♯ major elided on the surface (see Example 4).

Top voice harmonizes bass according to second-species counterpoint.

Bruckner avoids parallel fifths with voice exchange to diminished seventh (Fig. U).

Awkward voice exchange prompts redistribution of voices (shown in Fig. W).

This highly chromatic voice exchange reinterprets an augmented sixth as a dominant seventh (see Figure V above, and my comments in the Appendix, Symphony V, Fig. F).

Figures X and Y give the voice leading of the second theme.

Reaching over mitigates parallel octaves between outer voices.
These intervals show the basic motion over these measures: G♯ moves to A with a 5–6 exchange that mitigates the resulting parallel fifths (G♯–A, D♯–E).

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

III#

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

IV#

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).

IV♭

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

C: II# V I

This middleground diminished arpeggiation (originating in Figure Aa) does not appear as a surface verticality. See my comment in the 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

Li. 111 113 114 115

Soprano given chromatic upper neighbor. Bass syncopates to avoid parallel fifths with alto (D–D♯, A–B♭).

Tenor and bass add chromatic passing tones.

D weakly articulated in bass.

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

The voice exchange of Figures Kk and Li is a transposition of the earlier exchanges of Figures G–H and R–S.
The theme’s key (at least until m. 78) is ambiguous: F minor or A♭ major?

The pervasive top-voice motive $3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2$, often coupled with a descending tetrachord in the bass.

Note the motive first appears in mm. 76–77.

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

F: III

I III$^6\|$ II V VII$^7$ I V III

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

Elaborated on the surface through a voice exchange.

Measures 94–96 quote the first movement of Bruckner’s own Seventh Symphony, mm. 197–200.

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 measure. Figure F explains the voice leading more fully.

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

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

C# does not appear in the inner voices because of a Bb pedal in the 2nd horn and violas (running from mm. 127–130). Note the especially telling slur in m. 130 of the viola part.

An excellent example of what Schenker called "the freest form of interruption" in Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, §217 and Fig. 91).
where the real bass is shown to be $D\#$.

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

Parallel octaves mitigated by reaching over in the top voice.

The tetrachord motive (marked with a black asterisk) and the octave motive.

The tetrachord motive in ascending form.

Parallel octaves mitigated by reaching over in the top voice.

The passage quoted in Figure H makes the $A$–$G$ connection predominates.

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 $m.\ 11\>$'s $D$. $B$ minor momentarily tonicized.

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 $D$s and $B$s.

A lower neighbor $F$ in the bass allows for the dissonant $A$s of Figure E to be prepared as a consonance. The neighbor figure also mitigates the enharmonic succession $G$–$F$.

Schenker introduced this principle in Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, §249 and Fig. 114.2).

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 (mm. 13–21, through a neighbor $G$) $F$ is chromatically altered to $F\#$ in $m.\ 24$, where it leads to $G\#$.

For the remainder of the exposition, the $A$–$G$ connection predominates.

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

Here $Bb$ is subordinate to $G$; the exact opposite of $m.\ 2$! (See Fig. A.)

A lower neighbor $F$ in the bass allows for the dissonant $A$s of Figure E to be prepared as a consonance. The neighbor figure also mitigates the enharmonic succession $G$–$F$.

Schenker introduced this principle in Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, §249 and Fig. 114.2).

Here $Bb$ is subordinate to $G$: the exact opposite of m. 2! (See Fig. A.)

A lower neighbor $F$ in the bass allows for the dissonant $A$s of Figure E to be prepared as a consonance. The neighbor figure also mitigates the enharmonic succession $G$–$F$.

Schenker introduced this principle in Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, §249 and Fig. 114.2).

Here $Bb$ is subordinate to $G$: the exact opposite of m. 2! (See Fig. A.)

A lower neighbor $F$ in the bass allows for the dissonant $A$s of Figure E to be prepared as a consonance. The neighbor figure also mitigates the enharmonic succession $G$–$F$.

Schenker introduced this principle in Der freie Satz ([1935] 1979, §249 and Fig. 114.2).
Figures J-L illustrate how the development’s voice leading reverses the course of the exposition’s motivic descending tetrachord on a large scale. Figures N and O provide a more detailed account of this voice leading. (See Ex. 5 for deeper layers.)

The structural D♯ that I show in mm. 65–66 is merely putative; this is not the C♯ sixteenth note in m. 65. More literal readings are certainly possible. These would most likely take A♭ as the main tone across mm. 61–67. However, this feels overly static to my ear; m. 65 is the theme’s climax, approached with a build-up and reached with a discharge of energy. For this reason, I take m. 65 as the point at which the ascending tetrachord’s C resolves to D♯; accordingly I read mm. 61–64 as prolonging dominant, not tonic, harmony. Note that, in my reading, the D in m. 65 is prolonging dominant, not tonic, harmony. Notice too the invertible counterpoint here, which also begins the development (mm. 69 ff.).

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.).

Figure N is a foreground sketch of the third theme (which, though formally part of the exposition, belongs 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♭ 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♭ tonic emerge over the course of the antecedent as an auxiliary cadence. The G major at the end of m. 56 serves as a clever sort of misdirection. This A♭ soon yields to D♭ major, and its melodic descent (mm. 59–61) is not supported harmonically.

The structural D♭ that I show in mm. 65–66 is merely putative; this is not the C♯ sixteenth note in m. 65. More literal readings are certainly possible. These would most likely take A♭ as the main tone across mm. 61–67. However, this feels overly static to my ear; m. 65 is the theme’s climax, approached with a build-up and reached with a discharge of energy. For this reason, I take m. 65 as the point at which the ascending tetrachord’s C resolves to D♭; accordingly I read mm. 61–64 as prolonging dominant, not tonic, harmony. Note that, in my reading, the D♭ splits: on a deeper level it ascends to E♭; accordingly I read m. 54 as a descent to D♭ major, and its melodic descent (mm. 59–61) is not supported harmonically.

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♭ (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.
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 As provides a point of articulation that subdivides the inner-voice fifth into a fourth (C to F) plus a step (F to G).

Each of the foregoing figures has featured the direct chromatic succession A–As. Schenker notes in Der freie Satz 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, §249). He explains the contradiction as follows: "The As major chord in bar 43 . . . is an interpolation whose sole purpose is to rectify the hidden false relation "g–G; Es–e" . . . by setting it in a diatonic context, as is the custom when rectifying direct chromatic progressions" ([1930] 1997, Figs. 2 and 3). Note the unavoidable prolongational conflict—surely intentional—in Schenker's reading: G3 is read at once as an alteration of the Kopfton (G9) and as a structurally subordinate passing tone between As and F.

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 it necessary to include. 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 heap closely to Schenker's Schenker—not a sanitized modern version of his theories: 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–G provides some coherence, and the VII 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 As 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.