TONAL AND FORMAL ASPECTS OF SELECTED MAZURKAS OF CHOPIN: A SCHENKERIAN VIEW

by

Sheung Yung Joyce Yip

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Music: Theory)
in The University of Michigan
2010

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Wayne C. Petty, Chair
Professor Walter T. Everett
Professor Lorraine M. Gutierrez
Professor Kevin E. Korsyn
Associate Professor John S. Ellis

TONAL AND FORMAL ASPECTS OF SELECTED MAZURKAS OF CHOPIN: A SCHENKERIAN VIEW
Volume One

by

Sheung Yung Joyce Yip

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Music: Theory)
in The University of Michigan
2010

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Wayne C. Petty, Chair
Professor Walter T. Everett
Professor Lorraine M. Gutierrez
Professor Kevin E. Korsyn
Associate Professor John S. Ellis

© Sheung Yung Joyce Yip
2010

Acknowledgements

Many friends, colleagues, teachers, and family members helped bring this dissertation to life. I am most grateful to Wayne C. Petty, my advisor, for his dedicated teaching, constant encouragement, and insightful advice throughout the entire process of my graduate study in Michigan. I am thankful to my committee members, John Ellis, Walter Everett, Lorraine Guttierrez, and Kevin Korsyn, for their helpful suggestions on this project. I wish to extend my appreciation to Karen Frye, Steven Whiting, and the Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies for generously assisting my research through the awarding of a Barbour Scholarship and a One-Term Dissertation Fellowship.

I benefited no less from the teaching of professors at previous institutions, in particular William N. Rothstein of the City University of New York and Annie Yih of the Hong Kong Baptist University, who have been a great inspiration to me. Many former teachers have also helped me over the years, including James Dapogny, Sean Duggan, David Gagné, Ching Wah Lam, and Joseph N. Straus.

I wish to thank the following individuals for their friendship: Christine Chun, Hye-yoon Chung, René Rusch Daley, Philip Duker, Pei Ming Lee, Wendy Wan-Ki Lee, Billy Liang, Boon Hwang Lim, Yu Liu, Eva Sze, and Zhimei Zhu. I also wish to sincerely thank Yun-ju Lai and Kay Zavislak who care for me personally and academically. Frank Chiou deserves special thanks for his technical assistance on the example volume of this

dissertation, his critical comments on a late version of this study, and most of all, his continuous support and patience during the writing and revising of this thesis.

My deepest gratitude goes to my family: my sister, for her devotion and encouragement; my grandfather, for his belief in my pursuit of graduate study; and most important of all, my parents, for their boundless love, giving, and understanding.

Table of Contents

List of Examples

Example

Chapter 1

The Centrality of the Mazurka in Chopin's Music

> An absolute, incomparable innovator—between colorless precursors and epigone followers (Szymanowski aside)—an innovator Chopin remains in his mazurkas, which are the heart of his oeuvre.[1]

The phrase chosen by Jean-Jacques Eigeldinger, that the mazurkas form the "heart" of Chopin's oeuvre, certainly rings true. No type of piece was more central to this composer's career. In quantity, Chopin left more works in this genre than any other, some fifty-eight in all, spanning his entire adult life, from student works written in 1826 to the final examples from the year of his death, 1849. But aside from their number, the mazurkas seem to capture better than any other kind of piece the very pulse of Chopin's music, embracing that combination of song, dance, and storytelling that lends an unmistakably human quality to all his music, the mazurkas in particular crystallizing much of the Polish sound, refined pianism, and perfection of detail that are the lifeblood of Chopin's style.[2] The mazurkas are not show pieces like the etudes, concertos, and some of the other virtuoso works that Chopin wrote, so they tend to disappear from

---

[1] "Novateur absolu, incomparable—entre pâles antécédents et descendance épigonale (Szymanowski excepté)—, Chopin l'est encore avec les Mazurkas, coeur de son oeuvre." Jean-Jacques Eigeldinger, *Frédéric Chopin* (Paris: Fayard, 2003), 72.

[2] Carl Schachter, Review of *The Music of Chopin* by Jim Samson and *The Music of Brahms* by Michael Musgrave, *Music Analysis* 8/1–2 (1989): 187–191.

concert programs, relegated perhaps to encores. But neither are they especially easy to play, given their rhythmic and melodic complexities and the contrapuntal intricacies that come increasingly to the fore, especially in the later mazurkas. These are challenges of a different, more intimate sort, the kind that have drawn all pianists who play Chopin—which is to say, most of the world's classical pianists—to these exquisite miniatures.

Generic features common to many of Chopin's mazurkas derive from the *mazur*, *oberek*, and *kujawiak*, the three most common types of Polish folk mazurka. Chopin's mazurkas may combine characteristics of all three, though borrowings from actual folk music seem to be rare or nonexistent. All written in triple meter, the *oberek* is the fastest, the *mazur* is in moderate tempo, and the *kujawiak* is the slowest with longer phrases and a more lyrical character. The second- or third-beat accent typical of these dances may refer to peasants' foot stomping, and rhythms of the type called "descending" by scholar Ewa Dahlig-Turek, in which short note values are concentrated toward the beginning of the bar, followed by a long note on beat two, are especially common.[3] From the standpoint of phrase rhythm, folk mazurkas tend to employ regular four-bar measure groupings, articulated by short repeated motives, usually within some kind of ternary form ending with a reprise of the opening section. Modally inflected melodies, particularly those that include the Lydian raised fourth scale degree, and ornamentation such as grace notes, trills, and mordents further intensify the folk sonority, which may strike some listeners as somewhat "exotic." Early folk mazurkas were accompanied by Polish bagpipes, the *dudy*, with its characteristic open-fifth drone; instrumental groups

[3] Ewa Dahlig-Turek, "The Mazurka Before and After Chopin," paper read at the Third International Chopin Congress (Warsaw: University of Warsaw, 26 February 2010).

joined later to form ensembles that might include the drum, violins, and harmonium. Many of these features appear in various guises in the Chopin mazurkas, along with the inconclusive endings common in folk mazurkas, such as one finds in Chopin's Opp. 7/5 and 30/2.[4]

The extent of Chopin's exposure to folk mazurkas, and folk music generally, may never be known with certainty, but it does seem clear that Chopin had extensive exposure to Polish national music in the formative years of his youth, both in the city of Warsaw where he lived from infancy and in his many sojourns to the Polish countryside. According to Piotr Dahlig, an ethnomusicologist who has studied this question in detail, Chopin had access to such music from a variety of sources, including (1) the singing of his Polish mother and of domestic servants who had migrated to the city from the countryside; (2) his peers in school and the generally current popular repertory; (3) composers like his teacher Józef Elsner whose music aspired to national values; (4) peasant music in various guises, including music for ceremonies like weddings and

---

[4] Stephen Downes, "Mazurka," in *Grove Music Online*, accessed 7 February 2008; Jeffrey Kallberg, "The Problem of Repetition and Return in Chopin's Mazurkas," in *Chopin Studies*, ed. Jim Samson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 18; and Anne Swartz, "Folk Dance Elements in Chopin's Mazurkas," *Journal of Musicological Research* 4/3–4 (1983): 417–424. Swartz's discussion of the three mazurka types is based on the folk mazurka studies by Wiaczesław Paschałow, *Chopin a Poliska Muzyka Ludowa* (Cracow: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1951) and Aleksander Poliński, *Chopin* (Kijow: L. Idzikowski, 1914). The *mazur*, originating near Warsaw and probably the oldest Polish folk mazurka, has the freest pattern accents, which fall on any beat of a bar and each bar can have any number of accents. The *oberek* is from central and western Poland. It often has short, repetitive two-bar motives with accents generally falling in alternating bars. The *kujawiak* of the Mazowsze region is a stately dance characterized by its final *accelerando* section. Accents fall mostly on the second or third beat of a bar, and the strongest one is in the fourth bar of each phrase. For a detailed list of mazurka types in Chopin's mazurkas, see Paschałow, *Chopin a Poliska Muzyka Ludowa*, 91–95 or Swartz's reproduction in her dissertation, "The Mazurkas of Chopin: Certain Aspects of Phrasing" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1973), 134–136.

harvest festivals; (5) "manorial" songs, a kind of "go-between" for music of country and town; (6) instrumental music (similar to today's klezmer) in taverns and inns; (7) music from outside Poland, against the background of which the national music "gained its sense and peculiarity."[5] To this long list might be added Chopin's possible participation in dance classes at the University of Warsaw where he received his formal education,[6] as well as his partaking of social dancing, as reported in his letters from the Warsaw period.[7] In addition, one of Chopin's neighbors in Warsaw was Oskar Kolberg (1814–1890), who became a professional pianist, composer, and above all a prolific collector and publisher of Polish folk music; his work would certainly have interested Chopin.[8]

Even granting Chopin's exposure to folk or national Polish music, the extent and significance of folk elements in Chopin's mazurkas has been controversial, and will perhaps remain so. Attempting to address this issue Barbara Milewski observes that for some scholars Chopin is more a "connoisseur" of Polish music than a true practitioner because he never used direct quotes, treating the music of his homeland only as a compositional stimulus; others believe that Chopin studied actual folk music, as the

---

[5] Piotr Dahlig, "On Attempts at Interpreting Chopin's Mazurkas from an Ethnomusicological Perspective," in *Chopin in Paris: The 1830s*, ed. Artur Sklener (Warsaw: Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, 2006), 112–113.

[6] Chopin was a student at the Principal School of Music, which was part of the Department of Arts and Sciences at the University of Warsaw (not, as is sometimes said, at the Warsaw Conservatory), from 1826 to 1829, where he could partake of a varied curriculum of study. Zofia Helman, "Correspondance de Chopin: Aspects de la Nouvelle Édition (Vol. 1, 1816–1831)," paper read at the Third International Chopin Congress (Warsaw: University of Warsaw, 25 February 2010).

[7] See, for example, the letters from 20 August 1824, 5 September 1824, and 24 August 1825, and 7 November 1829. These letters were cited by Tomasz Nowak in a paper, "Fryderyk Chopin in [the] Context of Trends in Dance Culture from the First Half of the Nineteenth Century," read at the Third International Chopin Congress (Warsaw: University of Warsaw, 27 February 2010).

[8] Ewa Dahlig-Turek, "The Mazurka Before and After Chopin."

composer suggested in his conversations with and letters to his friends.[9] A factor complicating the perception of the folk elements in Chopin arose with the emergence in the twentieth century of composers who were also folk music collectors, including Béla Bartók, a highly respected and influential composer, critic, and pedagogue, who claimed that Chopin "probably had no opportunity of hearing the genuine peasant music at any time" and that his work is a "mixture of exoticism and banality," "something imperfect, inartistic, in marked contrast to the clarity of real peasant music with which it compares most unfavorably."[10] Although Bartók was probably wrong, since Chopin did have access to folk music and folk musicians, as noted above, one can see that for some musicians any stylization of the dance did not preserve the folk characteristics, it obliterated any trace of authenticity one might wish to impute to them.

In light of the uncertainties surrounding Chopin's folk music experience, Milewski proposed in her dissertation that

> the "national style" of Chopin's mazurkas was shaped not by unmediated, authentic folk music naively absorbed by Chopin from direct contact with the rural peasantry, but rather by the stylized "folk dances" and "folk songs" inserted into the Polish operettas, . . . ballets, . . . and "folk mazurkas" adapted to parlor piano. . . . Against conventional interpretation, I argue that Chopin's mazurkas are indeed national works but without a "pure" folk content.[11]

To expand her view, Milewski says in a later article:

---

[9] Barbara Milewski, "Chopin's Mazurkas and the Myth of the Folk," *19th-Century Music* 23/2 (1999): 116–117.
[10] Béla Bartók, "The Relation of Folk Song to the Development of the Art Music of Our Time" (1921), in *Béla Bartók Essays*, sel. and ed. Benjamin Suchoff (London: Faber & Faber, 1976), 322–323.
[11] Milewski, "The Mazurka and National Imaginings: Poland, Frédéric Chopin, Karol Szymanowski" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 2002), 9–10.

> To recognize that the composer drew on and synthesized a variety of musical experiences both rural and urban is not, however, to diminish his achievement in this genre. Instead, it gives us a richer context for appreciating the level of inspiration he brought to his sonic account of the nation.[12]

Whatever the sources, Chopin's familiarity with music specific to his native country, whether the various species of mazurka or other genres like the polonaise and *krakowiak*, seems clear from his music. As Milewski notes, these influences would combine with others, including music from the salon and theater, other types of dance, and commercial music—to which one must certainly add Chopin's rigorous contrapuntal studies as a composer, pianist, and organist—to stylize the mazurka into a unique kind of creation. Whether Chopin himself regarded the mazurkas as representing Poland or Polishness as they did for others is open to question;[13] but if nothing else, one can begin to sense that these works have no single origin, and that Chopin's mazurkas are complex and original creations influenced by a variety of other music yet qualitatively different from anything else. Jim Samson's attractive solution is to consider Chopin a composer who paid respect to both the rural roots and the urban adaptation of mazurkas, "preserving the unique qualities of the former as a source of energy for an art-form of some sophistication, and one which he was to make very much his own."[14] Though originating in a dance, Chopin's mazurkas are not meant for dancing but, to quote Samson again, they express "his most deeply felt and poignant music, and also some of his most original."[15]

---

[12] Milewski, "Chopin's Mazurkas and the Myth of the Folk," 134–135.
[13] Kallberg, "Hearing Poland: Chopin and Nationalism," in *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music*, 2nd ed., ed. R. Larry Todd (New York: Routledge, 2004), 246.
[14] Jim Samson, *The Music of Chopin* (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), 110.
[15] Ibid.

In this dissertation I will concentrate on some of the features widely admired in the Chopin mazurkas but rarely considered as topics in their own right, devoting a chapter to each. I have grouped the chapters so as to structure the discussion in two main parts. The first part, comprising Chapters 2 through 4, focuses on aspects of tonal organization. I examine Chopin's motivic practice on various structural levels (Chapter 2), his often bold use of chromaticism (Chapter 3), and the enigmatic quality in some mazurkas that leaves them incomplete or tonally ambiguous (Chapter 4). The second part shifts to the formal aspect of the mazurkas, beginning with the manifold effects and purposes of the introductions (Chapter 5). A study of Chopin's often subtle and intricate reworkings of the opening sections in his reprises (Chapter 6) and an examination of the codas (Chapter 7) complete the dissertation. Thus the organization is more around topics, such as chromaticism or reprises, than by individual pieces. My hope is that the advantage of such an organization will become apparent as the dissertation proceeds, and that readers will excuse the need in some of the later chapters to summarize findings from earlier chapters when a particular mazurka is taken up a second or third time from a new perspective.

The analytical stance I have taken toward the mazurkas is based on the work of Heinrich Schenker (1868–1935), a musician with a connection to Chopin through Chopin's distinguished pupil Karol Mikuli, and probably the first important music theorist to rank Chopin among the greatest masters of tonal composition.[16] Schenker's

[16] Hellmut Federhofer, *Heinrich Schenker: nach Tagebüchern und Briefen in der Oswald Jonas Memorial Collection* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1985), 4; cited in William Rothstein,

influence on the future course of music theory was of course profound and continues today. His approach is especially well suited to Chopin's music, where thematic elements operate on more than one structural level and where relationships among the different elements, tonal and formal, are subtle enough to require close multi-layered readings. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine unraveling the complexities of Chopin's harmonic practice without some notion that chords are by nature contrapuntal entities, the flowing together of melodic lines, an idea that Chopin himself expressed in a well-known conversation recorded by his close friend, the painter Eugène Delacroix, in which Chopin objected to the teaching of harmony before counterpoint, "the succession of notes that leads to chords."[17]

Schenker's additional ideas, that harmonies are regulated in an abstract sense, not chord to chord, by the harmonic scale degree (*Stufe*), with most chords serving to group, emphasize, and connect other chords into broadly expressed (composed-out) harmonies, though not as obviously implicit in anything Chopin himself said, should be plausible intuitively, given the attention that Chopin paid to the bass line, always for him a melodic entity carefully pitched in register even in passages where many of the chords happen to lie in root position. As for the more controversial ideas that Schenker developed in his final work, the *Urlinie* and *Ursatz*, these play a role in my work similar to their role in the work of other Schenkerians, figuring prominently in some of my analyses, especially

---

Review of Articles on Schenker and Schenkerian Theory in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, *Journal of Music Theory* 45/1 (2001): 207.

[17] "Il m'a dit que l'on avait l'habitude d'apprendre les accords avant le contrepoint, c'est-à-dire la succession des notes qui mène aux accords." Eugène Delacroix, *Journal de Eugène Delacroix*, vol. 1, ed. André Joubin (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1932), 285.
A translation of this 7 April 1849 diary entry appears in Eugène Delacroix, *The Journal of Eugene Delacroix*, trans. Walter Pach (New York: Crown, 1948), 194–195.

when I need to establish long-range melodic connections or show how works are brought to closure, but playing a relatively small role in others. And if a piece lacks some element of the *Ursatz*, this is something I gladly acknowledge as an unusual feature of the composition rather than forcing the work into a preconceived mold. For my work, as for others working in the Schenkerian tradition, it is no single musical element, but rather the synthesis of all the musical factors that counts above all, and each of my individual analyses will contain in the graphs, if not necessarily in the text as well, observations on melody, harmony, rhythm, counterpoint, and form.

Here one might add, from a historical standpoint, that Schenkerian analysis, with its strong emphasis on melodic and contrapuntal coherence, seems especially well suited to the music of an artist like Chopin, whose favorite composers were J. S. Bach, with his incomparable command of every aspect of counterpoint, and Mozart, who absorbed those influences into a style already based on the long Italianate lines that Chopin so admired in vocal music for the theatre. And thanks to the outstanding recent work by Halina Goldberg on Chopin's musical life in Warsaw, we now know a great deal more about Chopin's training with his composition teacher Elsner as well, instruction that emphasized study of classical models while giving the student a great deal of latitude, a situation Goldberg regards as ideal for the young Chopin.[18]

Unavoidably, I have had to assume a working knowledge of Schenkerian theory, but my hope is that readers who know the Chopin mazurkas and possess a basic knowledge of music theory will still be able to gain much from the analyses, skipping the

[18] Goldberg gives a thorough account of Chopin's education in Chapter 4 of *Music in Chopin's Warsaw* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), without making any kind of connection to Schenker.

occasional specialized theoretical point I may wish to make about, for example, the absence of a full bass arpeggiation supporting the second branch of the interrupted *Ursatz* in one of the mazurkas (Op. 7/3, as it happens). In the opening sections of each chapter I do attempt to explain Schenker's ideas on a particular topic and show how they intersect with ideas of more recent theorists and Chopin scholars.

Because all the analyses in this dissertation are in depth, it would have been impractical to discuss all fifty-eight Chopin mazurkas for a project of this scope. Thus I have been selective. Two factors affected my decisions on which mazurkas to include. First, I wished to avoid as much as possible reanalyzing mazurkas already discussed in detail by respected Schenkerians. Thus, although I mention analyses by David Beach (Op. 17/4), Carl Schachter (Op. 50/3), Charles Burkhart (Op. 59/2), Edward Laufer (Op. 7/2), Eric Wen (Op. 63/3), and Felix Salzer (Op. 68/4), I generally summarize their findings without restating them myself, unless I have something in particular to add or emphasize. The same principle holds for Schenker's readings of several mazurkas. Second, I chose mazurkas that I thought would best exemplify the techniques of tonal and formal organization that I have identified in the mazurkas generally. This yielded a total of seventeen complete analyses, often distributed among the chapters to promote the dissertation's topical organization. Other mazurkas would have been possible to include, but I strove to include just enough to suggest the range of applicability of any compositional technique, be it motivic organization, the functions of the reprise, or any of the other techniques discussed here.

One further limitation I have had to impose on the dissertation is to analyze only one version of any particular mazurka, whereas most of Chopin's compositions, as

Christophe Grabowski and John Rink have exhaustively documented, "continually evolved," remaining subject to revision or refinement at any time, whether in performance, in the preparation for their first publications, or in subsequent printings.[19] This need to stabilize the work into a form that can be readily analyzed might seem an unwelcome limitation given the fluid relationship for Chopin between performance and composition, but in general the features I identify in the mazurkas are common to most good modern editions, including the two on which I relied on most heavily, the Henle edition, edited by Ewald Zimmermann (1975), and the mazurka volumes of the *National Edition of the Works of Fryderyk Chopin*, edited by Jan Ekier and Paweł Kamiński (1998). Unless otherwise noted, the works analyzed in this dissertation, as well as the opus numbers for those mazurkas that were published in more than one order, are the versions present in the Henle edition. I also adopt the dates of composition from the Henle editor.

My goal in the chapters that follow will be to demonstrate through Schenkerian analysis a range of techniques that give the Chopin mazurkas such a special place at the "heart of his oeuvre," a task best accomplished not through style analysis alone or the identification of generic or otherwise typical features, but rather through close readings of individual mazurkas that place those features into the context of a particular work, each unlike any other.

---

[19] Christophe Grabowski and John Rink, "Chopin's First Editions: Historical Overview" in *Annotated Catalogue of Chopin's First Editions*, ed. Grabowski and Rink (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), xxi.

Chapter 2

Motives

> The motif, and the motif alone, creates the possibility of associating ideas, the only one of which music is capable.[1]

Motive in Schenkerian Theory

Motivic analysis is, without doubt, one of the most studied areas in musical research. Unfortunately, the number of different meanings for terms relating to "motive," "theme," and "idea" has led to considerable variation in scholarly practice. Motive for a Schenkerian will differ considerably in its meaning from, say, *Grundgestalt* for a Schoenbergian or "basic idea" for William Caplin. Even within a single tradition, practice may vary. Among Schenkerians, for example, John Rothgeb tends to favor a stricter approach to motivic reading than Edward Laufer, who allows thematic development greater flexibility depending on the piece. From this one might conclude that motivic analysis always remains, to a degree, a personal activity.

The key idea behind Schenker's view of motive is that thematic repetition makes music intelligible. Without the capacity to denote explicitly as verbal language does, music communicates through a means from within—namely, the imitation or repetition of a musical idea. Repetition allows a listener to associate musical ideas anywhere in

---

[1] Heinrich Schenker, *Harmony*, ed. Oswald Jonas and trans. Elisabeth Mann Borgese (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 4.

a piece through patterns of statement and restatement based on thematic similarity, promoting synthesis of individual parts into a musical whole. Schenker also placed great stress on factors that promote the formation of coherent musical units (wholes) from contiguous segments (parts), especially the contrapuntal forces of dissonance preparation and resolution forming lines into chords, themselves grouped into harmonies organized by the forces of scale degrees (*Stufen*) within a key. Though a simplification, this is essentially the view Schenker took in his first major theoretical work, the *Harmonielehre* of 1906, a position he maintained and refined through the 1910s.

As Schenker's view of the "parts" to be synthesized expanded in the 1920s and '30s to include layers (*Schichten*), or levels, of structure as well, he came to recognize that a repetition from an immediate (foreground) layer to a more remote (middleground) layer could promote a synthesis of those layers, allowing a concealed repetition (*verborgene Wiederholung*) to organize spans of music that were potentially of any length. Such repetitions would never be as essential to Schenker as the voice-leading transformations that stabilized elements dissonant on an early layer to be composed out on a later one; but when concealed repetitions did occur, he found they promoted a particularly intimate rapport ("Fühlungsnahme") among the levels. One effect was to greatly increase the range of passages that could be interpreted as statement and restatement, pattern and copy.[2]

---

[2] The preceding discussion draws on David Beach, "Schenkerian Theory," *Music Theory Spectrum* 11/1 (1989): 6; Oswald Jonas, *Introduction to the Theory of Heinrich Schenker: The Nature of the Musical Work of Art*, 2nd English trans., trans. and ed. John Rothgeb (Ann Arbor: Musicalia Press, 2005), 1–11; Wayne C. Petty, "Thoughts on Schenker's Treatment of Diminution and Repetition in Part III of *Free Composition*, and Its Implications for Analysis," in *Structure and Meaning in Tonal Music: Festschrift in*

Even with this additional theorizing of layers, or levels, in his late work, Schenker never abandoned the view that motivic repetition plays a key role in making music comprehensible—and enjoyable: "The ever stronger inner desire of music to follow its own course, to strive toward expansion of content, found its counterpart in the pleasure the ear derived from repetition—a joy in recognition itself."[3] But Schenker's joining of motivic factors to voice-leading transformations did have some far-reaching effects. He became highly skeptical toward views of motive limited to the musical surface and not tied to principles of counterpoint, and he added the view that motivic repetitions were *organically* connected only when attached to the same *Ursatz*; otherwise they had the questionable status of what he called "wandering melodies," repetitions that lack such an intimate bond.[4]

Because motivic analysis is highly contextual, Schenker did not formulate rules for motivic analysis, but we can find helpful discussions in the secondary literature. Two classic articles by Schenkerian scholars are indispensable for the understanding of motivic relationships in the Schenkerian literature: Charles Burkhart's essay on motivic parallelism and John Rothgeb's article on thematic content.[5] Burkhart's article is perhaps the most invaluable study of Schenker's ideas on the subject, exploring hidden parallelisms among motives behind the musical surface that help connect the structural

---

Honor of Carl Schachter, ed. L. Poundie Burstein and David Gagné (Hillsdale, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 2006), 74; and Schenker, *Harmony*, 4–9.

[3] Schenker, *Free Composition*, trans. and ed. Ernst Oster, (New York: Longman, 1979; rpt., Hillsdale, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 2001), 99.

[4] Schenker, *Free Composition*, §262.

[5] Charles Burkhart, "Schenker's 'Motivic Parallelisms,'" *Journal of Music Theory* 22 (1978): 145–175; and John Rothgeb, "Thematic Content: A Schenkerian View," in *Aspects of Schenkerian Theory*, ed. David Beach (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 39–60.

levels to each other. Rothgeb's contribution stresses the need to join motivic analysis to principles of counterpoint, noting the variety of repetitions that can connect different segments, including "linkage technique," whereby phrase endings join to subsequent phrase beginnings through repetition.[6] Together these two articles nicely complement each other, Burkhart's stressing motivic repetitions on different levels, Rothgeb's more concerned with those on the same level.

It is important to note that Schenker rarely uses the term "*motivischer Parallelismus*" and even when he does, it remains undefined. In order to establish Schenker's ideas on motivic parallelism more concretely, Burkhart distinguishes three types of parallelism based on the length of the copy (the restatement) as compared to the pattern (the original musical idea). An *enlargement* expands the original pattern, often caused by elaborate embellishment. Example 2-1a illustrates a well-known example of motivic enlargement in the first movement of Mozart's Piano Sonata in C Major, K. 545. The two-bar idea, a^2-g^2-f^2-e^2 in bars 3–4 returns coupled in octaves over the next four bars where each of the four notes are embellished by scalar motion, producing the coupling.[7] Enlargement in this Mozart example is easy to hear, since the enlargement directly follows the original motive; other examples include enlargements more separated in time or covering longer spans of music.

---

[6] Rothgeb, "Thematic Content," 44–45.

[7] Burkhart, "Schenker's 'Motivic Parallelisms,'" 147–148 and 168. Example 2-1a is based on Burkhart's Example 1a, which he draws from Oswald Jonas, *Einführung in die Lehre Heinrich Schenkers* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1934; rev. ed., 1972).

Example 2-1b, on the other hand, shows a *contraction*, the opposite of an enlargement.[8] It results when the copy is shortened. In the first four bars of the Menuetto from Beethoven's Piano Sonata in F Minor, Op. 2/1, the opening turn motive $a\flat^1$-$b\flat^1$-$a\flat^1$-g^1-$a\flat^1$ appears more embellished than its copy in the tenor. Note that the pattern and the copy are heard in different harmonic contexts as $b\flat^1$ of the pattern is a dissonant neighbor resolving to $a\flat^1$ over a tonic prolongation while $b\flat$ of the copy is supported by the dominant and the ensuing $a\flat$ is a passing tone. Richard Cohn challenges Burkhart's view, questioning whether parallelism still applies in this example when the same pitch class succession is heard in different prolongational patterns. Cohn writes:

> An ordered list of an entity's components (whether these be pitch classes, pitches, or intervals) is not sufficient to establish its identity. . . . If the entities share surface characteristics but have different structural descriptions, . . . the hypothesized relationship would fail the test and be dismissed. Their similarity is based only on surface properties—what Schenker frequently refers to as *Erscheinung*. To posit a connection between them would be to respond to surface distraction, to lose the contact with the Ursatz, to sever entities from the breath which sustains them.[9]

In my opinion, we do hear parallelism here, despite the different harmonic context, because the same sequence of notes repeats itself in close proximity. Another feature worth noting in this example is that the copy is nested within the pattern. This is a special instance of parallelism since when a motive returns unchanged or varied, the pattern and

---

[8] Ibid., 148. Example 2-1b is a simplified version of Burkhart's Example 1b, which he adapted from Schenker, "Beethoven: Sonate Opus 2 Nr. 1," in *Der Tonwille* 2 (Vienna: Tonwille Flugblätterverlag, 1922), 32 and supplement, 4.

[9] Richard Cohn, "The Autonomy of Motives in Schenkerian Accounts of Tonal Music," *Music Theory Spectrum* 14/2 (1992): 154–162.

the copy are more often temporally separated from each other and therefore could be either on the same or on different structural levels.[10]

Finally, and perhaps the most common of all three, is a *transposed copy*. Example 2-1c shows bars 25–34 of Chopin's Mazurka in G Minor, Op. 24/1, in which a motive comprising a descending third embellished by an upper neighbor (f^2-g^2-f^2-$e\flat^2$-d^2) not only recurs twice sequentially in the upper voice but also restates itself in the alto.[11] This last example also shows linkage technique as a new section begins with a concealed repetition of the pattern that ended the previous one.

These three examples illustrate only the most basic principles of parallelism. Before we look at large-scale parallelism, which I will illustrate using examples from other Schenkerian literature below, we need to remember that although motivic parallelism is a very important concept for Schenker, often it is not the focal point of his analytic work. For him, "they sometimes occur; they do not have to occur; when they do, their significance for the particular work will vary from case to case, but they always impart to it a greater coherence, a richer content."[12] While it might be fruitful to show motivic unity in an analysis, we have to be careful to not make it the determinant of our analytic process; "recognition of motivic repetition is a byproduct of analysis."[13] Joseph Straus further addresses this concern:

> Concealed repetitions may significantly contribute to the unity and coherence of a composition, providing all of the structural levels with the same motivic content. Despite their intrinsic interest, however, concealed repetitions and other motivic relations are neither necessary nor sufficient

[10] Burkhart, "Schenker's 'Motivic Parallelisms,'" 148–151.
[11] Rothgeb, "Thematic Content," 45. Example 2-1c is modeled on Rothgeb's Example 5b.
[12] Burkhart, "Schenker's 'Motivic Parallelisms,'" 146.
[13] Beach, "Schenkerian Theory," 6.

> for tonal coherence, which is assured by the relations among the structural levels, by the systematic prolongation at each level of events at the higher levels, and by the composing-out of the tonic triad, the ultimate structural determinant. The composing-out may follow a motivic path; but it need not do so. Motivic association is thus only a secondary determinant of structure in tonal music. Furthermore, what motivic relations there are always have a tonal function to fulfill. They not only are less important structurally than the tonal relations but also function primarily to express and elaborate those relations.[14]

In this dissertation, "motive" refers to a recurring rhythmic or melodic figure of importance that is overtly presented on the musical surface or concealed in a deeper level. It could return unchanged (exact restatement), varied (embellished), or transformed (parallelism). Within these categories, a large number of possibilities exists, and these will be explored in the remainder of this chapter.

Schenkerian Motivic Studies of Chopin's Works

According to Carl Schachter, Chopin's compositional genius lies largely in his use of motives and his ability to relate them through hidden repetitions, which enable him to connect a large structure to surface events.[15] We will look at several Schenkerian analyses of Chopin's works below in order to reveal the composer's originality in motivic treatment.

Schenker, in his *Five Graphic Music Analyses* and in *Free Composition*, provides us with analyses of Chopin's Etude in C Minor, Op. 10/12, which include extensive insights into the etude's motivic workings. Example 2-2 combines some of Schenker's

---

[14] Joseph Straus, *Remaking the Past: Musical Modernism and the Influence of the Tonal Tradition* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990), 22.
[15] Carl Schachter, "Chopin Fantasy Op. 49: The Two-Key Scheme," in *Chopin Studies*, ed. Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 228.

ideas to guide our discussion.[16] Nicknamed the "Revolutionary" Etude, the piece is written in two-part form A_1A_2 with an introduction and a coda.[17] The introduction (bars 1–9) announces the neighbor motive G-A♭-G over an implied dominant prolongation as the peak notes arpeggiate a diminished fifth to f^3. Section A_1 has two statements, the second an expansion of the first. The first statement (bars 9–18) establishes the *Kopfton* $e♭^3$ (3̂), resolving the f^3 from the introduction, and a tonic prolongation in which the bass introduces a motivic descending fourth, C-B♭-A♭-G that concludes at a half cadence at bar 18. The music restates the G-A♭-G neighbor motive and altered forms centering on G, G-A♮-G and G-F♯-G, establishing in addition a juxtaposition of A♭ and A♮. Through coupling, $e♭^3$ arrives at $e♭^2$ and moves toward d^2 over the cadential dominant at bars 17–18 where the first small-scale interruption takes place.

The second statement (bars 19–41) expands the first and comprises three distinct phrases. The first phrase (bars 19–28) begins by quoting the first six bars of the first statement, then expands it via an ascending sixth g^2-$e♮^3$, reaching a cadential dominant at bar 27 that resolves to the local tonic B♭ major in the following bar. The music not only brings back the G-A♭-G neighbor motive and the A♭-A♮ conflict but also contrasts the first statement's G-F♯-G figure with G-G♭-F, respelling F♯ as G♭ for a downward pull toward F♮, the dominant of B♭, allowing a thematic idea to motivate the modulation. The second phrase (bars 29–36) develops the semitone conflicts and the ascending-sixth idea, presenting them in a different harmonic setting as C♭-C♮ in the top voice and a♭-f^1 in the

---

[16] Schenker, "F. Chopin: Etude in C Minor, Op. 10, No. 12," in *Five Graphic Music Analyses* (New York: Dover, 1969), 53–61; *Free Composition*, Figs. 73,1, 114,10, and 119,14.

[17] See William Rothstein, "Rhythm and The Theory of Structural Levels" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1981), 224–242.

bass. The prolongation of A♭ minor, notated enharmonically as G♯ minor, starts at bar 29 and ends at bar 40 where it turns into F minor through a 5–6 shift. With the third phrase (bars 37–41) the second statement reaches its harmonic goal, the dominant seventh at bar 41, leading to a high-level interruption.

Crucial to Schenker's analysis of the second statement is his interpretation of the tonicizations of both B♭ major and F minor. Both are read as surface events only, resulting from a descending fourth C-G in the bass as the tonic moves toward the dominant. By enlarging the initial descending-fourth motive of bars 9–18, the bass of bars 19–41 binds the two statements into a single expanded consequent that embraces foreground changes of key.

An exact restatement of the nine-bar introduction returns at bar 41 as a prefix to the reprise (Section A_2, bars 49–77). The first statement (bars 49–58) appears in its entirety but the second statement (bars 59–77) has to be rewritten to bring tonal closure to the etude. A new passage enters at bar 65 as the music begins its descent toward $e♭^2$ at bar 71 over a tonic prolongation. Owing to the embellished restatement of Section A_1, Section A_2 is able to repeat the G-A♭-G, G-A♮-G, and G-F♯-G neighbor motives, the A♭-A♮ conflict, and the descending-fourth figure in the bass. The enharmonic F♯-G♭ play also returns before Chopin corrects these notes to the diatonic counterparts in bars 68–69. The Neapolitan chord supporting ♭$\hat{2}$ follows the conclusion of the tonic prolongation at bar 71, arriving at the cadential dominant seventh chord at bar 73 where $d♮^2$ corrects $d♭^2$. The *Ursatz* concludes as the final tonic arrives, supporting $\hat{1}$ in the upper voice.

One more aspect of the etude deserves our attention, the hidden repetition of motives. A parallelism of chromatic passing tones is found between the outer voices in

bars 11–17, as shown by the brackets in Example 2-2; on a higher level, the neighbor motive heard above the dominant-tonic progression in bars 1–11 is echoed by its chromaticized copy over a tonicization of the subdominant in bars 33–37, returning above the final tonic at bar 77. For Schenker, the different harmonizations of the neighbor motive allow Chopin to achieve "cohesiveness of the whole" in this etude.[18]

Two mazurkas further demonstrate Chopin's genius in relating surface events to deeper structure through hidden repetition. Here I will choose examples from two respected Schenkerians, one whose approach to motivic reading is relatively strict, the other more free, thus showing some of the variation among practitioners working with the same Schenkerian tradition that I noted earlier.

Example 2-3 is an edited voice-leading graph of David Beach's analysis of the Mazurka in A Minor, Op. 17/4.[19] In this mazurka a four-bar introduction announces the principal motive of the piece, the ascending third B-C-D (Example 2-3a). The beginning of the three-part Section A_1 (bars 5–60) picks up the ascending-third motive, restating it twice more in bars 5–7 as the music climbs toward the *Kopfton* e^2, reached in bar 8. The motive is then transformed into an enlarged chromatic descending third, e^2-$d\sharp^2$-$d\natural^2$-c^2 in bars 8–13. This chromatic third-descent organizes the opening of the middle part of Section A_1 (bars 37–44) as well, despite a change in harmonic context (Example 2-3b). The music then continues to elaborate the third-motive in Section B (bars 61–92) (Example 2-3c), now diatonically with a change to the parallel major. With $c\sharp^2$ as the local *Kopfton*, Section B not only repeats the ascending and descending thirds

[18] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 100.
[19] David Beach, "Chopin's Mazurka, Op. 17, No. 4," *Theory and Practice* 2/3 (1977): 12–16.

throughout; one might also add that these thirds invert to sixths as c♯^{2}-e^1 in bars 61–62 becomes e^1-c♯^{2} in bars 73–74. The prominent e^2-d♯^{2}-d♮^{2}-c^2 figure also returns as e^2-d♯^{2}-d♮^{2}-c♯^{2} in bars 76–77, supported by the A-major pedal.

Unlike the thirds that permeate this mazurka, the F-E neighbor idea from bars 7–8 appears to be suppressed until its numerous appearances as F♯-E in Section B (bars 61–62 and 74–76) reveal it as another main motive of the piece (Examples 2-3a and c). In order to return to A minor at the reprise (bars 93–108), the F♯ in this neighbor motive has to be inflected to F♮, as Chopin does at the end of Section B (Example 2-3d). The reprise (bars 93–108) repeats the third and the neighbor motives, with the thirds continuing their dominance in the coda (bars 109–132) (Example 2-3e). The four-bar introduction functions as a postlude at the end of the piece, making its final effort in stating the main feature of the piece—the ascending third B-C-D—but now without the answering melodic third from A to C, as the enigmatic f^1 from the introduction lingers above the final tonic harmony.[20]

Edward Laufer illustrates motivic saturation in another Mazurka in A Minor, Op. 7/2 (Example 2-4).[21] His reading elegantly displays how the opening F-D-F-E figure repeats and transforms itself in the first eight bars of the piece, resulting in a dense

---

[20] Beach does not mention the play between chromatic and diatonic pitches, which I see as a characteristic of this mazurka. The pairs in question are D-D♯, F-F♯, G-G♯, and B-B♭. The first three are first heard in the first part of Section A_1 while the last is introduced in the middle part of Section A_1. The coda summarizes all of these chromatic pairs (Example 2-3e), as is typical of its function. I will discuss this aspect of codas in greater detail in Chapter 7.

[21] Edward Laufer, "A Different Reading for the Same Music," paper read at the annual meeting of the Music Theory Society for New York State (Flushing, N.Y.: Queens College, 9 October 1993). Example 2-4 is modeled on Laufer's Exx. 6-1 to 6-4, which are reproduced in full in Example 6-1 from Chapter 6 below.

pattern of motivic repetition. He also shows the motive being carried over into the middle part of Section A_1, appearing as E-C-E♭-D and D-B♭-(D)-C♯ at bars 16–21. Another motivic idea in this piece is its falling fourth, first heard as F-E-D-(C) in the opening two bars nested within a larger descending fourth in bars 1–4; the initial implication, that F-E-D will fall to C, is realized only in bar 4. A chromaticized form, F-E♭-D-C returns in the alto in bars 12–16, and is further transformed into F-E-E♭-D-C♯-D in the tenor at bars 21–25. These hidden repetitions of the F-D-F-E and falling fourth figures provide the mazurka with a coherent sound characteristic of Chopin's music. This analysis also shows a willingness to hear motivic parallelisms where pitch-class successions repeat with varying degrees of support for the individual tones of the pattern, a tendency noted earlier in Laufer's work.

Analyses

Building on our survey of Schenkerian approaches to motivic analysis and the folk influences on Chopin mentioned in Chapter 1, five mazurkas will be studied in the last part of this chapter. My discussion begins with the diatonic motives in the Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 6/2 and the Mazurka in G Major, Op. 50/1, followed by the modal characteristics in the Mazurka in E Minor, Op. 41/1, concluding with the chromatic features in the Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 50/3 and Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 30/4. Literature by Schenker and his followers provides helpful clues to the understanding of these pieces, but except where noted the analyses are my own.

Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 6/2 (1830)

In the eight-bar introduction of Op. 6/2, the melody lies in the alto, covered by $g♯^1$ over a drone bass on the dominant. The alto voice announces an arpeggiated fifth motive $b♯\text{-}c♯^1\text{-}d♯^1\text{-}f♯^1$ in bars 1–4, repeats it, and as the piece progresses, this motive returns in enlargement and contraction in both ascending and descending forms (Example 2-5).

The first part of the three-part Section A_1 (bars 9–16) presents a fifth-descent, an enlarged form of the arpeggiated fifth motive, in an eight-bar sentence. The presentation phrase answers the introduction's rising arpeggiated fifth motive with its falling arpeggiated fifth, $g♯^2\text{-}f♯^2\text{-}e^2\text{-}c♯^2$ in bars 9–10 and twice summarizes this fifth $g♯^2\text{-}c♯^2$ as a contraction at bars 10 and 12. The continuation phrase responds down a fourth, giving us the falling fifth $d♯^2\text{-}c♯^2\text{-}b♯^1\text{-}g♯^1$ in bars 13–14 with its own summary $d♯^2\text{-}g♯^1$ at bar 14 before the phrase ends with yet another falling fifth, $g♯^1\text{-}c♯^1$, at bar 16. The opening of Section A_1 is thus densely packed with the downward form of the arpeggiated fifth motive.

The middle part of Section A_1 (bars 17–24) expands and tonicizes the home dominant harmony. It brings the *Urlinie* from the one-line register back to its original two-line register through an arpeggiated dominant triad, $d♯^1\text{-}g♯^1\text{-}b♯^1\text{-}d♯^2$ at the outset, within which the rising form of the motive is embedded, answering the falling fifths of the previous section. The top voice immediately balances the rising arpeggiated fifth with a falling one, taking $d♯^2$ back to $g♯^1$ at bar 19. The music gains its obligatory two-line register through an octave leap at bar 24, with repetitions of that leap summarizing the overall coupling idea, reaching $g♯^2$ to prepare for the return of the opening material.

Section B (bars 33–48) is subdivided into two parts, a passage in E major (III) in bars 33–40 and its transposition in G♯ major ($V^{\sharp}$) in bars 41–48. Thus, the overall bass motion in Sections A_1 and B arpeggiates the tonic triad C♯-E-G♯, another representation of the enlarged motive. The E-major segment begins with an ascending third $c\sharp^2$-$d\sharp^2$-e^2 and answers it with the motivic descending fifth, b^1-$g\sharp^1$-e^1. Likewise, the main motive is heard in the G♯-major passage as $d\sharp^2$-$b\sharp^1$-$g\sharp^1$, which is also heard in its enlarged form in bars 42–49.

Apart from the introduction's open-fifth drone bass, the constant second-beat accents, the grace notes and triplets, and the Lydian fourth F𝄪 show likely folk influences on this mazurka.[22] However, it is chiefly the variants of the arpeggiated fifth motive in different harmonic settings that act as a unifying element in different sections of the piece.

Mazurka in G Major, Op. 50/1 (1841/42)

The first part of the three-part Section A_1 (bars 1–16) in Op. 50/1 comprises an eight-bar period and its modified restatement. The initial phrase in bars 1–4 announces two main motives—the c^2-b^1 neighbor motion and the b^1-e^2-d^2 segment. The consequent balances the antecedent's rising contour with its falling gesture, answering the former b^1-e^2-d^2 motive with b^1-g^1-e^1-d^1, as bracketed in Example 2-6a.

The middle part of Section A_1 (bars 17–25) responds to the previous music in several ways even as it establishes a new harmony, the submediant, which supports the section (Example 2-6b). The top voice leads e^1 up to e^2 and back to e^1, creating a melodic

[22] Each F𝄪 in this piece functions as local leading-tone to G♯ ($\hat{5}$)

contour similar to that of the opening eight-bar period but stabilizing the high e^2 by providing it consonant support. Also as in the earlier section, the upper voice states the c^2-b^1 neighbor motive, in bars 19–20, and concludes with b^1-g^1-e^1-d^1 in bars 24–25, overlapping with the return of the first part. Moreover, it revalues the first chromatic neighbors in the mazurka—a♯-b and c♯-d from bar 4—as it repeats them in bars 17–18 and 24–25.

Perhaps the most dramatic statement of the upper neighbor motive comes in the retransition from Section B (bars 41–48), where the melody pauses at bar 54 on e^2, the large-scale upper neighbor to the ensuing d^2 that enters when the dominant seventh resolves to the tonic at bar 59. This enlargement of the initial D-E-D neighbor motive (bars 1–4) is repeated an octave lower across bars 56–57, linking Section B to the reprise (Example 2-6c). By serving as the high point of each section within the main part of the mazurka, e^2 serves as what Kevin Korsyn has called a *registral ceiling*, a high point touched on repeatedly, "appearing in various contexts with many different meanings."[23] Chopin's use of the registral ceiling helps integrate sections that otherwise present varied musical ideas.

The flats that suddenly flood Section B create a vivid visual contrast, but G major remains the underlying tonality since the chromatic notes are surface contrapuntal events involved in a local composing-out of the G-minor triad in bars 42–48. An E♭-D neighbor motive permeates the inner and outer voices throughout this section, later becoming a prominent feature in the two-part coda (bars 73–104) as well (Examples 2-6d and e). It

[23] Kevin Korsyn, "Integration in Works of Beethoven's Final Period" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1983), 33.

appears forcefully in octaves, accompanied by a juxtaposition of b♭^{1}-b♮^{1} in the alto. The alternating b♭^{1} and b♮^{1} is actually a respelling of the a♯^{1}-b♮^{1} neighbor from bar 4, and the relationship becomes obvious when this gesture reverts to A♯-B♮ in bars 78, 80, and 88. Meanwhile, d^1-a^1-(g^1) in bars 76–78 answers the motivic b^1-e^2-d^2 idea. The abundance of chromatic notes overwhelming the first part of the coda (bars 73–89) recalls those in Section B, but as the second part of the coda enters at bar 89, the music becomes largely diatonic. Both the c^2-b^1 and b^1-e^2-d^2 motives return, the latter stated an octave lower by the tenor. Although the E♭-D neighbor persists, it resides in the inner voice and is thus less aggressive than earlier when it began the coda. Attempts to correct E♭ to the diatonic E♮ in bars 91–100 fail as the e♭^{1}-d^1 neighbor motive reappears for the last time at bars 102–103, recalling that of bars 47–48.

Although most of the findings concerning motivic development in this mazurka involve a relatively surface level, inter-section motivic connection is crucial in this mazurka, as demonstrated by recurring motives, contours, and the coda's reference to the first chromatic motive from bar 4.

Mazurka in E Minor, Op. 41/1 (1838)

Chromaticism features prominently in Op. 41/1, a piece that announces its play of chromatic elements from the very first chord (Example 2-7a). Although the opening E in the bass supports $\hat{5}$ as the *Kopfton*, the chord is an applied dominant of the ensuing A-minor triad, A thus becoming the tonic suggested by the opening two bars. The true tonic E minor arrives only in bar 4; the A-minor triad is heard in retrospect as the

subdominant, which becomes an important harmony as the music proceeds.[24] The first four bars thus present an auxiliary progression which, according to Eric McKee, is a very effective way to begin a piece because it delays the tonic, resulting in "a state of suspense and tonal ungroundedness that immediately engages the listener's attention."[25]

Section A_1 (bars 1–16) states an eight-bar period twice, establishing three motives—the plagal and Phrygian sonority as well as the surface neighbors, which also permeate the middle part of the extensive three-part Section B (bars 33–40) over a local B-major tonic. The upper-voice fifth-descent in the antecedent (bars 1–4) contrasts the one in the consequent (bars 5–8) in two ways. First, the former is a diatonic fifth b^1-a^1-g^1-$f\sharp^1$-e^1 while the latter employs a Phrygian inflection b^1-a^1-g^1-$f\flat^1$-e^1. Second, the first descent ends on a perfect authentic cadence but the second concludes with a plagal progression. The reprise (bars 57–64) restates all these properties. The tonal unsettledness caused by the *Kopfton*'s failure to gain simultaneous tonic support, the conflict between diatonic E minor and the Phrygian mode, and the final descent of the *Urlinie* over a plagal progression creates an expectation for the coda (bars 64–68) to bring some kind of resolution. Rather than doing this, the coda summarizes all three motives in five bars,

---

[24] In his sketch, Chopin himself was confused about the tonality of this mazurka, naming A minor as the tonic at first and then changing it to E minor. See Jeffrey Kallberg, "Hearing Poland: Chopin and Nationalism," in *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music*, 2nd ed., ed. R. Larry Todd (New York: Routledge, 2004), 239. I will explain tonal ambiguity in this and other Chopin mazurkas in Chapter 4.

[25] Eric McKee, "Auxiliary Progressions as a Source of Conflict between Tonal Structure and Phrase Structure," *Music Theory Spectrum* 18/1 (1996): 64. Two articles by L. Poundie Burstein discuss auxiliary cadences in great detail, as does his dissertation. See "The Off-tonic Return in Beethoven's Piano Concerto No. 4 in G Major, Op. 58, and Other Works," *Music Analysis* 24/3 (2005): 305–347; "Unraveling Schenker's Concept of the Auxiliary Cadence," *Music Theory Spectrum* 27/2 (2005): 159–185; and "The Non-Tonic Opening in Classical and Romantic Music" (Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1988).

restating the opening neighbor b-c^1-b in the alto over the plagal progression and settling once again with the Phrygian melody, c^2-g^1-$f♮^1$-e^1 (Example 2-7b).

Commenting on this mazurka in *Free Composition*, Schenker explains the persistent F♮, saying that "once the diatonic structure of a composition is firmly established, the composer can, for the sake of a special effect, place a ♭$\hat{2}$ even at the end, as though the entire piece were in the Phrygian mode."[26] He shows the F♯-F♮ conflict in the two fifth-descents in his Fig. 75 (Example 2-7c), the middleground graph of this mazurka that he labels as Op. 41/2.[27] He also identifies e^2-c^2-b^1 in the cover tones, which possibly transforms into a^1-$f♮^1$-e^1 at the end (Example 2-7a). This parallelism suggests that b^1 ($\hat{5}$) and e^1 (î) are decorated the same way and therefore, F♮ appears to be more appropriate at the ending than F♯, giving the mazurka an intriguing Phrygian quality that recalls the folk tradition of the genre.

Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 50/3 (1841/42)

Chromatic conflicts take on motivic significance from the very opening of Op. 50/3, and they become a factor organizing what will become a large ternary form. In this design the contrapuntal, somber Section A_1 (bars 1–44) contrasts with Section B's much simpler,

---

[26] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 71.

[27] Ibid., Fig. 75. Instead of recognizing g^1 at bar 3 as the upper neighbor of $f♯^1$, Schenker reads it as a passing tone between a^1 and $f♯^1$ and therefore interprets it as $\hat{3}$ in the fifth-descent b^1-a^1-g^1-$f♯^1$-e^1 in bars 1–4. Schachter deems this analysis untenable; for him, the first four bars present a third-descent, b^1-a^1-(a)-g while the next four trace the b^1-a^1-(a)-g segment and complete the *Urlinie*'s fifth-descent b^1-a^1-g^1-$f♮^1$-e^1 in which $\hat{3}$ and the Phrygian $\hat{2}$ have no harmonic support and the *Ursatz* lacks a cadential dominant. See Schachter, "The Prelude in E Minor, Op. 28, No. 4: Autograph Sources and Interpretation," in *Chopin Studies* 2, ed. John Rink and Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 168, Example 9.4. Schachter's graph is reproduced here in Example 2-7d.

cheerful dance (bars 45–92). Section A_2 (bars 93–181) is an expanded reprise that provides a dramatic change of sonority and emotion, and a twelve-bar coda harks back to the opening section by employing its theme as the main material.

The first part of Section A_1 (bars 1–16) begins with an unaccompanied melody, and subsequent imitative entrances of voices attain a texture typical of a four-part fugue.[28] The juxtaposition of F𝄪-F♯ and B♮-B♯ in the "subject" becomes a special feature of the piece (Example 2-8a). In the last four bars of this subsection where the fifth-progression approaches a perfect authentic cadence in C♯ minor, Chopin introduces a motivic fourth (or fifth), D♯-G♯, which might also have its roots in the subject.

The first part of the three-part Section B (bars 45–60) highlights the B♮-B♯ conflict with the abrupt entrance of B major (♭VII) as the local tonic. Harmonically, the B-major triad, sharing three common tones with the dominant seventh of C♯ minor, functions as its upper third and supports d♯^{2} as the local $\hat{3}$ (Example 2-8b). Schachter suggests hearing this subsection as "transporting us to a distant place or time," where "the vision of a wished-for future" is "far happier than the conflicted present evoked by the opening section"; thereby, the piece might represent "the situation of Chopin's oppressed country."[29] To prepare for the reprise, the music jumps back to G♯ major, the home

---

[28] While the subject-answer construction in four-part texture resembles that of a fugue, only soprano and tenor are involved here, and the subject-subject-answer-answer pattern contradicts the alternating subject-answer scheme of a fugue. However, the reprise (bars 32–41) has a subject-answer-subject-answer construction that resembles a genuine fugue. Schachter suggests that this fugue-like gesture "might evoke an ensemble of folk musicians, with one—a fiddler or flute player—starting off and the Chers joining in as an introduction to the dance proper." See Schachter, "Counterpoint and Chromaticism in Chopin's Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Opus 50, Number 3," *Ostinato rigore: Revue internationale d'études musicales* 15 (2000): 124. Schachter's observation agrees with my earlier discussion of instrumental group involvement in folk mazurkas.

[29] Ibid., 129.

dominant, at bar 89, and once again juxtaposes B♮ with B♯. The prolonged d♯^{2} leaps to g♯^{2} at bar 92 over the dominant pedal, completing an enlargement of the motivic fourth (or fifth), D♯-G♯ across Sections A, B, and A_2. The coda (bars 181–192) further develops the characteristic F𝄪-F♯ and B♮-B♯ clashes and the motivic fourth (or fifth), D♯-G♯; I will discuss this feature at length when treating this and other codas in Chapter 7.

Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 30/4 (1836/37)

Rather than displaying the typical ternary formal design we have examined in the previous four mazurkas, the piece for this chapter's final analysis, Op. 30/4, is written in more than three parts (Example 2-9a).[30] I will address not only the prominent surface neighbor motive, noted by Schenker in his analysis, but also Chopin's treatments of d♯^{2} and f♯^{2} (Example 2-9b). In doing so I will deviate from the traditional analytic approach to motives seen above, but I hope this will account for a crucial idea that shapes this piece.

The introduction (bars 1–5) presents an auxiliary progression, featuring what Joel Lester named "chromatic circle of fifths" that delays the tonic arrival until bar 5.[31] The opening bars also present the primary upper neighbor motive, expressed as the pair of semitone progressions E-D♯ and A-G♯, as indicated by the brackets in my graph.

---

[30] Schenker reads this mazurka in three parts: Section A_1 (bars 1–64), Section B (bars 65–96), and Section A_2 (bars 97–139). See *Free Composition*, Fig. 53,3. However, the difference between his interpretation and mine on the formal structure does not affect the voice-leading of the piece.

[31] Joel Lester, "Harmonic Complexity and Form in Chopin's Mazurkas," *Ostinato rigore: Revue internationale d'études musicales* 15 (2000): 102–103.

Schenker comments on the use of this motive, suggesting "a wealth of hidden relationships—parallelisms—in this mazurka."[32]

The introduction overlaps with Section A_1 (bars 5–32) where the tonic and the *Kopfton* e^2 (3̂) arrive. Of particular interest is Chopin's various harmonizations of $f♯^2$. The first time, it functions as an upper neighbor that prolongs the *Kopfton* in bars 5–13; as the seventh of the dominant seventh chord, it resolves *downward* to e^2 over the tonic triad. The second time, $f♯^2$ is a passing tone within a third-progression e^2-$f♯^2$-$g♯^2$ that tonicizes the mediant in bars 17–20, resolving *upward* to $g♯^2$.[33] The different harmonic settings continue in bars 21–27 where $f♯^2$, acting as an incomplete upper neighbor to the *Kopfton*, is heard repetitively over a Neapolitan harmony.

The expansive prolongation of the Neapolitan harmony that begins at bar 21 not only introduces a D♮-D♯ conflict between the structural Neapolitan harmony and the subordinate dominant harmony but also brings back the figuration, $d♯^2$-$c♯^2$-$d♯^2$-e^2 that we first heard at bar 6. The sound of $d♯^2$ functioning as a lower neighbor that resolves *up* to the *Kopfton* e^2 is so prominent that it could seem impossible for Chopin to bring this structural 2̂ down to 1̂ in the reprise (bars 101–139), as we will see. This $d♯^2$ returns as the headnote of Section B (bars 33–64), while the section as a whole transforms the major dominant harmony into a minor one. In bars 39–47, $d♯^2$ begins a third-descent, moving downward to b^1 via $c♯^2$ for the first time. However, tension remains since $c♯^2$ is not the

---

[32] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 58 and Fig. 53,3. In his analysis, Schenker also uses brackets to highlight the upper neighbor motive. His slurring of e^2 to $c♯^2$ in bars 65–95 appears to be a mistake, however, for e^2 over the applied dominant resolves to the ensuing $d♯^2$ over the local tonic, B major. My deep-middleground graph shows $d♯^2$ remains the local *Kopfton* in this passage.

[33] Schenker interprets this passage with a^2-$g♯^2$ in the upper voice, that is, he hears an enlargement of the neighbor motive.

goal of this downward resolution but a dissonant passing tone with a G♯ minor context. The downward resolution from d♯^{2} to c♯^{2} has been thwarted again.

Apart from the return of the upper neighbor motive, Section C (bars 65–95) answers Section A_1 with its upward motion from d♯^{2}, presenting a fifth-ascent via a 5-10 linear intervallic pattern in bars 68–74. In bars 76–80, f♯^{2}, now set against B major,[34] initiates a fifth-progression to continue the attempt to bring d♯^{2} downward. The progression is heard again in bars 92–100, passing through the retransition that is largely based on the introduction. This time, however, the descent rests on b♯ over the dominant seventh harmony in preparation for Section A_2 (bars 101–139). Although d♯^{2} resolves to c♯^{2} over the cadential dominant in both fifth-progressions, c♯^{2} cannot be the goal of the descents, as they lie outside the key of C♯ minor.

The most important task of the reprise is to achieve melodic closure in a convincing way, bringing d♯^{2} down to c♯^{2} in the home key. This proves to be very difficult, if not impossible, because of the persistent upward resolution of d♯^{2} to e^2 that appears the same way as in the opening section. Rather than eliminating this sound and bringing d♯^{2} downward, Chopin reinforces it as he introduces an expansion (bars 127–139) to Section A_2, restating the figuration d♯^{2}-c♯^{2}-d♯^{2}-e^2 repetitively. Meanwhile, he reharmonizes the upper neighbor e^2 by setting it against f𝄪 and g♮ in the bass, thus beginning to erase the image of the tonic triad supporting a consonant passing or neighbor tone e^2 in bars 118–126. Only when e^2 is set as a dissonance can Chopin begin to force it down to d♯^{2} instead of always having it as the upward resolution of d♯^{2}. The

[34] Section C plunges into the remote key of B major, the subtonic, which functions as the upper third of the minor dominant in Section B.

d♯^{2}-c♯^{2}-d♯^{2}-e^2 figuration is then transformed into a chromatic series of descending seventh chords that features a sixth-descent, d♯^{2}-f♯^{1} in the top voice in bars 129–133.[35] The music turns completely diatonic upon the arrival of f♯^{1}, now harmonized by a half-diminished II^7 chord that functions as the upper fifth of an underlying dominant harmony, its resolution essentially elided.[36]

While Chopin manages to bring melodic closure at bars 136–137 where the top voice regains the two-line register, both d♯^{2} (2̂) and c♯^{2} (1̂) lack simultaneous harmonic support as the bass turns silent. The downward resolution of d♯^{2} is further undermined when the upper voice rests upon E at bar 139, as if refusing to put to rest the fight between the upward and downward resolutions of D♯.[37] Schenker's interpretation of this unusual ending is puzzling. While he attempts to show motivic parallelism between the opening and the ending in the unfoldings of the final tonic and the preceding half-diminished II^7 chord in bars 133–139, his interpretation of G♯ in the bass at bar 134 seems unjustified (Example 2-9c).[38]

In some ways this motivic analysis of Op. 30/4 has been conventional, but it also includes some innovations not usually associated with a Schenkerian approach. With regard to the primary E-D♯ and A-G♯ neighbor motives, the D♮-D♯ conflict, and the d♯^{2}-c♯^{2}-d♯^{2}-e^2 segment, my approach was rather traditional; on the other hand, my

---

[35] Schenker explains this parallel fifth succession within the seventh chords as an elided underlying 5, 4-5, 4-5 progression. See Schenker, *Free Composition*, 59 and Fig. 54,6.
[36] A characteristic sound of this mazurka, this half-diminished chord is first heard at the opening (bars 3–4). Here, however, it functions as the upper fifth of the prolonged dominant seventh chord.
[37] The final e should be understood as the resolution of f♯^{1} at bar 133, which is subsequently transferred to f♯ in the inner voice at bar 138.
[38] Schenker, *Free Composition*, Fig. 53,3. Example 2-9c adapts Schenker's analysis of the reprise.

discussion of the various harmonic treatments of d♯^{2} and f♯^{2} adopts a new analytical path, showing how various harmonizations of a single note bring different consequences to the voice leading as if both d♯^{2} and f♯^{2} bear several identities in this mazurka. The possible sonorities over which these notes are heard provide forward momentum for the piece, searching for the true meaning of the note. This is one quality that lends this mazurka a sound unlike any other.

Conclusion

In my presentation of Schenkerian and non-Schenkerian approaches to motivic analysis in these five chosen mazurkas, I have tried to show how surface and hidden motives interact with elements of harmony and voice leading to form these pieces into cohesive wholes. Through our study of the diatonic motives in the Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 6/2 and Mazurka in G Major, Op. 50/1 to the modal features of the Mazurka in E Minor, Op. 41/1 and finally, the chromaticism in the two Mazurkas in C♯ Minor, Opp. 50/3 and 30/4, we have come to another vital aspect of Chopin's mazurkas that we will explore in the next chapter—his innovative use of chromatic harmonies.

Chapter 3

Chromaticism

The discussion of motive in Chapter 2 explored Chopin's use of subtle thematic repetitions in the mazurkas, stressing equally the participation of diatonic and chromatic elements, and surface and higher-level motives. A fuller account of Chopin's use of chromaticism in the mazurkas will be the focus of the present chapter. As before, I will begin with a summary of the relevant aspects of Schenker's theory, as left by Schenker and interpreted by his followers, ending the chapter with my own analyses of Chopin mazurkas in which the techniques described by that theory play an especially important role.

A full account of the Schenkerian theory of chromaticism, though perhaps valuable, will not be necessary for the analyses that are the main focus of this chapter. I have chosen instead to review Schenker's thoughts on chromaticism based on his writings on the topics most relevant to Chopin's mazurkas—mixture, Phrygian $\hat{2}$, tonicization and modulation, and enharmonic and chromatic play. My analyses of selected mazurkas then further illustrate these concepts.

Mixture

A misunderstanding about Schenker and chromatic theory is that he regards chromaticism merely as a foreground tonal event. This view, shared by scholars such as David Kopp and Graham Phipps, is based on the view that all chromaticism must be incidental since the *Ursatz* is diatonic. Kopp, for example, in his discussion of the treatment of chromaticism in Schenker's "linear, diatonically oriented" theory, claims that the theory

> downplays the importance of local harmonic phenomena, assigning harmonic status sparingly to *Stufen* which by and large are fundamental diatonic steps of the key.[1]

Kopp observes that Schenker's belief in the concept of *Stufen* or scale-steps began in the early *Harmonielehre* (1906) and continued in the mature *Der freie Satz* (1935).[2] Although the theory allows Schenker to accommodate chromatic events, Kopp still finds it too limiting:

> As a rule, lines of great structural prominence, operating at the far middleground and background levels, contain only diatonic pitches, corresponding to their function as a large-scale tonic-key framework upon which surface elaborations, including modulations, are erected through the agency of various diminution procedures.[3]

Kopp's disappointment with Schenker's theory is best summarized by his statement that "all things being equal, Schenker sees diatonic events as more basic than chromatic ones."[4]

---

[1] David Kopp, *Chromatic Transformations in Nineteenth-Century Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 103.
[2] Heinrich Schenker, *Harmonielehre* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1906) and *Der freie Satz* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1935).
[3] Kopp, *Chromatic Transformations*, 106.
[4] Ibid., 117.

Arguing on similar grounds, Graham Phipps, in his attack on Schenker's view of chromaticism, says "all surface events are understood only in relation to the tonic triad, which, Schenker contends, generated them."[5] Schenker's conception of tonality is limited because

> he judges the music of Bach, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Chopin, and Brahms, as well as that of Wagner, Bruckner, Mahler, Strauss, and presumably Schoenberg, all with the same yardstick—that is, the major or minor tonic triad. . . . Whereas Schoenberg's concept provides a basis for comprehending a continuum of musical expression throughout music history—a continuum which leads to his own form of musical expression—Schenker is forced by his theory not only to reject music of the *Spätromantik* and the twentieth century, but also to perceive all music of the so-called "tonal period" as based upon a single unchanging principle.[6]

In fact, Schenker's conception of tonality is fully chromatic, a view he expresses early in *Harmonielehre*, even denying that mixture of mode represents chromaticism:

> Properly speaking, I think that any composition moves in a major-minor system. A composition in C, for example, should be understood as in C major-minor ($C\frac{\text{major}}{\text{minor}}$); for a pure C major, without any C minor ingredient, or, vice versa, a pure C minor, without any C major component, hardly ever occurs in reality. The expansive urge of the tone demands the use of both systems as well as of all their possible combinations.[7]

---

[5] Graham H. Phipps, "A Response to Schenker's Analysis of Chopin's Etude, Opus 10, No. 12, Using Schoenberg's 'Grundgestalt' Concept," *The Musical Quarterly* 69/4 (1983): 544.

[6] Ibid., 568–569. William Rothstein counters this partly legitimate criticism by observing that Schenker's is a theory of language, not of style, adding that Schenkerians could do more to study "the nature and history of musical style *within* the tonal era." See Rothstein, "The Americanization of Heinrich Schenker," in *Schenker Studies*, ed. Hedi Siegel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 202.

[7] Schenker, *Harmony*, trans. Elisabeth Mann Borgese, ed. Oswald Jonas (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 86–87. The original text in Schenker, *Harmonielehre*, 109, reads: "Ich halte es daher im Sinne jeder Komposition eigentlich für wahrheitsgemäßer, z.B. von einer C-dur-moll ($C\text{-}\frac{\text{dur}}{\text{moll}}$) zu sprechen, da es sich fast nie ereignet, daß ein C-dur ohne C-mollingredienzien und umgekehrt ein C-moll ohne

The juxtaposition of the tonic major and minor in the opening theme (bars 9–24) of the Mazurka in D♭ Major, Op. 30/3, for example, gives it a D♭ $\frac{\text{major}}{\text{minor}}$ sonority. This combination of the major and minor systems represents Schenker's expanded diatonic system, now commonly explained through the concept of modal mixture.

It could be argued that *Harmony*, written in 1906, is an early treatise by Schenker, and that Schenker's later work still neglects the importance of chromaticism, since the *Ursatz* is completely diatonic. But even in Schenker's late work, chromaticism is allowed at deep middleground levels, including the first level. In *Free Composition*, Schenker provides models of the *Ursatz* that add mixture at $\hat{3}$, explaining that while the *Urlinie* remains diatonic in the background, mixture can occur at the first level of the middleground (Example 3-1).[8] Drawing on the music of Chopin, Schenker indicates in a nearby example, Fig. 30a, that in Chopin's Mazurka in A♭ Major, Op. 17/3, the altered *Kopfton* ♭$\hat{3}$ in Section B (bars 41–80) is supported by ♭VI; written enharmonically as E major in the foreground for notational convenience, the chromatic tones govern an entire section of the form (Example 3-2a). When the lowered *Kopfton* ♭$\hat{3}$ is rectified by ♮$\hat{3}$ in the reprise, the *Urlinie* maintains its diatonic quality in the background, but the presence of mixture shows Schenker's reading to be highly sensitive to this aspect of Chopin's style.

The Mazurka in C Major, Op. 33/3 shares a tonal plan similar to that of Op. 17/3. In Example 3-2b, my analysis of Op. 33/3 illustrates that A♭ major, the lowered submediant

---

C-duringredienzien auftritt. Es liegt eben die Inanspruchnahme beider Systeme sowohl als aller unter denselben möglichen Kreuzungen im Sinne der Expansionsbedürftigkeit des Tones."

[8] Schenker, *Free Composition*, trans. and ed. Ernst Oster (New York: Longman, 1979; rpt., Hillsdale, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 2001), §§102–103 and Fig. 28.

(♭VI) to the tonic, provides consonant support to the altered *Kopfton* e♭^{2} (♭$\hat{3}$) in Section B (bars 17–32). As in Op. 17/3, the reprise in Op. 33/3 regains the *Kopfton* at the onset of Section A_2, correcting e♭^{2} to e♮^{2} at bar 33. Note that in both mazurkas, the lowered *Kopfton* does not function as a neighbor to the diatonic $\hat{3}$ since these are only different forms of the same scale degree. The abrupt change from the flats to the sharps or vice versa between the outer and middle sections of both mazurkas effects the contrast inherent in the ternary form.

Chopin frequently employs mixture of $\hat{3}$ in the *Urlinie* of his minor-mode compositions as well, as in the Polonaise in C♯ Minor, Op. 26/1, and the Fantaisie-Impromptu, Op. 66, both of which have a middle section enharmonically spelled as D♭ in the foreground. A ternary form based on mixture does not necessarily entail mixture in the fundamental line, however, as the Mazurka in A Minor, Op. 17/4, features mixture in the middleground linear progressions from $\hat{5}$ in the contrasting sections. A synopsis of these works is given in Example 3-2c.[9]

Phrygian $\hat{2}$

Though not strictly a result of modal mixture, the Phrygian $\hat{2}$ and the associated Neapolitan chord (♭II) are also regarded by Schenker as an expansion of a diatonic system. The lowered $\hat{2}$ makes possible a major triad, which replaces the diatonic diminished supertonic triad in the minor mode where motivic repetitions often lie

[9] My reading of Op. 17/4 is based on David Beach's analysis in "Chopin's Mazurka, Op. 17, No. 4," *Theory and Practice* 2/3 (1977): 12–16. Op. 66 is discussed in detail by Ernst Oster in "The *Fantaisie-Impromptu*: A Tribute to Beethoven," in *Aspects of Schenkerian Theory*, ed. David Beach (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 189–207.

uncomfortably.[10] Schenker discusses this idea in §50 of *Harmony* and later in §§104–105 and 194–195 of *Free Composition*. In *Free Composition*, Schenker's models in Figs. 31b and 74,1 show how the Phrygian $\hat{2}$ is rectified, sometimes only implicitly, by the diatonic $\hat{2}$ over the structural dominant (Example 3-3). He further illustrates this concept in his analyses of Chopin's Mazurka in B Minor, Op. 33/4 in Fig. 74,2 of *Free Composition* (Example 3-4a), the "Revolutionary" Etude, Op. 10/12 (Example 2-2 from Chapter 2),[11] and the Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 30/4 in Fig. 53,3 of *Free Composition* (Example 3-4b). The Phrygian $\hat{2}$ can also appear after the diatonic $\hat{2}$ has been established. The Mazurka in E Minor, Op. 41/1 is an excellent example of such writing, and Schenker makes a special point in Fig. 75 of *Free Composition* that in this case the Phrygian $\hat{2}$ ($f♮^1$) remains without being corrected by the diatonic $\hat{2}$ (Example 2-7c from Chapter 2).[12]

A most striking use of the Phrygian II appears in the Mazurka in C Major, Op. 24/2, where the music plunges into the remote key of D♭ major in Section C (bars 57–85) despite C major having been strongly established as the tonic without a single chromatic note (Example 3-5). The Neapolitan chord becomes the local tonic of the entire section. The *Kopfton* e^2 ($\hat{3}$) was earlier prolonged through its upper neighbor, supported by the subdominant harmony in Section B (bars 21–36), then the Neapolitan chord supports that same upper neighbor in Section C, effectively contrasting the "black key" music with the earlier "white key" ones of Sections A_1 and B while drawing these contrasting sections

---

[10] Schenker, *Harmony*, 110. Schenker's term for this effect is "Unbequemlichkeit"; see *Harmonielehre*, 144.
[11] Schenker, "F. Chopin: Etude in C Minor, Op. 10, No. 12," in *Five Graphic Music Analyses* (New York: Dover, 1969), 53–61; Schenker, *Free Composition*, Figs. 73,1, 114,10, and 119,14.
[12] I discussed this aspect of Op. 41/1 in Chapter 2.

into a subtle relationship through the composing-out of the same upper neighbor.[13] From a harmonic standpoint, the Phrygian II fulfills its pre-dominant function indirectly in this case, continuing to the dominant that occurs well after Section A_2 has begun.

For Schenker, such cases of the Phrygian $\hat{2}$ result not from a change to the old church modes but from a temporary modal borrowing. Thus, the original expanded diatonic system stays intact despite the inclusion of the inflected $\hat{2}$, $\hat{3}$, $\hat{6}$, and $\hat{7}$.

Tonicization vs. Modulation

I explained above that both mixture and the Neapolitan chord are part of Schenker's expanded diatonic system; therefore, they are not recognized as chromatic elements. One might ponder what constitutes chromaticism for Schenker if a switch from major to minor or Phrygian modes does not qualify as a chromatic event. In Schenker's early writing, the answer would be *tonicization* (*Tonikalisierung*), which spans §§136–162 of *Harmony*. Schenker opens the discussion of chromaticism saying:

> Not only at the beginning of a composition but also in the midst of it, each scale-step manifests an irresistible urge to attain the value of the tonic for itself as that of the strongest scale-step. If the composer yields to this urge of the scale-step within the diatonic system of which this scale-step forms part, I call this process *tonicization* and the phenomenon itself *chromatic*.[14]

---

[13] Because of the use of Aeolian and Lydian modes, Sections A_1, B, and A_2 use only the white keys. Chapter 4 will discuss the modal aspect of this mazurka in further detail.

[14] Schenker, *Harmony*, 256, translation slightly modified. In *Harmonielehre*, 337, Schenker says "Nicht nur aber am Anfang des Stückes, sondern auch mitten im Verlaufe desselben bekundet jede Stufe einen unwiderstehlichen Drang, sich den Wert der Tonika als der stärksten Stufe zu erobern. Wenn nun diesem Drange der Diatonie, der die Stufe angehört, wirklich stattgegeben wird, so bezeichne ich den Prozeß als *Tonikalisierung* und die Erscheinung selbst als *Chromatik*."

Schenker classifies tonicization into direct and indirect types, neither of which signifies a departure from the overall tonic. The former refers to a brief local chromatic event in which the diatonic counterpart immediately rectifies the altered note. The latter occurs more frequently and involves the alteration of more than one scale step, such as the use of a secondary dominant prior to the tonicized scale step.[15]

In *Harmony*, Schenker distinguishes tonicization from *modulation*, which involves a change of key so complete and independent that "the original key does not return."[16] Schenker distinguishes three types of modulation in §§172–180 of the treatise: 1) modulation by changing the meaning of a harmony, that is, modulating via a common chord that functions differently in the original and the new keys; 2) modulation by chromatic change, in other words, situations where a chord is altered in the process of modulation to function only in the new key; and 3) modulation by enharmonic change, in which the enharmonically spelled chord signals a change of key so drastic that the original and the new keys share no harmonic relation. Owing to its dramatic nature, enharmonic modulation has a special capacity to surprise the listener, who would rarely expect such an occurrence. It is not to be confused with the enharmonic writing composers used for notational convenience.[17]

Despite the important role tonicization and modulation have in the discussion of chromaticism in *Harmony*, Schenker avoids both terms in his late work, his critical attitude toward genuine key change or modulation leading easily to a perception that he

---

[15] Ibid., 256–272.
[16] Ibid., 321.
[17] Ibid., 322–334.

rejects such concepts entirely in his strictly monotonal mature theory.[18] Near the beginning of *Free Composition*, for example, he writes:

> But the most baneful error of conventional theory is its recourse to "keys" when, in its lack of acquaintance with [background] and middleground, it finds no other means of explanation. . . . Nothing is as indicative of the state of theory and analysis as this absurd abundance of "keys." The concept of the "key" as a higher unity in the foreground is completely foreign to [conventional] theory: it is even capable of designating a single unprolonged chord as a key.[19]

In statements like this, Schenker wants to stress that temporary new keys participate in the composing-out of harmonies and therefore unify events of the foreground. Indeed, he is fully aware of possible changes of tonal center or key within a prolonged harmony where the tonicized chord would eventually resolve to the home tonic. But key succession for Schenker comes to mean essentially a large-scale written-out chord progression where secondary keys are not self-contained entities; rather, their tonics are scale degrees, or, *Stufen*, within the whole piece. Revising the view taken in his earlier writings, Schenker ultimately refers to all foreground keys as "illusory keys" in *Free Composition*;[20] as a result, he simplifies the subject of modulation by not differentiating between local tonicization and large-scale modulation.

Even with this limitation in Schenker's late work, Patrick McCreless deems Schenker's theory of chromaticism superior on the whole to other nineteenth- and twentieth-century theories:

---

[18] Carl Schachter, "Analysis by Key: Another Look at Modulation," *Music Analy*sis 6/3 (1987): 289.
[19] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 8. Carl Schachter corrects the apparent misprint, ". . . in its lack of acquaintance with foreground and middleground [to] . . . background and middleground." See Schachter, "Analysis by Key," 315 n1.
[20] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 11.

> His [Schenker's] system establishes a background—both in the general sense, and in the specific sense of his concept of the *Ursatz*—in terms of which all chromatic motion can be heard and explained. Rather than hearing tonicizations of chromatic elements merely as distant modulations, somehow "expressive" or "programmatic," but strangely detached and separated from the diatonic underpinnings of a piece, he subsumes all chromatic motion into an ultimate diatonic structure. The analytical power of such a point of view is clear, since the seemingly random and unmotivated modulations described by earlier theorists can now be heard as all directed toward a single goal and controlled by a single principle. Furthermore, Schenker shows that chromatic tonicizations often arise from the expansion of linear motives, thereby demonstrating that they participate in the coherence of tonal masterworks not only through their integration into linear-harmonic structure, but also through the unifying force of motivic cross-reference.[21]

Chromatic and Enharmonic Play

Having surveyed Schenker's views on the diatonic system and chromaticism in *Harmony* and *Free Composition*, I now attend to a foreground event that often takes on motivic significance, namely the chromatic and enharmonic play between two scale steps. In *Free Composition*, Schenker touches upon this idea in his discussion of foreground motivic repetition. In Fig. 119,7 of *Free Composition* (Example 3-6a), for instance, his analysis of the first movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata in E♭ Major, Op. 81a reveals that

> $g♭^2$ and g^2 are engaged in a struggle with one another—only two single tones, certainly not a motivic repetition in the usual sense. And yet the synthesis of the entire movement circles around this conflict.[22]

In a separate paragraph on foreground chromatic tones, he provides another example by Beethoven that illustrates the conflict between two chromatically inflected scale steps. In the brief tonicization of A♭ major in the third movement of the Violin

---

[21] Patrick McCreless, "Schenker and Chromatic Tonicization: A Reappraisal," in *Schenker Studies*, ed. Hedi Siegel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 125.
[22] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 100 and Fig. 119,7.

Concerto, Op. 61, he comments on the e♭^{2}-d♯^{2} exchange, as illustrated in Fig. 114,7 of *Free Composition* (Example 3-6b):

> Occasionally an enharmonic tone can introduce a chromatic change. The insertion of an enharmonic situation provides opportunity for a small but beautiful prolongation.[23]

In addition, Schenker notes that enharmonic restatement can enhance an organic relation between the foreground voice-leading events. In yet another passage by Beethoven, from the fourth movement of the Piano Sonata in E♭ Major, Op. 7, he notes in *Free Composition*, Fig. 121,2 (Example 3-6c) the tension created by the motivic parallelism between bars 62–64 and their return, starting at bar 154:

> b^2, originally a passing tone, provides an opportunity for a dreamlike digression into E major, through which sounds the beginning of the Rondo. The contradiction of the initial tonality by this enharmonic interpolation creates a very special feeling of suspense. It is like an awakening when, in measure 161, the composer suddenly—at the ***ffp***—transforms g♯^{1} back into a♭^{1} (a♭^{2}) and then ends in the main tonality.[24]

Examples of the chromatic and enharmonic shifts between two scale steps abound in Chopin's works. In his detailed analysis of the "Revolutionary" Etude, Op. 10/12, which I discussed in Chapter 2, Schenker highlights chromatic conflicts in the A♭-A♮, C♭-C♮, and D♭-D♮ pairs with a "♭-♮" marking in the foreground graph, along with the F♯-G♭ conflict in an inner voice (Example 2-2 from Chapter 2).[25] In his article on the Prelude in D Major, Op. 28/5, Carl Schachter shows a similar kind of conflict, here between B♭ and B♮; originating in the four-bar introduction, this conflict resolves

---

[23] Ibid., 92 and Fig. 114,7.
[24] Ibid., 101 and Fig. 121,2.
[25] Schenker, "F. Chopin: Etude in C Minor," 54–55.

temporarily in favor of B♮ when B♭ turns into A♯ and leads to B♮ at bar 5, although B♭ eventually prevails as it returns at bar 29 and replaces B♮ altogether (Example 3-7a).[26]

In his article on Chopin's Polonaise-Fantasy, Op. 61, William Rothstein explains how the B-major middle section, the enharmonic minor mediant (♭III$^{♭5}$) relates to the three-part formal plan in which A♭ major is the home tonic (Example 3-7b).[27] The opening bar foretells this enharmonic relation with its emphasis on C♭ (♭$\hat{3}$).[28] The pervasive use of ♭$\hat{3}$ instead of ♮$\hat{3}$ suggests the important role of modal mixture in the piece, as Rothstein notes:

> The long stability of "B major," and the audibly transitional function of C♮ in m. 215, indicate that it is C♭ and not C♮ that represents the third scale degree. This enharmonic transformation of B♮ into C♭, *across* structural levels, is part of the piece's deep-seated mystery.[29]

As Rothstein's interpretation demonstrates, enharmonic play can occur at an early structural level. Adding to his discussion, Rothstein also outlines two pairs of enharmonic motives presented at the beginning of the Polonaise-Fantasy, namely F♭-E♮ and C♭-B♮. F♭ and C♭, the initiating tones of these two motives, stem from mixture and therefore further reinforce mixture as the governing compositional idea behind the piece.[30]

---

[26] Carl Schachter, "Chopin Prelude in D Major, Op. 28, No. 5: Analysis and Performance," *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy* 8 (1994): 39–41. Example 3-7a is taken from Schachter's Example 2 on p. 34.
[27] William Rothstein, "The Form of Chopin's Polonaise-Fantasy," in *Music Theory in Concept and Practice*, ed. James Baker, David Beach, Jonathan Bernard (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1997), 352, Example 3. Example 3-7b reproduces Rothstein's analysis.
[28] Ibid., 339.
[29] Ibid., 346.
[30] Ibid., 355–358.

My own analysis of the mazurkas has revealed the prevalence of chromatic and enharmonic play elsewhere in Chopin's music. In the tonally ambiguous Mazurka Op. 30/2, Chopin juxtaposes G♮ and G♯ between the B-minor Section A_1 (bars 1–16) and the F♯-minor Section B_1 (bars 17–32) as well as in the A-major music in Section C (bars 33–48) (Example 3-8). This conflict first appears in the opening four bars of the piece where the contrast between the major and minor dominant is introduced. Since the mazurka ends with Section B_2 (bars 49–56), a restatement of Section B_1, G♯ prevails.[31]

In the Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 30/4, an F𝄪-F♯ conflict is heard at the first two bars of the four-bar introduction (Example 2-9b from Chapter 2). In Section A_1 (bars 5–32), F♯ acts as the upper neighbor to the *Kopfton*, harmonized mainly by the dominant seventh or the Neapolitan sixth chords while F𝄪 remains latent.[32] When the chromatic clash returns in Sections B (bars 33–64) and C (bars 65–96), F♯ still maintains a higher structural status since F𝄪 is merely a foreground lower neighbor to G♯. The introduction's return in bars 97–100 restates the F𝄪-F♯ play before G♮ has the final word at bar 128 where the expansion of the reprise (bars 101–139) begins. The enharmonic conflict in these two mazurkas therefore has different roots: in Op. 30/2, it arises from the tonal contrast between different keys; in Op. 30/4, it assumes a melodic origin in the folk tradition where raised $\hat{4}$ is common in the mazurka genre.

Aside from the voice-leading events discussed above, it is not uncommon to find a cross relation when the dominant harmony is prolonged by different forms of its upper third. In §248 of *Free Composition*, Schenker notes in Fig. 113,3a–c that such writing

---

[31] I will discuss tonal ambiguity in Op. 30/2 in Chapter 4.
[32] The various ways of harmonizing F♯ were discussed earlier, in Chapter 2.

creates a chromatic conflict between the leading tone and the subtonic, as in Chopin's Polonaise in C♯ Minor, Op. 26/1 (Example 3-9). Besides expanding the dominant by separating two statements of that harmony, the VII or ♭VII chord can also unfold the dominant by appearing prior to it. This concept is explained in the discussion of the VII-V progression in §246 of *Free Composition* where Schenker, in Fig. 111a, shows various forms of the descending VII-V model, citing examples from Chopin's Bolero, Op. 19 and Etude in E Minor, Op. 25/5 in Figs. 111a2 and 111b2 (Example 3-10).

Two mazurkas I studied further demonstrate this chromatic play between the dominant and its upper third. In the Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 30/4, the entire Section C (bars 65–94) establishes and prolongs B major as the local tonic (Example 2-9b from Chapter 2). This subtonic harmony, nested between a minor dominant and a dominant seventh chord, brings a B-B♯ shift as it reaches the dominant seventh at bar 99. In the Mazurka in C Minor, Op. 56/3, the subtonic (B♭) again becomes the local tonic, here of a substantial three-part Section B (Example 3-11). The outer parts of this section (bars 73–88 and 121–134) are in B♭ major, supporting d^1 as the local $\hat{3}$ while the middle part (bars 89–121) is in B♭ minor where $d♭^2$ replaces the diatonic $d♮^2$. This results in a contrasting middle section with a darker tone than the outer parts in the major mode. More importantly, the mixture of the two forms of $\hat{3}$ in B♭ introduces the Phrygian $\hat{2}$ of C minor that will provide a source for subsequent elaboration in the coda, which I will discuss in Chapter 7.

Chopin's contrapuntal ingenuity is on full display in leading the composed-out ♭VII to the home dominant in Op. 56/3. Following the restatement of the first part of Section B, a chromatic retransition (bars 134–136) brings back C minor through a series

of foreground ascending tenths that drives toward the dominant seventh chord at bar 136. Section A_2 begins on the dominant at the following bar and immediately reestablishes C minor as the tonic after the extensive B♭ $\frac{\text{major}}{\text{minor}}$ music in Section B. Although the chromatic conflict resulting from the prolongation of the dominant via its upper third might be less discernible than the one appearing on the musical surface, it nonetheless provides a means for another "small but beautiful prolongation."[33]

Analyses

Schachter comments that Schenker's early theory of chromaticism is in some ways superior, for it distinguishes between structural and local keys.[34] For Schachter,

> a reasonably comprehensive and faithful analysis, then, will balance moment-by-moment and global perspectives by showing the connections among foreground tonicizations, large modulations belonging to the middleground, and inclusive background structure. This procedure will be in no way contradictory to the spirit of Schenker's approach, even though it may give more attention to the fluctuations of the foreground than he did, especially in his later writings.[35]

In this spirit, I would like to focus on the chromaticism in four Chopin mazurkas—in B Major, Op. 56/1; in F Minor, Op. 68/4; in C♯ Minor, Op. 41/4; and in A Minor, Op. 59/1—that exemplify Schenker's views on mixture, Phrygian mode, and chromatic and enharmonic play.

---

[33] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 92.
[34] Schachter, "Analysis by Key," 289–290.
[35] Ibid., 315.

Mazurka in B Major, Op. 56/1 (1843)

Aside from being one of Chopin's longest mazurkas, Op. 56/1 showcases one of his most challenging tonal plans by employing different types of mixture, emphasizing the chromatic mediant relations as much as the diatonic ones (Example 3-12a).[36] At the background level, the piece presents a typical tonic-mediant-dominant-tonic progression supporting a third-descent. However, this simple tonal structure is concealed in the foreground via abundant writing involving auxiliary cadences that emphasize G major (♭VI), giving this mazurka a distinctive sound without effacing its monotonal quality.

Example 3-12b shows the voice leading of the opening music. With a non-tonic beginning and a descending sequence, the introduction (bars 1–6) overlaps with Section A_1 (bars 6–44) at bar 6 where the G-major triad (♭VI), the harmonic goal of the sequence attained through simple mixture, supports d♮^{2}, the lowered *Kopfton* that anticipates the diatonic d♯^{2} at bar 16 where the tonic finally arrives.[37] The G-major music not only provides a mixture of $\hat{3}$ where the lowered *Kopfton* appears *prior to* the real one, it also establishes a chromatic interplay on the neighbor motive where D♮-E-D♮ in bars 6–8 is replaced by its diatonic form, D♯-E-D♯ at bars 16–18 (Example 3-12c). Despite its apparent role as the "tonic" at the onset of Section A_1, the G-major triad is transformed into an augmented-sixth chord at bar 12 (Example 3-12b). The introduction and the opening bars of Section A_1 therefore feature a chromaticized voice exchange between the opening subdominant harmony and the augmented-sixth chord, which is prepared by the

[36] Kopp writes about the third-related harmonic structure in this mazurka using an approach based on harmonic transformations. See Kopp, *Chromatic Transformations*, 235–240.

[37] The introduction of this mazurka will be discussed further in Chapter 4 under the section on auxiliary progression.

G-major triad, the lowered submediant. As we will see, the first twenty bars already prepare us for the unusual and complex chromatic writing in this mazurka.

To ensure a smooth transition to Section B_1 (bars 45–81), Chopin transforms the tonic triad into an augmented-sixth chord at bar 44 (Example 3-12d), a change similar to that of the G-major triad at bar 12. This time, however, the resolution at bar 48 brings an E♭-major triad, the enharmonic mediant major (III$^{\times}$) achieved via secondary mixture that functions as the local tonic of Section B_1 and provides consonant support to e♭^{2}, the enharmonic *Kopfton*. At this point, it becomes obvious that Chopin is exploring chromatic third relations in this mazurka since both the lowered submediant (G-major triad) and the enharmonic major mediant (E♭-major triad) are given prominent harmonic emphasis. Melodically, Section B_1 also alludes to Section A_1 as its upper-voice diminution pattern is based entirely upon neighbor notes that draw on the original D♯-E-D♯ motive (Example 3-12c); in particular, that opening motive returns enharmonically as E♭-F♭-E♭ in bars 76–80, anticipating its imminent restatement in Section A_2 (bars 86–102). While the introduction and Section A_1 return in their entirety in bars 81–102, one aspect is worth noting: the arrival of the structural dominant at bar 93 is attained in the deep middleground via a large-scale bass arpeggiation, I-III$^{\times}$-V beginning at bar 16. The return of the introductory music is therefore embedded within a wider progression connecting III$^{\times}$ to V.

Section B_2 (bars 103–143), a slightly modified transposition of Section B_1, follows at bar 103 with G major as the local tonic (Example 3-12d). The lowered submediant, no longer foreign to our ears at this point, again supports the altered *Kopfton* d♮^{1} and embellishes it as before with its upper neighbor. Set in a different key, Section B_2 also

presents a different route in the bass: while Section B_1 moves *down* a fifth to A♭ major, Section B_2 moves *up* a fifth to D major, the dominant of the G-major triad at the beginning of Section A_3 (bars 148–162). Therefore, the return of G major on a significant scale not only recalls the beginning section of the piece but also enables a seamless transition to the final reprise at bar 148 via a large-scale prolongation of the lowered submediant harmony. Although Sections B_1 and B_2 are in different keys, the latter ends with a series of chromatic descending $\frac{6}{3}$ chords in bars 135–142 that brings back enharmonically bars 77–80 of the former section. The mirror symmetry of the two chromatic mediants around the tonic, emphasized by Kopp's transformational approach, can therefore be explained also through voice-leading continuities, as well as the chromatic and enharmonic play on the D♯-E-D♯ neighbor motive, these being key to the tonal and formal schemes of this mazurka.

The coda that completes Op. 56/1 addresses previous chromaticism in a way characteristic of Chopin's codas, by reassessing the previous chromatic relationships and bringing them into contact with diatonic harmonies in the home key. I will address this closing section of the mazurka in Chapter 7, where this tendency in Chopin's endings is considered in the context of Chopin's codas generally.

Mazurka in F Minor, Op. 68/4 (1849)

Once known as the "Dernière Pensée" and thought to be Chopin's last work in the genre,[38] Op. 68/4 is packed with dense foreground chromaticism from the outset,

[38] The mazurka exists only as an almost illegible manuscript in a single leaf now in the collection of the Chopin Society in Warsaw. Published by Julian Fontana in 1855, it is one of a few pieces Chopin wrote at his last piano, Pleyel No. 14810. Numerous attempts to reconstruct the entire piece have been made, including the ones by Jan Ekier (1965),

producing an initial sequence of chromatic linear chords that nonetheless move, at least initially, among members of the governing F-minor tonic. The section to be discussed here, A_1 (bars 1–23), has an antecedent-expanded consequent construction of the kind favored by Chopin in other genres, with the antecedent in this case establishing F minor as the tonic (Example 3-13). A chromatic descending bass supports a series of parallel tenths in the outer voices with inner-voice suspensions, the beginning on I^6 causing a strong downward pull in the bass. Rather than culminating in a tonic, the bass descends toward the dominant at bar 7 that resolves to the tonic on a perfect authentic cadence in the ensuing bar. The composed-out tonic triad in the bass in bars 1–8, along with the fifth-descent in the upper voice, confirm the F-minor tonality and the F-minor triad as the frame within which the chromaticism operates.[39]

The expanded consequent restates the first four bars of the antecedent but provides immediate root-position tonic support to the *Kopfton*. At bar 13, however, Chopin extends the chain of 7–6 suspensions one step further to include f♭ in the bass.

Wojciech Nowik, and Ronald Smith (1975), but none is entirely successful, leaving us with the version best known today as the one published by Fontana. It is widely assumed that the mazurka survives only as a sketch owing to Chopin's deteriorating health in 1848–1849. Based on several letters written by Chopin in his final year and the paper type used by the composer, Jeffrey Kallberg claims that Chopin wrote this piece at an earlier date, probably in 1845–1846. He also proposes that the mazurka might be related to the Mazurka in F Minor, Op. 63/2, with which it shares tonal and thematic features. See Kallberg, "Chopin's Last Style," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 38/2 (1985): 297–315. Jim Samson agrees with Kallberg's proposal that the mazurka was originally intended for Op. 63 but was abandoned in favor of the mazurka in the same key published as the second mazurka in the Op. 63 collection. See Jim Samson, *Chopin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 263.

[39] The opening I^6 chord has an effect similar to that observed by Schachter in the Prelude in E Minor, Op. 28/4, in which the bass seeks its tonic fundamental through a slow descent. See Schachter, "The Triad as Place and Action," *Music Theory Spectrum* 17/2 (1995): 149–169.

A respelling of e𝄫^{1} and a♭^{1} to d♮^{1} and g♯^{1} immediately follows at the resolution, resulting in an applied dominant that slides into A major at bar 15, the chromatic upper mediant of F minor. The A-major triad, brought about by double mixture, provides consonant support to c♯^{2}, the enharmonic upper neighbor of the *Kopfton*, recalling and recasting the primary c^2-d♭^{2}-c^2 neighbor motive that began the piece, the c♯^{2} now decorated with its own motivic upper neighbor d^2. After five bars, the flats regain the F-minor sonority and d♭^{2}, the diatonic upper neighbor of the *Kopfton*, returns at bar 20 over the pre-dominant IV. The fifth-progression begins its descent and concludes Section A_1 on a perfect authentic cadence in F minor at bar 23. Despite the highly chromatic voice-leading events on the musical surface, the tonic status has never been threatened in the mazurka, but the initial surface chromaticism does yield the luminous moment of A major that gives at least a temporary respite from the otherwise unrelieved gloom of the falling chromatic lines elsewhere in the section.[40]

Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 41/4 (1839)

Op. 41/4 differs from the examples discussed above for it has a mixture at $\hat{3}$ in a $\hat{5}$-line and contrasts different forms of the tonic triad as an organizing factor for the entire piece (Example 3-14a). As I will show, this mazurka is a study in contrasts that revolve around the uncertain status of the C♯-major (the tonic major) triad.

[40] Kallberg suggests that the contrast of chromatic and diatonic music in this mazurka creates a lack of continuous overall structure that became popular in the music of Wagner, Liszt, and Verdi. Such advanced tonal writing might have led Chopin to discard the sketch from his Op. 63 set. See Kallberg, "Chopin's Last Style," 314. For an alternative analysis of this opening section, see Felix Salzer, *Structural Hearing: Tonal Coherence in Music*, corrected ed. (New York: Dover, 1961), Example 387.

The mazurka has a two-part Section A_1 (bars 1–32) presenting the basic chromatic elements of the piece—C♯ minor, ♭$\hat{2}$ (d♮), and C♯ major (Example 3-14b). The first part (bars 1–17) announces an eight-bar theme establishing C♯ minor with Phrygian inflections where the emphatic ♭$\hat{2}$ moving upward from $\hat{1}$ to $\hat{3}$ gives the theme its peculiar modal character. After a transposition of the theme to the mediant, the second part (bars 17–32) enters featuring waltz-like music in C♯ major, the parallel mode.

Both forms of the tonic triad support G♯ ($\hat{5}$) as the *Kopfton*, and while temporal and thematic precedence is given to the home key of C♯ minor, the minor mode is undermined in several ways: first, there is no V-I progression establishing C♯ minor since the theme is set against a tonic pedal; second, the music drifts into E major at bar 9, and while it could return to C♯ minor after the dominant harmony at bar 17, it arrives at and stays in C♯ major instead; third, not only does Chopin write the entire second part of Section A_1 in the tonic major, he also gives strong tonal closure in that key through an upper-voice fifth-progression and an authentic cadence. In addition, the *Kopfton* G♯ or its harmonic support is displaced in all three key areas so that the *Kopfton* never gains immediate and direct harmonic support. As if to compensate for a potential tonal instability, Chopin, in a less obvious way, composes out a C♯-minor triad ($c♯^2$-e^2-$g♯^2$) in the cover tones in bars 1–17 before the arrival of the *Kopfton*. Even so, by the end of Section A_1, the music strongly suggests C♯ major as a possible tonic of the piece. Despite its close relationship to C♯ minor, E♯, the raised $\hat{3}$ prominent in the C♯-major theme, results in mixture in the *Urlinie* that brings a feeling of unsettlement, which contrasts with the celebratory mood that accompanies the entrance of the major mode. The basic

conflict of this mazurka has thus been established through the composing-out of the two forms of the tonic triad that differ sharply in form and character.

Section B (bars 33–65) takes the music further away from the home key as the C♯-major triad turns into a dominant seventh chord of F♯ major, a harmony prolonged for a lengthy sixteen bars. The transitional passage in bars 33–48 functions tonally as a kind of prefix to the subdominant major that arrives at bar 49. Rather than becoming the local tonic, however, as might have been expected, the tonicized F♯-major triad becomes the pre-dominant and brings back C♯ major at bar 52. E♯ (♯$\hat{3}$) persists through Section B, which completes another fifth-progression in the tonic major at bar 56. The tonal struggle between the two modes of the tonic therefore remains unresolved. C♯ major, however, appears to be a stronger contender now since it is established by the fifth-progression and the perfect authentic cadence the same way it did in Section A_1; in addition, most of the music up to this point is devoted to this key. Even so, the tendency of C♯ major to move to a subdominant reflects a common progression in C♯ minor. One cannot be sure whether the C♯ harmony is resulting from mixture or from tonicization of F♯.

Having had two ♯$\hat{3}$s in middleground *Urlinie* replicas, it would seem that Chopin has given up C♯ minor. However, a retransition (bars 65–73) immediately corrects the E-sharps, emphasizing E-naturals in a descending-third sequence.[41] The reappearance of E-naturals hints at the return of C♯ minor in Section A_2, while a persistent D♮ brings back the Phrygian quality of the opening theme as well. The expectation of a secure return to C♯ minor is thwarted, however, when Section A_2 (bars 73–139) begins dramatically with

[41] The brief F♯-minor statement at bars 69–71 responds to the tonicized F♯-major passage in Section B as it replaces A-sharps with A-naturals.

a restatement of the opening theme in C♯ *major* even as D-naturals still assert the Phrygian sonority. E-sharps prevail, and the dominance of C♯ major over extensive passages in Section A_2 (bars 73–80 and 89–108) once again undermines C♯ minor.

Just as in Section A_1, the *Kopfton* continues to seek a direct and immediate harmonic support over the tonic in the reprise but fails. When the *Urlinie* starts its final descent at bar 97, Chopin appears to want to end the piece in C♯ major as the climactic $e♯^3$ at bar 102 seems to suggest an imminent final closure. However, the would-be descent of the *Urlinie* turns out to be the beginning of an elaborate expansion (bars 102–139). While it seems that Chopin had overtly denied C♯ minor as the tonic, the expansion turns the situation around as it reestablishes the minor mode at bar 119. C♯ minor finally claims victory triumphantly as it restates the original theme in double octaves, *fortissimo*. The *Urlinie* gains the diatonic $e♮^2$ ($\hat{3}$) at last and continues the final descent in C♯ minor at bar 128.

Although the tonic major is privileged by tonal and temporal significance during the course of Op. 41/4, the tonic minor, the key that begins and ends the piece, ultimately retains its tonic status. However, in a mysterious way, the last sonority of the mazurka presents an open fifth on C♯ where $\hat{5}$ appears as a cover tone, making one ponder whether Chopin, at this final moment, still lets a thought of C♯ major color the final sound of the piece.

Mazurka in A Minor, Op. 59/1 (1845)

Op. 59/1 occupies a unique place in the genre as Section A_2 (bars 79–130) begins a half step below the tonic, in G♯ minor (♯VII), making it the only piece in the collection with

a "false" reprise in such a remote key. Before explaining how Chopin gets back to the home key of A minor that is a half step away, I would like to trace how G♯ is laid out in the music to make it an appropriate key for the opening of the reprise. As we will see, the key to understanding this unusual tonal plan lies in the emphasis Chopin puts on the enharmonic and chromatic play between G♯-A♭ and G♯-G♮, respectively.

To explain Chopin's choice of G♯ minor as the key for the reprise, Joel Lester notes that in bars 124–127, the repetitive arpeggiation of the G♯-minor triad, marked in asterisks in Example 3-15a, makes clear this harmony is part of the downward movement toward the dominant. Lester also points out that when this G♯-minor triad first appears in bar 26 where the opening music returns in the last section of the three-part Section A_1 (bars 25–36) (Example 3-15b), its subtleness raises no anticipation that Chopin might later begin the reprise a half step lower than it should be.[42] Lester, however, does not recognize the long-range aspect of the arpeggiated G♯-minor triad across Section C (bars 57–78) and the reprise: the enlargement of B-G♯-E is made possible by the "false" return of the opening music in G♯ minor (♯VII), which takes part in the composing-out of the dominant in bars 57–103 (Example 3-15c).

While I agree with Lester's observation, I would propose that Chopin starts emphasizing the half-step relation as early as bars 4–5 (Example 3-15d). There, A♭ makes its first appearance in the bass, falling to G just as expected. However, when it comes the second time at bar 15, $a♭^1$ is an enharmonic respelling of $g♯^1$ from the previous

[42] Joel Lester, "Harmonic Complexity and Form in Chopin's Mazurkas," *Ostinato rigore: Revue internationale d'études musicales* 15 (2000): 118.

bar and again resolves down to g♮[1]. The G♯-A♭-G♮ pattern in bars 3–5 and 14–16 also contrasts G♯ with G♮, a chromatic conflict that continues in Sections B and C (bars 37–56 and 57–76) (Example 3-16). G♯ dominates in Section B since A major ($I^{\sharp}$) is the local key. However, G♮ returns at bar 56 where the half cadence in the tonic major turns into an E-minor chord via a G♯-G♮ chromatic shift that marks the end of an auxiliary progression in E minor, the *minor* dominant. G♮ and E minor remain throughout Section C until the last restatement of the four-bar theme (bars 69–78), an expanded phrase that respells G♮ as F𝄪 at bar 76, allowing G♯ to reemerge at bar 79. As I discuss below, the unfolding of the *major* dominant triad begins, passing through the "false" reprise and returning to the dominant at bar 103.

We might consider the enharmonic play between the leading tone (G♯) and its chromatic counterpart A♭ near the beginning of the piece as seeds that Chopin plants to prepare what will later become the most significant chromatic idea in this mazurka, that the return of the opening music will occur a half step too low in the reprise. G♯, rather than A♭, is chosen as the key to begin the reprise since its upward resolution will bring us the tonic, the desired key that ultimately arrives at bar 103. Despite its harmonic remoteness, G♯ minor is a most ingenious choice to begin the reprise for it highlights the primary chromatic motive in this mazurka,[43] the G♯-A♭ enharmonic play, in a way that no other means could have achieved.

How exactly does Chopin get back to the home key that is a half step away? Example 3-16 shows my analysis of the entire piece. Following the completion of a fifth-

[43] Another principal motivic idea, namely, the chromatic scale fragment, remains latent throughout most of the piece but makes an outburst in Section C (Example 3-16).

progression in G♯ minor that transposes the opening section's fifth-progression, g♯^{1} at bar 90 is respelled as a♭^{1} in the ensuing bar where the key signature of G♯ minor is cancelled. This respelling recalls bars 14–15 so that the reprise could simply continue from there. But bar 91 is formally analogous to bar 13, not bar 15, so Chopin repeats the two-bar unit of bars 91–92 rather than sequencing it as he had done before, thus effecting a half-step transposition and bringing the mazurka back to the original key of A minor. Example 3-16 traces in full the chromatic progression of bars 91–103. This passage leads into the final section of the reprise (bars 103–130) where the initial theme appears, as before, over the dominant, which resolves to the tonic and regains e^2 at bar 106. At this point, a large-scale third-progression, e^2-(d♯^{2})-d♮^{2}-c^1 spanning bars 49–106 is completed.

Having arrived at $\hat{5}$ and the tonic harmony, the *Urlinie* begins its final descent, only to arrive at an applied diminished-seventh chord at bar 114 that replaces the expected tonic harmony and initiates an expansion toward a strong dominant arrival at bar 123 via an inverted German sixth chord at bar 119. The final appearance of the initial theme in the tenor at bar 123 is supported by a dominant harmony, as in bar 25. When the cadential dominant resolves to the dominant seventh at bar 124, the fleeting juxtaposition of G♯ minor and E major noted by Lester results, as the theme presents an E-major triad linearly but the vertical sonority on the first beat is that of G♯ minor. This VII-V progression is an expression that unfolds the dominant harmony and highlights the significance of G♯ minor in this piece. Only after repeating this idea twice in bars 126–127 is d♯^{1} fully rectified by d♮^{1} over a dominant seventh chord. The tonic harmony supporting a^1 (î) finally arrives at the cadence at bar 130, completing the *Ursatz* and concluding the mazurka in the original key.

Conclusion

Matthew Brown credits Schenker's theory for making chromaticism an indispensable part of the diatonic system:

> According to Schenker, then, chromatic elements are inherent in the tonal system. Through the concepts of mixture (Phrygian II) and tonicization, he managed to construct a comprehensive monotonal theory that not only relates the full range of chromatic elements to the tonic—the prerequisite of any genuine monotonal theory—but allows chromatic events to emerge from the deep level middleground. Since this is at the level at which musical forms emerge, Schenkerian theory also accepts that chromatic phenomena indeed play a vital role in shaping the overall structure of a piece. . . . Indeed, one might even say that Schenker's real contribution to harmonic theory was showing that a fully chromatic theory is necessary not only to account for late nineteenth-century styles but also for understanding the works of the common practice style as well.[44]

Indeed, as we have seen in numerous works by Chopin, Schenker's expanded diatonic system effectively explains the vital role of chromatic notes in shaping the tonal and formal structures of a composition. Together with his insights on tonicization and modulation as well as enharmonic and chromatic play, Schenker succeeds in bringing forward an organic, goal-directed analytical approach that explains what could otherwise seem arbitrary, or at least less highly organized, chromatic motions.

---

[44] Matthew Brown, "The Diatonic and Chromatic in Schenker's Theory of Harmonic Relations," *Journal of Music Theory* 30/1 (1986): 25–27.

Chapter 4

Incompleteness and Tonal Ambiguity

This chapter considers various kinds of incompleteness and tonal ambiguity that characterize the mazurkas of Chopin. A great many of the mazurkas display one feature or the other, sometimes both. Incompleteness has been studied rather widely in Chopin's music, with well-respected studies of the fragmentary character of some of the Op. 28 Preludes, for example,[1] as well as the tendency of Chopin to employ non-tonic beginnings, which can produce a sense of incompleteness by using what Schenker called incomplete transferences of *Ursatz* forms. Chopin's tendency to design some of his large and ambitious works through directional tonality, beginning a large work in a key that proves not to be the final tonic, has been widely discussed as well, although such works as the Scherzo, Op. 31 and the Fantasy, Op. 49 tend to produce complete *Ursatz* forms, with the initial *Ursatz* interval delayed, sometimes fantastically, by the non-tonic opening music.[2] Nothing quite like these large works appears in the mazurkas, but Chopin

---

[1] Jean-Jacques Eigeldinger, *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher as Seen by His Pupils*, ed. Roy Howat, trans. Krysia Osostowicz and Naomi Shohet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Jeffrey Kallberg, "Small 'Forms': In Defense of the Prelude," in *The Cambridge Companion to Chopin*, ed. Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 124–144.

[2] Kevin Korsyn, "Directional Tonality and Intertextuality: Brahms's Quintet Op. 88 and Chopin's Ballade Op. 38," in *The Second Practice of Nineteenth-Century Tonality*, ed. William Kinderman and Herald Krebs (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996), 45–83; Harald Krebs, "Tonal and Formal Dualism in Chopin's Scherzo, Op. 31," *Music*

frequently begins the mazurkas off the tonic, possibly with an auxiliary cadence, and in two instances to be discussed below, he writes a piece that can arguably be heard as lacking a final tonic.

These two mazurkas, Opp. 7/5 and 30/2, besides raising questions of incompleteness, also raise a larger question to be addressed here, that of tonal ambiguity. Each can be heard in one of two keys, and Chopin skillfully deploys the materials in such a way that two incompatible hearings are defensible. In other mazurkas discussed in this chapter and elsewhere in this dissertation, other kinds of ambiguity, these more localized, operate in ways that organize the overall tonal ideas of the work. In none of these cases are we dealing with a lack of clarity or uncertainty in the possible tonal implications of a particular passage, as my analyses will show; rather, a sensitive listener must contemplate the multiple meanings of a passage and the implication of those meanings for interpreting the piece as a whole.

Incompleteness

Incomplete Opening: Auxiliary Progression

Of the two kinds of incompleteness to be considered here, those that delay or remove the opening tonic are simpler and more common and will be considered first. Whereas studies of endings primarily address how the ending recalls earlier music and whether it satisfies a knowledgeable listener's expectation of where the closure should fall, studies of openings tend to focus on how initial gestures foretell or otherwise affect the character

---

Theory Spectrum 13/1 (1991): 48–60; Carl Schachter, "Chopin's Fantasy, Op. 49: The Two-Key Scheme," in *Chopin Studies*, ed. Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 221–253. All to be discussed below.

of the piece. Non-tonic openings, often expressed by what Schenker calls *auxiliary cadences*, which later authors sometimes term *auxiliary progressions*, are of particular interest here as they raise the possibility of an incomplete opening that can potentially redefine the wholeness of a work by beginning *in medias res*.

Schenker's term "auxiliary cadence" (*Hilfskadenz*) is synonymous with his "incomplete transference of a form of the fundamental structure" (*unvollständinger Übertragung einer Ursatzform*); both refer to a progression that lacks the initial root-position tonic of a conventional *Ursatz*. An auxiliary progression typically involves a dominant-tonic or pre-dominant-dominant-tonic progression, as in Fig. 110a–e of Schenker's *Free Composition*, which I have adapted in Example 4-1. Listeners might experience a sense of tonal disorientation due to the off-tonic opening, but find themselves drawn to the suspense caused by the initial tonal ungroundedness. The progression creates drama and achieves harmonic fluidity as it drives forward toward the tonic, its structural goal.[3]

In his valuable discussion of auxiliary cadences, Poundie Burstein contrasts the different functions and effects of a complete progression with that of an auxiliary progression, saying that

> whereas a complete progression first states the tonic chord and then develops it, an auxiliary cadence first develops the tonic chord and then states it. By announcing the goal harmony at its very beginning,

[3] Heinrich Schenker, *Free Composition*, trans. and ed. Ernst Oster (New York: Longman, 1979; rpt., Hillsdale, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 2001), §244; see also Eric McKee, "Auxiliary Progressions as a Source of Conflict between Tonal Structure and Phrase Structure," *Music Theory Spectrum* 18/1 (1996): 63; William Rothstein, "Rhythmic Displacement and Rhythmic Normalization," in *Trends in Schenkerian Research* (New York: G. Schirmer, 1990), 97–98; and L. Poundie Burstein, "Unraveling Schenker's Concept of the Auxiliary Cadence," *Music Theory Spectrum* 27/2 (2005): 159−162.

> a complete progression establishes a point of stability from its outset, providing a platform for subsequent harmonic elaboration. An auxiliary cadence, on the other hand, starts in a state of harmonic instability that does not resolve until its end to discover the progression's role in the deeper levels of the voice leading.[4]

In what follows I will distinguish between introductory auxiliary progressions, which delay the initial *Ursatz* interval, and structural auxiliary progressions that govern an entire piece. Discussion of a separate kind of situation will follow as I discuss pieces in which it can be difficult to tell whether the overall structure presents an introductory auxiliary progression leading toward a later tonic or whether the piece begins with the true tonic and is simply left incomplete at the ending.

I. Introductory Auxiliary Progression

An introductory auxiliary progression, the most common type of auxiliary progression, uses its non-tonic beginning to prepare a tonic reached in Section A. Chopin's mazurkas often delay or anticipate the initial tonic triad by starting with an introductory auxiliary progression, as in the Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 30/4 that begins with a $\text{II}^{7}_{\sharp}$-V^{7}-I progression (Examples 2-9a and b from Chapter 2). Other cases are more complex. In the Mazurka in A Minor, Op. 17/4, for example, a four-bar introduction begins with an apparent II^{4}_{2} chord (Example 2-3a),[5] and the first unadorned tonic triad does not appear until the arrival of a perfect authentic cadence at bar 20. While one might assume the piece begins with an introductory auxiliary progression, Schenker does not read one here; instead, he suggests that the lowest tone of the opening chord, A, functions as the root of

---

[4] Burstein, "Unraveling Schenker's Concept of the Auxiliary Cadence," 162–163.
[5] The introduction returns at the final bars of the coda, giving the mazurka an incomplete ending on a first-inversion F-major triad that embeds itself within the tonic pedal. Chapter 7 will address the coda in detail.

the tonic triad with its fifth displaced a semitone.[6] One should therefore be cautious, recognizing that a non-tonic opening does not necessarily guarantee the presence of an auxiliary progression. Further examples below, drawn from other Chopin mazurkas, will clarify this concept and its applications in analysis.

Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 6/2 (1830)

As noted in Chapter 2, the *Kopfton* of Op. 6/2, G♯, appears at the outset but above a prolonged dominant harmony, with later rhythmic displacements denying the *Kopfton* its customary direct tonic support throughout the piece (Example 2-5 from Chapter 2). The dominant harmony of the introduction resolves to the tonic at the onset of Section A_1, completing a simple, straightforward introductory auxiliary progression.

Mazurka in C Major, Op. 7/5 (1830/31)

In Op. 7/5, the four-bar introduction's bare G octaves pose temporary tonal uncertainty, since such an opening could conventionally denote equally a tonic or dominant (Example 4-2). But the uncertainty dissolves as the G pedal becomes the root of the dominant seventh chord at the beginning of Section A_1. The introductory auxiliary progression continues its pull toward the C-major perfect authentic cadence at bar 12 where the *Urlinie* descent is completed, confirming C as the tonic. As I note below, however, the initial ambiguity surrounding the opening G continues to affect the piece.

[6] Schenker*, Free Composition*, 65–66 and Fig. 63,2.

Mazurka in B Major, Op. 56/1 (1843)

Op. 56/1 presents a more elaborate form of the introductory auxiliary progression, as shown in the middleground graph of Example 3-12b from Chapter 3. As the tonally mobile opening 10-5 sequence reaches its harmonic goal at bar 6 where the introduction overlaps with Section A, G major (♭VI) appears to be the tonic as it is prolonged by a pedal point until bar 12. Its tonal reign remains unquestioned until bar 12 where the "tonic" triad is transformed into a German augmented-sixth chord that resolves to the dominant of the true tonic, B major, which arrives at bar 16 over the perfect authentic cadence. G major, therefore, is heard in retrospect as a preparation for the augmented-sixth chord, itself a chromaticized form of the opening subdominant reached through voice exchange. As noted in Chapter 3, this auxiliary progression returns with different meanings twice more in the subsequent course of this complex, chromatic piece.

Mazurka in F Minor, Op. 7/3 (1830/31)

The introduction and each of the four formal sections A_1BCA_2 of Op. 7/3 are preceded by their own introductory auxiliary progressions that vary in length and complexity (Example 4-3). The eight-bar introduction presents C-D♭-C, a crucial motive for this piece that will recur in the top voice in a variety of contexts throughout the mazurka. The dominant harmony of the introduction resolves to the tonic at the opening of Section A_1 (bars 9–24), which prolongs c^2 as the *Kopfton*. Section B (bars 25–40) transforms the dominant triad at the conclusion of the tonally open Section A_1 into an applied dominant seventh chord, producing another auxiliary progression in A♭ major (III), the local key of the section. Section C (bars 41–72) presents yet another auxiliary progression, a brief one

in D♭ major (VI). In what follows, this submediant harmony functions as the upper neighbor to the structural dominant at bar 75; it also supports $d♭^2$, the upper neighbor to the structural $\hat{5}$ that substitutes for a missing *Urlinie* tone, $\hat{4}$.[7] Passing over $\hat{4}$, a fourth-descent in the upper voice leads $d♭^2$ to $a♭^1$ ($\hat{3}$) at bar 62, still supported by D♭, the local tonic. The D♭-major passage gives way to the dominant at the retransition (bars 73–76) where the *Urlinie* continues its descent to g^1 ($\hat{2}$), leading to a structural interruption at the end of Section C.

Characteristically for the mazurkas, the original introduction returns as a prefix to Section A_2 (bars 85–105), but now with its context changed. Coming from a well-prepared dominant, the introduction is heard with a clearer emphasis on that harmony than when the introduction began the piece. The reprise continues from there, restating the opening section but introducing a new passage over a tonic pedal at bars 99–105 to close the piece. A plagal sonority in bars 104–105 not only summarizes those in bars 9–12, 17–20, 42–44, and 50–52 but also concludes the piece with a c-d♭-c neighbor motive that originated in the eight-bar introduction. The definitive upper-voice descent from $\hat{5}$, covered by the neighbor motive and set over a tonic pedal, succeeds in bringing melodic closure; however, the lack of a bass arpeggiation supporting this upper-voice fifth-descent leaves the piece without a conventional *Ursatz*, rendering it incomplete at its conclusion.[8] This kind of incompleteness at the ending begins to approach the types of unusual structure to be discussed later in this chapter.

---

[7] In the foreground, although one could read a linear neighbor chord supporting $\hat{4}$ at bar 58, harmonic support for $\hat{4}$ would still be absent in the background.

[8] John Rink's analysis of this mazurka differs from mine. He reads a $\hat{3}$-line and does not recognize the arrival of D♭ major (VI) at bar 42, the local key of the extensive Section C.

II. Structural Auxiliary Progression

Structural auxiliary progression lies at the opposite end of the spectrum of auxiliary progression. Unlike the introductory auxiliary progression, which varies in length and harmonic complexity as we have seen, a structural auxiliary progression unfolds over an entire piece; that is, the tonic, the progression's harmonic goal, does not arrive until the end. Owing to the prolonged tonic deferral, such a progression brings enormous tension and drama to a piece and enables tonal forces to draw the music toward the initial, yet final tonic in one single breath. Structural auxiliary progressions are much rarer than introductory ones, since they produce incomplete *Ursätze*, and they are therefore presumably most appropriate for relatively short pieces as it would be impossible for composers to stretch tonal uncertainty indefinitely.

Chopin's Prelude in A Minor, Op. 28/2 offers a fine example of such progression (Example 4-4); Schenker calls this piece "a true prelude: it represents a fifth-progression over V-I only."[9] Here the structural auxiliary cadence V-I spans the entire composition, in a way that befits its somewhat halting, fragmentary character. But stranger things still can happen in some of Chopin's other works, those that call into question their closure and even their overall keys.

Incomplete Ending

Musical closure has been studied from a wide range of perspectives, with closure considered for such musical parameters as tonal structure, formal design, rhythm, and

---

See Rink, "Tonal Architecture in the Early Music," in *The Cambridge Companion to Chopin*, ed. Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 91–92.

[9] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 89 and Fig. 110,a3. Example 4-4 reproduces Schenker's analysis of the Prelude in A minor, Op. 28/2.

motivic organization. In tonal music, closure has been associated mostly with *tonal* closure. Also named *structural* or *syntactic* closure, tonal closure is marked by a cadence at or near the end of a piece—a cadence, often formulaic, approached in such a way that a listener will recognize that no further music is formally required.

While this conception rightly emphasizes harmonic and melodic completion through a consequential arrival on the tonic pitch in both domains—in Schenkerian terms the completion of the *Ursatz*—it runs the risk of neglecting other elements that often contribute to bringing a piece to a close, such as form, rhythm, motives, and dynamics. In response to the danger of a one-sided approach to the complex subject of closure, theorists such as William Caplin, William Rothstein, Kofi Agawu, and Robert Hatten have studied some secondary aspects of closure, devising such terms as formal closure, metrical closure, rhetorical closure, and dramatic closure, respectively.[10] For these authors, even if the final cadence typically brings the ultimate harmonic and melodic resolution of a piece, it is only one element of closure; other types of completion should be considered to form a comprehensive interpretation of the music's conclusion.

For this study of Chopin's mazurkas, it would be unrealistic to formulate a comprehensive theory of musical closure, and I will focus largely on tonal closure here. But as we will see, even tonal closure may be a more complex phenomenon than usually

---

[10] William E. Caplin, "The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57/1 (2004): 51–117; William Rothstein, "Ambiguity in the Themes of Chopin's First, Second, and Fourth Ballades," *Intégral* 8 (1994): 1–50; Kofi Agawu, "Concepts of Closure and Chopin's Opus 28," *Music Theory Spectrum* 9 (1987): 1–17; and Robert Hatten, "Aspects of Dramatic Closure in Beethoven: A Semiotic Perspective on Music Analysis via Strategies of Dramatic Conflict," *Semiotica* 66/1–3 (1987): 197–209. For a general review on types of closure in tonal music, see Mark Anson-Cartwright, "Concepts of Closure in Tonal Music: A Critical Study," *Theory and Practice* 32 (2007): 1–17.

believed, especially in works like the mazurkas that sometimes present their ideas in ways that are ambiguous or enigmatic.

My approach to closure agrees with that of Patrick McCreless, who proposes that tonal closure is undoubtedly the primary factor in bringing completeness to a tonal piece. Without a formal cadence on a tonic and an *Urlinie* descent to î, "a tonal piece cannot end; whereas a tonal piece *can* end without rhetorical flourish, thematic completion, fulfillment of formal prototype, or proportional balance."[11] This view accords well with Schenker's theory, in which the *Ursatz* completion marks the structural conclusion of a piece; anything that follows is considered a coda, a foreground event, as Schenker explains in *Free Composition*:

> The middleground and background . . . determine the definitive close of a composition. With the arrival of î the work is at an end. Whatever follows this can only be a reinforcement of the close—a coda—no matter what its extent or purpose may be.[12]

Although the completion of the *Ursatz* is typically marked by a cadence, the progression that commonly marks the *end* of a formal unit, be it a phrase, a section, or a piece, does not necessarily create a *stop*, especially when there is a post-cadential passage such as a coda. Leonard Meyer notes the difference between an ending and a closure, suggesting

> completion is not simply cessation—silence. It involves conclusion. Two types of incompleteness can be distinguished: (1) those which arise in the course of the pattern because something was left out or skipped over; (2)

---

[11] Patrick McCreless, "The Hermeneutic Sentence and Other Literary Models for Tonal Closure," *Indiana Theory Review* 12 (1991): 39–40.
[12] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 129.

> those in which the figure, though complete so far as it goes, simply is not felt to have reached a satisfactory conclusion, is not finished.[13]

Agawu seconds Meyer's proposal that a closure may require more than simply an ending. The latter may point to closing phenomena such as coda, codetta, and cadence while the former refers to "the sense of finality, stability, and integrity."[14] An ending, while significant, is therefore only part of a final closure. Emphasizing the special role of harmony in producing closure, Meyer adds that "a feeling of harmonic completeness arises when the music returns to the harmonic base from which it began or moves to one which was in some way implicit in the opening materials."[15]

Chopin's Mazurka in B Minor/F♯ Minor, Op. 30/2 illustrates some of the problems one can encounter in tonal music when a piece ends without seeming to reach closure. This raises the idea of incompleteness as the piece fails to bring a satisfactory conclusion when the opening music and tonality do not return at the end of the piece.

Mazurka in B Minor/F♯ Minor, Op. 30/2 (1836/37)

Besides concluding neither with the opening subject nor with the opening key, Op. 30/2 displays a four-part formal design AB_1CB_2 in a B minor-F♯ minor-A major-F♯ minor tonal plan, further suggesting incompleteness at the ending (Example 4-5a). Although B minor is firmly established as the tonic in Section A (bars 1–16), it never returns; instead, it declines, receding in importance as the music modulates to F♯ minor (V♮) in Section B_1 (bars 17–32), a section which returns and concludes the mazurka. Section C

---

[13] Leonard B. Meyer, *Emotion and Meaning in Music* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), 129–130.
[14] Barbara Herrnstein Smith, *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), viii; cited in Agawu, "Concepts of Closure," 4.
[15] Meyer, *Emotion and Meaning in Music*, 150.

(bars 33–48) summarizes the B minor-F♯ minor conflict in its first two bars, alternating these two harmonies before modulating to A major (♮VII), the upper third of F♯ minor. By this time, F♯ minor already seems to be gaining control over the opening's B minor.[16] While we might expect a return of Section A at bar 49, the music surprises us by restating the F♯-minor passage of Section B_1 in Section B_2, the final section of the mazurka (bars 49–64), which simply ends the piece in the minor dominant. In retrospect, perhaps Chopin hints at the importance of the F♯-minor dominant harmony when he first introduces it at bar 4, answering the dominant seventh in bar 2 with the contrasting minor dominant.

In addition to its unusual form, this piece is unique among the mazurkas in lacking an *Urlinie*. Section A prolongs the *Kopfton* d^2 ($\hat{3}$) over the tonic harmony in a d^2-d^1 coupling. Section B_1 features an $e♯^1$-$e♯^2$ coupling within a 10-8 sequence, with $e♯^2$ functioning as the lower neighbor to $f♯^2$, a cover tone. The music modulates to and ends on a perfect authentic cadence in F♯ minor, the minor dominant, at bar 24 where the upper voice reaches $c♯^2$ ($\hat{2}$). Section C presents a play between the cover tone $f♯^2$ and an inner voice a^1 in F♯ minor and its mediant, A major, with the repeated motivic sixths $f♯^2$-a^1 rooted in the opening section's d^2-$f♯^1$ and b^1-d^1 in bars 1–6. The return of Section B_1 at bar 49 brings back the cover tone $f♯^2$ via the same coupling idea and continues the prolongation of $c♯^2$ until cadencing on F♯ minor at bar 56. With its $\hat{3}$–$\hat{2}$ descent over a tonic-dominant harmonic motion, this mazurka has closure neither of the

[16]Jeffrey Kallberg proposes that F♯ minor is the real tonic; in other words, the piece begins in the subdominant and ends in the tonic. See Kallberg, "Hearing Poland: Chopin and Nationalism," in *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music*, 2nd ed., ed. R. Larry Todd (New York: Routledge, 2004), 234. I will discuss this equally valid reading (Example 4-5b) later in this chapter.

Urlinie nor of the harmony. Reading the piece in F♯ minor, as in my alternative analysis (Example 4-5b), allows a complete tonal closure but requires hearing the piece with an incomplete opening. I will address this interpretation along with Schenker's comment on Op. 30/2 (Example 4-5c) later in this chapter.

Mazurka in C Major, Op. 7/5 (1830/31)

Marked *Dal segno senza Fine*, Op. 7/5 provides an interesting study in formal and tonal structures due to its potential incompleteness (Example 4-2). At the end of Section A_1 (bars 5–12), a complete *Urlinie* replica over a perfect authentic cadence establishes C major as the tonic. Section B (bars 13–20) follows, and is essentially an exact restatement of the opening section in the dominant with the exception of its final two bars. Section A_2 begins as the music returns to bar 5. With no clear indication of closure, the piece is designed as if it could be played infinitely. This seemingly endless design is, however, not entirely atypical of the genre. As Carl Schachter notes, "many Chopin mazurkas reflect the folk origins of the genre through their lack of a strong sense of closure at the end. Mostly these open-ended pieces have in fact achieved a structural cadence and open up only after having done so."[17] Op. 7/5 had indeed concluded its opening section on C major, which would also be the most probable concluding point following the repeat. However, formal ambiguity allows the pianist to end the mazurka

[17] Carl Schachter, "Structure as Foreground: '*Das Drama des Ursatzes*,'" in *Schenker Studies* 2, ed. Carl Schachter and Hedi Siegel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 303.

elsewhere, and perhaps a "fade-out" ending would be possible given the piece's open-ended character.[18]

Both the tonal and formal ambiguities take part in the mazurka's potential endlessness. I would therefore disagree with Robert Morgan's view that the symmetrical tonal-formal scheme, not its harmonic plan, creates the incomplete quality of this mazurka.[19] It is inappropriate to separate harmonic structure from tonal plan, which embodies both melodic and tonal structures.

Tonal Ambiguity

From our discussion of tonal closure we can observe that monotonality or tonal unity is the strongest force underlying tonal completeness. When a piece's tonal scheme deviates from the tradition of monotonality, we might ask: 1) Does the piece exhibit tonal unity? That is, is there a principal tonic, and which one is it? How does the composer establish that tonic's primary status? 2) If, on the other hand, the initial tonic and the closing one seem to share equal importance and either could be primary, how do they interact with

---

[18] According to Joel Lester, Chopin writes a fade-out ending for the peculiar conclusion of the Mazurka in A♭ Major, Op. 41/3. See Joel Lester, "Comment (on '*Quaestionis gratia*', *ITO* 2/10: 35–39)," *In Theory Only* 3/1 (1977): 31. Schachter, however, regards this mazurka as a true "*senza Fine*," for the suppressed final $\hat{2}$–$\hat{1}$ descent denies melodic closure in the incomplete two-bar final phrase that contrasts with the constant four-bar construction. He explains the incompleteness as originating from bars 7–8 where melodic closure is avoided at the first possible place for an A♭-major cadence. The same idea is repeated at bars 15–16, and the absence of a final structural cadence is Chopin's last and strongest attempt in avoiding closure in this piece. See Schachter, "Structure as Foreground," 303–304.

[19] Robert P. Morgan, "Symmetrical Form and Common-Practice Tonality," *Music Theory Spectrum* 20/1 (1998): 45. Morgan suggests that the mazurka allows "unceasing continuation" as it "circles back upon itself symmetrically."

each other? The second of these raises the possibility of tonal ambiguity, as a listener may be faced with two potentially valid but incompatible readings of the same piece.

According to Carl Schachter, ambiguity can almost always be clarified by a true understanding of the motivic treatment, harmonic rhythm, and/or formal structure. He does not go so far as to deny that ambiguity exists in tonal music, but he questions the emphasis many analysts had put on the matter. When we are faced with two or more possible interpretations, Schachter believes that an experienced analyst can distinguish "the truest" reading from those of less artistic value:[20]

> It is just as much a part of the composer's art as it is of the sculptor's or painter's to be able to create clear and distinct shapes; the more clearly and vividly the listener perceives these shapes, the more fully and deeply will he live the life of the composition as he hears it.[21]

I would agree with Schachter that faced with alternative readings, questions about the best analysis are often possible to answer; but sometimes we find answers harder to come by, especially when dealing with tonal pieces that depart from monotonal practice but do not provide us with obvious clues as to whether they exhibit tonal unity or not. As a result, we are left to face the tonal ambiguity inherent in these pieces as more than one valid analytical interpretation is possible. In my view, while one might be able to analyze a tonally ambiguous piece in a single tonic, a comprehensive reading should show the ambiguous nature of the tonal structure that the composer casts upon the piece to lend it a unique character.[22]

---

[20] Carl Schachter, "Either/Or," in *Unfoldings: Essays in Schenkerian Theory and Analysis*, ed. Joseph N. Straus (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 122.
[21] Ibid., 124.
[22] This view is shared by Harald Krebs; see Krebs, "Alternatives to Monotonality in Early Nineteenth-Century Music," *Journal of Music Theory* 25/1 (1981): 16 n4.

The ambiguous meaning of such a piece owes its openness to more than one appropriate or valid interpretation. One possibility raised by Meyer involves the psychological uncertainty caused by a lack of clarity or regularity. Meyer refers to tonal uncertainty as a failure in fulfilling the listener's expectations:

> Ambiguity arises either because the harmonic progressions involved in a passage are so consistently irregular and unexpected that the listener begins to doubt the relevance and efficacy of his own expectations or because the shapes of the sound terms are so weak and uniform that there is only a minimal basis for expectation. The feeling is one of suspense and ambiguity.[23]

But in Chopin's music, such is rarely the case, and when a piece may seem tonally ambiguous, for instance, by beginning in one key but ending in another, we can usually conclude that one of the keys proves to be tonally subordinate to the other.

It might be tempting to conclude that pieces that seem tonally incomplete, say, by ending on an unexpected harmony, are therefore ambiguous. But that is not always the case. Drawing a distinction between tonal incompleteness and tonal ambiguity in his discussion of the second movement of Brahms's String Quintet Op. 88, Kevin Korsyn suggests that "by ending on a triad other than the tonic, the piece will seem tonally incomplete, but it does not become tonally ambiguous."[24] In other words, a tonally incomplete piece may still exhibit monotonality or its potential interpretations may be entirely clear, while a tonally ambiguous piece leaves us to contemplate meanings that may be valid but incompatible. It is these situations that the remainder of this chapter will address.

---

[23] Meyer, *Emotion and Meaning in Music*, 51.
[24] Kevin Korsyn, "Directional Tonality and Intertextuality," 83 n60. The second movement of Brahms's String Quintet Op. 88 will be discussed later in this chapter.

Momentary Tonal Ambiguity

A fascinating aspect of Chopin's music is that it is not always straightforward: "Chopin's art is often one of suggestion and allusion rather than straightforward statement, not least in his treatment of tonality."[25] And as Edward T. Cone observed, Chopin's ways of writing also tolerate a degree of harmonic ambiguity, although this is not necessarily based on tonal instability, nor need it occupy extensive passages; instead, the composer typically sets a brief passage within a stable key to suggest alternative tonal interpretations.[26] In other words, tonal ambiguity may be frequent but only temporary in Chopin's music, as the tonality will be clarified by later music. We will begin with these more localized kinds of ambiguity before turning to some more problematic cases.

Mazurka in E Minor, Op. 41/1 (1838)

Chopin presents us with two perfect authentic cadences in the opening four bars of Op. 41/1 (Example 2-7a from Chapter 2). To which should we give precedence? Is it the first one in A minor or the second in E minor? The bass's fifth-related e-A creates a short-term ambiguity that leads to a brief suspense and a forward momentum for resolution, which comes when the following four bars answer bars 1–4 and come to rest on E minor. Despite acknowledging E minor as the tonic and A minor as the subdominant, the F♮ in the Phrygian mode still asserts the A-minor quality that casts a shadow over the tonality at the outset.

---

[25] Carl Schachter, Review of *The Music of Chopin* by Jim Samson and *The Music of Brahms* by Michael Musgrave, *Music Analysis* 8/1–2 (1989): 190.
[26] Edward T. Cone, "Ambiguity and Reinterpretation in Chopin," in *Chopin Studies* 2, ed. John Rink and Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 144.

Although the opening eight bars announce two fifth-descents (b^1-e^1) in E minor, neither has sufficient harmonic support to be considered a genuine linear progression. Not only does b^1 lack tonic support but also g^1 fails to gain consonant harmonic support, appearing only as a neighbor at bar 3 and in unison at bar 7. Thus, the authority of E minor is further weakened. Cone believes that "the tonal ambivalence of the Mazurka is fundamental to its meaning."[27] Tonal instability is not a factor here, since the piece is set in E minor with Phrygian inflections, but the persistent allusion to A minor, even in the coda, is sufficient to cause the listener to remember the initial ambiguity right until the very end (Example 2-7b from Chapter 2).

Mazurka in C Minor, Op. 56/3 (1843)

It is not uncommon to find Chopin posing a possible threat to the opening tonic in his mazurkas. Besides Op. 41/1 discussed above, Op. 56/3 also illustrates this manner of composing (Example 4-6). The initial four-bar statement roots itself in C minor, and is answered by its extended, transposed version down a fourth, tonicizing G minor despite cadencing on a G-major triad at bar 9. While we are pondering whether C minor or G minor is the tonic, the music continues its circle-of-fifths path toward D minor, a local key in bars 14–22. The ensuing G-major triad resolves as the opening music returns at bar 25; only at this point—in retrospect—do we know for certain that C minor is indeed the tonic when we put all three tonalities into context.

[27] Ibid., 142–143.

Mazurka in C Major, Op. 24/2 (1834/35)

In both Opp. 41/1 and 56/3, although the tonic seems to be established at bar 4 with the conventional metrical cadential emphasis, a secondary, closely related key nonetheless suggests a momentary uncertainty surrounding the piece's tonality. Similarly, Op. 24/2 obscures its tonic by juxtaposing two closely related keys, in this case C major and A minor, at the beginning of the opening section where the melody and the harmony appear to contradict each other (Example 4-7a). In bars 5–6, the C-major melody is heard over an A-minor harmony; as it repeats in the following two bars, the transposed melody in A Aeolian mode cadences on A minor at bar 8. Not until a closing phrase (bars 13−16) that concludes Section A_1 on C major is the tonic firmly established.

More factors contribute to the tonal ungroundedness in this mazurka. The introduction, which can either be heard in C major or G major, adds to an ambiguous quality at the outset. The possible plagal relationship between the two fifth-related tonalities not only creates a temporary uncertainty as to whether C major is the tonic or the subdominant of G major but also influences later music in the mazurka. Section B (bars 21–36), for example, in F Lydian mode, allows for a large-scale tonic-subdominant-tonic harmonic scheme in bars 16–48. F major, the local tonic, forces C major to be a subordinate harmony—the dominant of the subdominant—in the middle section. The melody projects F Lydian mode and the distinctive F-B tritone that also defines C major. As Schenker explains:

> Chopin by no means intends to establish the old systems as equivalent [to major and minor] and as independent; this is sufficiently clear from the refined artistry he uses in the introduction as well as the harmonization in general to provide the listener with the absolute certainty of only C major and F major (in this connection, compare in particular the ingenious

> conclusion of the Mazurka, which orients the listener beyond any doubt!). Thus, the [Lydian] passage in question simply contains a few features of artistic archaism, a highly ingenious trick, such as could befall Chopin occasionally in the midst of his fantastic improvisations. It is merely a literal quotation, a curious genre-imitation, from that golden age when people still believed in the "Lydian" system, and sang and played irresponsibly, especially "nationalistic" melodies, because actually they did not know how to play and hear better.[28]

Whether or not one accepts Schenker's view that the Lydian element is an "archaism" or derived from an unsophisticated practice, Chopin clearly invested a great deal in the F-B tritone in this mazurka. He draws attention to it in bars 27–28, for example, marking this moment *ritenuto*. This sound appears in many different guises, such as surface clashes between the two pitches in bars 5–6 and between the D-minor and G-major chords in bars 13–14. Further development of this motive is found in the left-hand melody in bars 73–87 where the tenor restates the tritone repeatedly as F-C♭ and eventually back to F-B in the retransition (Example 4-7b).

In addition to affirming C major as the tonic, Chopin makes a final attempt in the coda (bars 105–120) to remind us of the tonal ambiguities that characterize the mazurka (Example 4-7c). We certainly know at this point that C major is the tonic and that the coda prolongs and confirms the tonality through the repetitive plagal and tonic-dominant progressions rather than suggesting tonal uncertainty as the music did at earlier moments. The ending bars thus effectively summarize the G major-C major-F major rivalries from the introduction and the harmonic plan of the piece.

---

[28] Schenker, *Counterpoint: A Translation of Kontrapunkt by Heinrich Schenker*, vol. 1, ed. John Rothgeb, trans. John Rothgeb and Jürgen Thym (New York: Schirmer Books, 1987; rpt., Ann Arbor: Musicalia Press, 2001), 57–58.

Directional Tonality

Despite Chopin's allusions that momentarily threaten the tonic in all three examples above, in each piece he soon eliminates any doubt as to the tonality, resulting in a short-lived ambiguity. However, the quick emotional relief and tonal stability that follow the clarification of a temporary ambiguity is not always desirable. Chopin, at times, achieves drama through the use of directional tonality, a compositional technique that becomes increasingly popular in the nineteenth century. It significantly challenges the tradition of monotonality that dominates classical music and, by extension, theories like Schenker's that depend on readings in a single key. In Korsyn's words,

> monotonal genres tend to be monologic, . . . any resistance to the primary key is ultimately defeated. Monotonality could be described through binary oppositions—primary key/secondary key, closure/nonclosure—in which the first member of each pair is the privileged term.[29]

Directional tonality, on the other hand, presents a secondary tonality at the onset of a piece that prepares for and drives toward the goal, that is, the tonic arrival. Many early nineteenth-century compositions depart from monotonality as they rescind the initial key and conclude on a different tonic. Problems for a theory like Schenker's have been explored by, among others, Harald Krebs, who contrasts the kind of tonal ambiguity that arises when a single *Kopfton* is supported by two closely related keys, as in three Schubert songs, "Der Alpenjäger," "Ganymed," and the first version of "Der Jüngling und der Tod." In these songs, each of the two or more unrelated key areas has its own *Kopfton* that explains the deviations from monotonality by the musical setting of texts.[30]

---

[29] Korsyn, "Directional Tonality and Intertextuality," 59.
[30] Krebs, "Alternatives to Monotonality," 3–11 and 14.

Since directional tonality often articulates text or drama, as in these Schubert songs, this nineteenth-century tonal phenomenon might be considered less applicable to instrumental works that lack explicit connections to poetry. Chopin, however, experiments with the innovative tonal language and the traditional form in his narrative compositions that lack any actual program, such as the Op. 31 Scherzo, the Op. 38 Ballade, and the Op. 49 Fantasy. His Prelude in A Minor, Op. 28/2 and Waltz in F Minor/A♭ Major, Op. 70/2 are smaller works that exemplify the same principle.[31]

Scherzo, Op. 31 (1837)

In *Free Composition*, Fig 13, Schenker regards D♭ major as the underlying tonic of Op. 31, treating the opening B♭ minor as the submediant (Example 4-8a). Krebs argues that we could hear B♭ minor as the tonic and D♭ major as the mediant, for the former is strongly established at the onset of the piece (Example 4-8b).[32] Krebs also suggests a two-key and two-form interpretation in which a B♭-minor sonata form and a D♭-major scherzo-and-trio form are equally important.[33] Even so, one might counter the idea that a single work could embody two keys and two forms simultaneously. Indeed, Krebs admits that

> no matter how one incorporates the B♭-minor interpretation into a total view of the work, the resulting dualistic analysis is more complex and less clear cut than is Schenker's. But when the work under analysis is itself highly complex and anything but clear cut, as is true not only of Chopin's Op. 31 but of much other nineteenth-century music, then the increased

[31] William Kinderman, "Directional Tonality in Chopin," in *Chopin Studies*, ed. Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 59–60.
[32] However, D♭ major is undoubtedly the tonic at the conclusion of the Scherzo; it would therefore be almost impossible to hear it as the mediant. Krebs's analysis is summarized in Example 4-8b; see Krebs, "Tonal and Formal Dualism," 50, Example 1.
[33] Ibid., 49–51 and 59.

> complexity inherent in a dualistic or an even more multiplistic interpretation is not a matter of gratuitous obfuscation; it is indispensable if one wishes fully to penetrate the mysteries and appreciate the miracles of the music.[34]

Whether or not one agrees with his interpretation, Krebs does succeed in observing that the Scherzo may not be an entirely straightforward instance of the second key replacing the first, and that other factors grant B♭ minor greater priority than might seem at first to be the case.

Fantasy, Op. 49 (1841)

With respect to the tonal structure of Op. 49, Schachter reads A♭ major, the closing key, as without question the primary tonality (Example 4-9).[35] The harmonic progression F minor-E♭ major-A♭ major results in an auxiliary cadence toward A♭ as the harmonic goal, which does not arrive until bar 276. Also, the final cadence in A♭ major is much stronger than that of the march in F minor. Thus, the two "tonics" are not of equal status.[36] Schachter offers a poetic explanation to the unusual tonal plan, suggesting a solemn program that expresses the opening march, the tonal conflict between F minor and A♭ major, and the triumphal victory and celebration of A♭. At the end, however, a deceptive cadence interrupts A♭ major's victory, representing the struggle between triumph and tragedy that contradicts the Fantasy's positive move from F minor to A♭ major and "the urgent appeal of the Adagio sostenuto."[37] There is no firm conclusion

---

[34] Ibid., 59.
[35] Example 4-9 reproduces a middleground reading in Schachter, "Chopin's Fantasy, Op. 49," 226, Example 2a.
[36] Ibid., 225–226. For a detailed analysis of the voice leading, motivic development, and chromatic writing of the Fantasy, see 227–253.
[37] Ibid., 253

on the final tonic; as Schachter puts it, "the piece ends like a dream, its elements dissolving into nothingness just when we think we have finally grasped their meaning."[38]

Brahms, String Quintet Op. 88, II (1882), and Chopin's Op. 38 Ballade (1838–1839)

According to Korsyn, in our last example of directional tonality, Brahms modeled the second movement of his String Quintet Op. 88 (1882) on Bach's Suites, Brahms's own A $\frac{\text{major}}{\text{minor}}$ Sarabande (1855) and A-major Gavotte (1855), and especially Chopin's Ballade in A Minor, Op. 38.[39] Departing from monotonality, the Brahms movement begins in C♯ $\frac{\text{major}}{\text{minor}}$ and shifts to A $\frac{\text{major}}{\text{minor}}$ (Example 4-10). Unlike our earlier examples in which one of the keys prevails, the interaction between the two keys throughout this quintet movement results in tonal uncertainty at the end.[40]

In Op. 38, Chopin deconstructs tonal hierarchy and unity by beginning in F major and concluding in A minor, a secondary key at the outset that turns primary at the conclusion (Example 4-11).[41] Brahms, on the other hand, "deconstructs Chopin's deconstruction" in his quintet movement,[42] giving C♯ $\frac{\text{major}}{\text{minor}}$ and A $\frac{\text{major}}{\text{minor}}$ equal status as he allows the former to maintain its influence at the final section. This radical and perhaps more advanced tonal treatment renders the hierarchy of the two keys ambiguous, approaching terminal tonal ambiguity in which the question of primacy between two or more equally poised keys never gets settled.

---

[38] Ibid.
[39] Korsyn, "Directional Tonality and Intertextuality," 45–83.
[40] Ibid., 83 n60. Example 4-10 draws from Korsyn's Table 2 on p. 49.
[41] Example 4-11 is taken from Korsyn's Table 1 on p. 49.
[42] Ibid., 77.

The view of Chopin's Op. 38 Ballade as fundamentally an A-minor piece has recently been challenged in a book by Jonathan Bellman, who considers the work to be in F major but with an ending in the wrong key, an off-tonic ending that Bellman explains as expressing the quality of a tragic narrative common to the ballads of Mickiewicz that Chopin admired.[43] Bellman's conclusion, whether or not one agrees with it, begins to show that even in cases that might seem to be clear instances of directional tonality, other factors may encourage us to interpret a piece as incomplete at its end rather than its beginning.

Terminal Tonal Ambiguity

While the tonal ambiguities discussed thus far bring an ultimate resolution that confirms one single principal tonic, a situation one might call *terminal ambiguity*, though rare, does exist. When we have two equally valid interpretations in which we cannot determine an overall underlying tonic, there is no reconciliation between the two keys, or a clear replacement of the first key by the second. In this closing section of this chapter I will argue that such is the case in Chopin's Mazurka in C Major, Op. 7/5 and Mazurka in B Minor/F♯ Minor, Op. 30/2.

Mazurka in C Major, Op. 7/5 (1830/31)

Discussed earlier in this chapter, Op. 7/5 consists formally of a large-scale antecedent-consequent construction. While C major is clearly established as the tonic at bar 12, the end of the Section A_1, its primacy is ultimately challenged because of the potentially

[43] Jonathan D. Bellman, *Chopin's Polish Ballade: Op. 38 as Narrative of National Martyrdom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

endless formal design brought by the marking *senza Fine* (Example 4-2). C major and G major each articulate the fifth-related Sections A_1 and B, which could bring the two tonalities equal status after numerous repetitions because neither need assume tonal priority over the other when they share the same musical idea despite the pitch differences caused by the transposition. Each of the cadences in the C-major antecedent and the G-major consequent (bars 12 and 20) functions as an upbeat that links to the next phrase, enabling a continuous flow during repetitions.[44] Tonal uncertainty arises since either C major or G major could serve as the primary tonality; that is, the piece could be heard as in C major with a dominant section or in G major with a subdominant section. Here, Chopin fully exploits the I-V and IV-I polarity that gives rise to the quality of terminal ambiguity. The piece remains tonally equivocal since both interpretations are valid. Which of the two tonalities serves as the "home" key depends largely on how one plays the mazurka and where one chooses to end a performance. Especially elegant in this particular mazurka is the way the introductory G octaves prepare this ambiguity, since the unaccompanied pitches would be conventionally understood as either tonic or dominant. It is this same ambiguity that the mazurka as a whole plays out through its repetitive scheme in which G becomes the dominant but potentially the tonic as well.

---

[44] Robert Morgan describes the piece as having a symmetrical modular form in which repeated and transposed sections are the dominating musical idea; see Morgan, "Chopin's Modular Forms," in *Variations on the Canon: Essays on Music from Bach to Boulez in Honor of Charles Rosen on his Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Robert Curry, David Gable, and Robert L. Marshall (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2008), 188–189. Leo Treitler calls the piece music that "stops but does not conclude." See Treitler, "History and the Ontology of the Musical Work," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 51/3 (1993): 486.

Mazurka in B Minor/F♯ Minor, Op. 30/2 (1836/37)

We have observed that tonal ambiguity, a major characteristic in Chopin's mazurkas, often arises when the leading tonality of a fifth-related tonic-dominant or tonic-subdominant becomes unclear. Based on the same principle, Chopin creates a sense of equivocalness between the fifth-related B minor and F♯ minor in Op. 30/2. Here, one can hear B minor as either the home key or the subdominant of F♯ minor (Examples 4-5a and b).[45]

My primary graph interprets the piece in its opening key B minor, highlighting the incompleteness at the end as the mazurka concludes with the F♯-minor passage heard initially in Section B_1. The alternative middleground graph in Example 4-5b shows a possible and equally valid interpretation of the mazurka in F♯ minor, removing the incomplete ending but resulting in an incomplete opening. In this graph, Sections A and B_1 present a large-scale introductory auxiliary progression. The tonic, F♯ minor, arrives only at bar 24. Section A_1 is solely in the subdominant while Section B_1 features a 10-8 linear intervallic pattern that prolongs the dominant seventh harmony, which resolves to the tonic at the perfect authentic cadence in bar 24. Section C opens with a plagal progression that makes reference to the initial B-minor sonority. The *Kopfton* a^1 finally arrives at bar 34 over the tonic harmony. After a brief passage in A major, the mediant, the music leads to the return of Section B_2 at bar 49 where $\hat{2}$ enters. Unlike my primary reading in B minor which lacks tonal closure, this alternative interpretation secures one with the arrival of $\hat{1}$ over the perfect authentic cadence in F♯ minor at bar 56.

[45] Professor Kevin Korsyn, in a personal conversation, refers to the piece as representing "terminal ambiguity," a tonal uncertainty that cannot be cleared.

Therefore, reading the piece in F♯ minor has the advantage of having closure in both the harmonic and melodic domains.[46]

In *Free Composition*, Schenker comments on the tonal ambiguity in Op. 30/2, saying that "the uncertainty which rises about the tonality almost prevents us from calling this Mazurka a completed composition."[47] The possibility noted by Schenker of reading this mazurka in either B minor or F♯ minor may suggest that Chopin intends to present either tonal or melodic incompleteness, or both, in his mazurka in an attempt to challenge the tradition of monotonality and formal wholeness. No mazurka illustrates terminal tonal ambiguity better than this one. We have discovered that it is equally valid to name the piece the Mazurka in B Minor or the Mazurka in F♯ Minor. There is no single conclusion as to what the tonality of the piece is because the two readings exert equal validity, contradicting yet complementing each other at the same time.

Conclusion

The unconventional tonal structures of the above examples raise doubts: Are there some early nineteenth-century compositions not governed by monotonality? The challenges, however, have not stopped Schenker and his followers from reconciling the works with the concept of tonal unity. However, not all of these analyses are successful, for some works exhibit tonal duality to the extent that they can only be explained from more than one different angle,[48] be it the narrative perspective or the emerging tonal language of

---

[46] Cone claims that Chopin is experimenting with "a two-stanza form in F♯ minor," namely, IV-I followed by III-I; see Cone, "Ambiguity and Reinterpretation in Chopin," 157.
[47] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 131 and Fig. 152,7 (Example 4-5c).
[48] Krebs, "Tonal and Formal Dualism," 48–49.

directional tonality. Most tonal pieces begin with a strong statement of the tonic before departing from and eventually returning back to it, resulting in a beginning-middle-end structure crucial in and typical of classical music. However, as we have seen, this traditional framework is by no means necessary. Pieces with non-tonic openings create a forward momentum toward the tonic as they bring the music from tonal instability to stability; pieces with a non-tonic ending often have a tonal shift or terminal ambiguity that lends a narrative quality to the work. Instead of representing an absence of clarity, incompleteness and ambiguity in Chopin allow for more than one simultaneous reading of the same music that could be equally valid and artistic. We therefore should not hesitate to embrace such multiple analytical interpretations when they become appropriate.

Chapter 5

Introductions

Many introductions have been studied, often insightfully, in the Schenkerian analytical literature, but introductions have rarely been treated as a topic in their own right. A perusal of David Carson Berry's comprehensive research guide shows only eight entries on the subject, two of which are cross references, compared to far greater numbers of studies on more specialized topics.[1] The reason for this comparative neglect is probably that introductions are generally considered to be at a lower hierarchical level, a prelude to the main body of a piece, carrying a "before-the-beginning" function that is optional to the overall form.[2] As a result, for a work that *has* an introduction, it is not uncommon to find analyses that begin only at the main body of the composition as if the piece under discussion did *not* have an introduction attached to it. For instance, in his analysis of Chopin's Waltz Op. 34/1, Schenker did not consider the introduction, nor did he explain in the text how the introduction connects with the later music (Example 5-1).[3] In his detailed graphs of the "Revolutionary" Etude, however, Schenker did discuss the

---

[1] David Carson Berry, *A Topical Guide to Schenkerian Literature: An Annotated Bibliography with Indices* (Hillsdale, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 2004), 153–154.
[2] William E. Caplin, *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 15.
[3] Heinrich Schenker, "Further Consideration of the Urlinie: II," in *The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook*, vol. 2 (1926), ed. William Drabkin, trans. John Rothgeb (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 7. Example 5-1 is taken from Schenker's Fig. 13.

introduction, showing the motivic relations and voice-leading connections between that opening passage and the main body of the work (Example 2-2 from Chapter 2).[4]

Introductions undergo certain changes from the classical period to the romantic era. According to William Caplin, a classical introduction is often brief, lasting two to four bars at most, with little or no emphasis on the thematic or motivic content, these being reserved for the opening theme; it usually expresses the tonic harmony and occasionally includes the dominant. Despite its relatively neutral melodic and harmonic content, a classical introduction nonetheless builds up tension and anticipation, forming an upbeat to the opening section.[5] Later, a new trend to incorporate thematic or harmonic ideas into the introduction would arise, as used extensively by Chopin in his dances. In the mazurkas, the introduction differs markedly from Caplin's classical introduction. As we will explore, a Chopin introduction often presents thematic fragments or motivic ideas that return in the later music, binding the opening section organically to the rest of the piece. With regard to the introduction's harmonic content, it varies from a tonic or a dominant prolongation to an elaborate introductory auxiliary progression that may return to introduce any reprises of the opening theme;[6] at times, the introduction foretells the composition's tonal plan by showing its harmonic design on a compressed miniature scale.

---

[4] Schenker, "F. Chopin: Etude in C Minor, Op. 10, No. 12," in *Five Graphic Music Analyses* (New York: Dover, 1969), 53–61; *Free Composition*, trans. and ed. Ernst Oster (New York: Longman, 1979; rpt., Hillsdale, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 2001), Figs. 73,1, 114,10, and 119,14.

[5] Caplin, *Classical Form*, 15. Caplin defines this type of introduction as a "thematic introduction," which differs from the slow introduction that could have an extensive span. For his discussion of the slow introduction, see 203–208.

[6] See Chapter 4 for a discussion of the introductory auxiliary cadence.

This chapter examines the functions of all fourteen introductions in Chopin mazurkas:

Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 6/2 (1830)
Mazurka in E Major, Op. 6/3 (1830)
Mazurka in F Minor, Op. 7/3 (1830/31)
Mazurka in C Major, Op. 7/5 (1830/31)
Mazurka in A Minor, Op. 17/4 (1832/33)
Mazurka in C Major, Op. 24/2 (1834/35)
Mazurka in B♭ Minor, Op. 24/4 (1834/35)
Mazurka in D♭ Major, Op. 30/3 (1836/1837)
Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 30/4 (1836/37)
Mazurka in A♭ Major, Op. 50/2 (1841/42)
Mazurka in B Major, Op. 56/1 (1843)
Mazurka in C Major, Op. 56/2 (1843)
Mazurka in G Major, Op. 67/1 (1835)

In general, all introductions anticipate the main body of the piece by providing an extended upbeat to the opening section; in addition to having this upbeat function, the introductions Chopin writes for his mazurkas often establish essential features such as the key, the mode, the tempo, and the character. Within these general guidelines, there is much variety in Chopin's introductions. While it is the norm for an introduction to lay the groundwork of the thematic ideas and the harmonic scheme, an introduction, rather than establishing the tonality of the mazurka, occasionally creates tonal ambiguity that obscures the real key of the piece, resulting in mounting tonal tension and a forward momentum toward the resolution where the initial tonic arrives. Another new phenomenon that is not uncommon in the mazurkas is the return of an introduction in later music, making the introduction an integral component of the piece and thereby affecting the overall form of the work. In sum, no two introductions serve identical functions in Chopin's mazurkas.

Presentation of the Thematic Idea and Harmonic Plan

Among the fourteen mazurkas that begin with an introduction, all present thematic and/or harmonic materials that return as vital elements of the piece, with the exception of Op. 7/5. With regard to the thematic ideas, Chopin often plants melodic motives or chromatic or enharmonic conflicts at the onset of the introduction and restates them in later music either on the musical surface or on a deeper level. I will begin by exploring the relationship between the introduction and the main body of the mazurka by illustrating how aspects of the introductory music return as surface events in five mazurkas: Opp. 6/2, 7/3, 17/4, 30/4, and 68/1.

Direct Restatement

Several examples from earlier chapters discuss introductions in passing as part of a discussion of other compositional issues. I will begin this section by concentrating on four mazurkas, now focusing exclusively on the introductions, followed by a discussion of one not discussed previously.

With g♯^{1} as the cover tone and a drone bass on the dominant, the eight-bar introduction of Op. 6/2 announces an arpeggiated fifth motive b♯-d♯^{1}-f♯^{1} in the alto in bars 1–4 which appears in both ascending and descending forms throughout the piece, as discussed in Example 2-5 from Chapter 2. The eight-bar introduction of Op. 7/3, discussed in Example 4-3 from Chapter 4, presents a C-D♭-C neighbor motive that becomes prominent in the top voice in later music. Moreover, Chapters 2 and 3 discussed the upper neighbor motives E-D♯ and A-G♯ and the F𝄪-F♯ conflict originating in the

four-bar introduction of Op. 30/4. The brackets in Example 2-9b from Chapter 2 illustrate the ways these thematic ideas permeate that mazurka.

Unlike the above examples, Op. 17/4 begins with a highly unstable and dissonant sonority. In this widely studied mazurka,[7] the four-bar introduction momentarily obscures the tonality by suggesting an apparent II^4_2 chord that leads to a $^6_3$ chord on A, followed by a neighbor $^6_4$ chord at bar 5 that marks the beginning of Section A_1 (bars 5–60) (Example 2-3a from Chapter 2). However, as noted in Chapter 4, A, the lowest note of the opening chord acts as the root of the tonic and therefore the apparent non-tonic opening actually represents a true tonic with melodic displacements; in other words, the introduction is supported by a tonic pedal with f^1 in the upper voice and an ascending-third motive b-c^1-d^1 in the inner voice resolving eventually to a I^6_3 chord at bar 4. The first root-position tonic triad appears only much later, delayed until the perfect authentic cadence at bar 20, finally confirming A minor as the key of this mazurka. A rising third motive, issuing directly from the introduction's inner voice, permeates the musical surface, as I explored in Chapter 2 (Examples 2-3a, b, c, and e).

The Mazurka in C Major, Op. 68/1 also restates the introduction's thematic material in the foreground. In fact, the G-A-G neighbor motive rooted in the four-bar introduction becomes a characteristic sound of the mazurka (Example 5-2a). It returns in various forms in the opening section (bars 5–32) and the reprise (bars 53–72), most notably at places where the upper neighbor is expressed by a grace note. Two other motives suggested by the introduction become prominent in the piece: the E-F-G-A-G and G-E-C

---

[7] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 65–66 and Fig. 63,2; David Beach, "Chopin's Mazurka, Op. 17, No. 4," *Theory and Practice* 2/3 (1977): 12–16; and Allen Forte and Steven E. Gilbert, *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis* (New York: Norton, 1982), 357–362.

segments are both restated up a fifth in later music; the former is heard as B-C-D-E-D at the beginning of Section A_1 while the latter returns as D-B-G that begins the middle part of the three-part Section A_1 (bars 21–25) (Example 5-2b).

In all these cases the introduction directly prepares what follows in the main body of the mazurka by anticipating key motives. Other introductions work in even more subtle ways.

Transformed Restatement

All the examples we have seen thus far involve a rather direct restatement of introductory materials in later music. Op. 24/4, on the other hand, transforms ideas from its four-bar introduction when the thematic materials return. While the introduction itself never comes back during the course of the mazurka, the top chromatic line of the introduction is integrated into the piece. In each reappearance, the modified version of the introductory music functions as a link between different sections of the piece (Example 5-3). For instance, the opening chromatic descending line inspires the music at bars 24–28 that repeats at bars 32–37, connecting the middle part of the three-part Section A_1 (bars 21–37) to the varied restatement of the first part (bars 37–52). This chromatic idea undergoes further transformation and becomes the retransition at bars 95–99, linking Section B (bars 61–95) to the reprise (bars 99–114) as the A♭-major seventh chord (VII^7) at bar 95 is subsumed into the dominant seventh chord at bar 99 that resolves to the ensuing tonic.

As in Op. 24/4, three mazurkas—Opp. 50/2, 30/3, and 56/2—never repeat the introduction in its entirety but thematic elements of these introductions are essential to

later melodic development. In Op. 50/2, the eight-bar introduction announces two repeated neighbor motives around $\hat{5}$, E♭-F-E♭ in the top voice and E♭-D♮-E♭ in the bass, and different forms of these motives soon color the surface diminution (Example 5-4a). The introduction's dominant seventh chord sustains against the bass's E♭-D♮-E♭ motive, together presenting a delicate D♭-D♮ clash crucial to the following music. In the outer parts of the three-part Section A_1 (bars 9–28 and 40–59), for example, this chromatic pair characterizes the sound of the theme where D♮ is a chromatic passing tone in the E♭-D♮-D♭ fragment; the D♭-D♮ conflict is also heard in the tenor voice at the closing cadence of these sections over the dominant (bars 27 and 58) (Example 5-4b).

In the middle part of Section A_1 (bars 29–39), Chopin again juxtaposes D♭ and D♮ between the tenor and the upper voice over C, the tonicized composed-out dominant; here D♮, the major ninth, prevails because of the local tonicization of C and because D♭ is merely a chromatic upper neighbor (Example 5-4c). The D♭-D♮ clash is also prominent in the outer parts (bars 60–67 and 76–83) of Section B where the music is entirely in D♭ major (Example 5-4d). Here, the subdominant harmony (D♭) is prolonged while the upper voice and the tenor restate the E♭-D♮-E♭ motive supported by the local dominant seventh chord. A result is to juxtapose D♭ with the subordinate D♮ as the local tonic and its dominant seventh chord alternate. The D♭-D♮ conflict is of course again reconfirmed in Section A_2 (bars 84–103) where only the tonally closed first part of Section A_1 is restated.

Other motives from the introduction are worked into the main body of Op. 50/2 without undergoing quite the same degree of transformation. Leading from the introduction into the main body of the mazurka, Chopin incorporates a tiny chromatic

fragment, B♭-B♮-C (bars 8–9) into the opening theme; it appears in a descending form, C-B♮-B♭ (bar 14), which answers and thus coordinates with E♭-D♮-D♭ at the second bar of the theme (Example 5-4b). Both here and in the more extensive motivic repetitions the introduction, while simply composing out the dominant seventh chord on an E♭ pedal, has surprisingly rich motivic content that deeply affects what follows.

Unlike the introductions seen above, the eight-bar introduction of Op. 30/3 stays completely diatonic. It therefore shows no signs of the mixture that will come to define the mazurka when the tonic major and minor will be juxtaposed in the main theme of Section A_1 (bars 9–24). Even so, the introduction, heard only at the outset, manages to modify its thematic fragments and incorporate them into the main body of the piece. The introduction's melodic idea F-G♭-A♭-B♭-A♭ returns immediately at the beginning of the opening theme as F-G♭-(G♮)-A♭-B♭-A♭-(F), carrying an added chromatic passing tone and a chordal leap (Example 5-5a). Embedded within this theme is a A♭-B♭-A♭ neighbor motive that permeates the mazurka, as in a 7-10 sequence prolonging the minor dominant of B♭ minor, the local tonic in bars 49–56 (Example 5-5b). The neighbor motive also appears transposed, as C-D♭-C in the retransition (bars 71–79) following the arrival of the dominant seventh of B♭ (Example 5-5c).[8]

The drone bass in the introduction of Op. 56/2 carries a special meaning in the genre: as we recall, a drone bass appears in the introduction of three early mazurkas published during Chopin's lifetime—Opp. 6/2, 6/3, and Op. 7/5. In Op. 6/2, the open fifth

[8] Nicol Viljoen also discusses the transformed restatement of the A♭-B♭-A♭ neighbor motive in the retransition; see Viljoen, "The Motivic, Structural, and Formal Implications of Mixture for Chopin's Mazurka Op. 30, No. 3," *South African Journal of Musicology* 11 (1991): 150–151.

prolongs the dominant that supports an alto melody. In Op. 6/3, the open fifth again accompanies a top voice but it represents the tonic. In Op. 7/5, the bare octave G creates temporary tonal uncertainty as it could be heard either as the tonic or the dominant. After more than a decade, Chopin picks up the folk-oriented drone bass and uses it in Op. 56/2. The rustic open fifth drone C-G prolongs the tonic in much the same way as Op. 7/5, giving the four-bar introduction a seemingly less sophisticated folk feature that is unexpectedly prominent for a late mazurka, given that a freer and more sophisticated tonal plan and deeper poetic content tend to flourish in the later works.[9]

The introduction never comes back in the course of Op. 56/2, but the characteristic drone becomes the backbone of the piece as it dominates the bass of this mazurka (Example 5-6). Besides occupying the entire opening section (bars 5–28), resulting in a complete harmonic standstill on the tonic, the open fifth idea also provides an anchor in Section B (bars 29–52) and the retransition (bars 53–69). Although the reprise (bars 69–84) does not repeat bars 5–12 of the opening section, it retains the initial C-G drone from bars 13–28.

Motivic Enlargement on a Higher Level

Having explained how introductions are represented in the surface diminution of later music, I will now turn to two mazurkas that illustrate motivic enlargement of the introduction on a deeper level. In Op. 6/3, an eight-bar introduction on an E-B open fifth drone establishes the tonic and presents a melodic segment, C♯-B-A-G♯-F♯-E, starting on

[9] Nicol Viljoen, "The Drone Bass and Its Implications for the Tonal Voice-Leading Structure in Two Selected Mazurkas by Chopin," *Indiana Theory Review* 6/1–2 (1982–1983): 17–35.

an upper neighbor C♯ and filling in that same fifth in its main voice, given by the crossed-over right hand at the bottom of the texture (Example 5-7). This fragment shapes the mazurka's overall thematic idea, as represented in the cover tones $c♯^3$-b^2-$g♯^2$ and the *Urlinie* $g♯^2$-$f♯^2$-e^2; in particular, the sliding G♯-F♯-E figuration at bars 6 and 8 also anticipates the *Urlinie*, $\hat{3}$-$\hat{2}$-$\hat{1}$. Foreground melodic fifths also organize the overall motivic design of Section C (bars 41–64), as shown on the second system of Example 5-7, allowing the motive from the filled-in drone fifth to operate on multiple levels.

Similarly, the four-bar introduction of Op. 67/1 prolongs the tonic via its open fifth drone, at the same time generating motivic ideas that flow into the mazurka (Example 5-8a). Heard only at the beginning, the introduction's drone bass supports a D-E-D-C♯-D turn motive around $\hat{5}$, accompanied in lower thirds that form a turn around B; these parallel thirds indirectly contrast C♯ and C♮. Both turn motives, around B and D, return in different guises at the opening of the two-part Section A_1 (bars 5–28), which again brings out the clash between C♯ and C♮, a conflict also heard, characteristically in an inner voice, in the second part of the opening section (bars 13–28) (Example 5-8b). The C♯-C♮ contrast is less direct, but palpable, in Section B (bars 29–45) where C is the local tonic; the conflict is restated as the four-bar theme returns four times, each with a slightly different harmonization (Example 5-8c). At bar 44, $c♮^2$ emerges victorious despite turning dissonant; as the seventh of the dominant seventh, it resolves to b^1 in the following measure where the reprise begins, restating all the motivic ideas originating from the introduction (Example 5-8d). Also characteristic for Chopin, an enlargement of the introduction's D-E-D fragment governs the mazurka's voice leading on a higher structural level. Prolonged throughout Section A_1, d^2 ($\hat{5}$) is embellished by its upper

neighbor e^2, the head note of the C-major music in Section B, before returning at the reprise (bars 45–60).

Groundwork of the Overall Harmonic Scheme

Besides foretelling the thematic ideas of a mazurka, an introduction can also foreshadow key aspects of the piece's overall harmonic plan. To demonstrate this concept, I will draw from two mazurkas discussed more briefly in earlier sections of this dissertation, now focusing on the role of the introduction in preparing harmonic ideas that follow in the main body of the work.

In Op. 68/1, the four-bar introduction lies almost entirely on a pedal that can only be heard as the tonic C, but Chopin adds one other harmony near the end, a single subdominant harmony at bar 3 supporting an upper neighbor motion around $\hat{5}$ in the top voice (Example 5-2a). The resulting plagal progression forecasts the overall tonal structure of the mazurka where the F-major Section B (bars 33–48) is embedded within the outer sections (Example 5-2c). This situation is somewhat like what we just observed in Op. 67/1 (Example 5-8d), where an upper neighbor appears as a surface element in the introduction and as a component of the structural upper voice, but now the subdominant harmony itself is forecast in the introduction, rather than just the neighbor note in the top voice.

More subtle and complex is the situation in the Mazurka in C Major, Op. 24/2. The alternating C-major and G-major triads in the four-bar introduction present a telling ambiguity as they can be heard as either a tonic-dominant progression in C major or a subdominant-tonic motion in G major (Example 4-7a from Chapter 4). Chopin avoids

an F♮ or F♯ that would clearly rule out C or G as the tonic. While we are inclined to hear C major as the tonic so that the introduction's tonic-dominant progression would define the tonality of the piece, the status of later C-major triads is consistently called into question. This becomes a main ingredient in what will come.

Following the introduction, the opening theme (bars 5–12) sounds initially in A minor, the C-major triad in bar 6 heard as possibly the tonic but then as the mediant. Later the subdominant harmony gains importance and becomes the local key of Section B (bars 21–36) where the C-major triad appears at bars 23 and 27 in a Lydian-inflected passage composing out F. Does this C-major triad serve as the tonic here or as the upper fifth of the subdominant? Either seems possible, and the Lydian inflections only complicate the question. The coda (bars 105–120) summarizes the harmonic rivalry caused by the tonic-dominant and tonic-subdominant polarity by quoting the introduction's music, again questioning the status of the C-major triad: it is perhaps the tonic, perhaps the dominant of the subdominant, or perhaps the subdominant of the dominant (Example 4-7c from Chapter 4).[10] The tonic status of C major is eventually confirmed when Chopin settles on the C as tonic at the end of the coda, concluding the mazurka in its home key, but only after Chopin's coda has reminded us of the ambiguity surrounding the C-major triads earlier in the piece.

Auxiliary Cadence Introduction

Despite the norm of beginning a composition with a tonic statement and therefore establishing the tonality as a point of departure for the piece, Chopin frequently employs

[10] See Chapter 4 for further discussion of the coda.

non-tonic openings in his mazurkas that involve an auxiliary progression to create suspense and delay the tonic arrival.[11] Poundie Burstein named this type of introduction an "auxiliary cadence introduction," the most common type of which comprises a dominant prolongation that prepares the tonic arrival. Such an auxiliary cadence introduction could be further elaborated by adding a pre-dominant harmony that precedes the dominant. An auxiliary cadence introduction often leads to the tonic that marks the beginning of the opening section of the mazurka, but it could also connect to an opening section with its *own* non-tonic beginning, thereby extending the tonal tension until the initial tonic arrives later in the section. In other cases, the tonic will arrive before the end of an auxiliary cadence introduction, that is, prior to the opening section.[12]

As in any introduction, materials from an auxiliary cadence introduction are often restated in later music without changes or they might return in a transposed version. Since most introductions have a non-tonic beginning, the return of an introduction could appear in the middle of a larger harmonic progression, as in Chopin's "Revolutionary" Etude where the introduction precedes the reprise that begins at bar 51 (Example 2-2 from Chapter 2). Sometimes only fragments of an auxiliary cadence introduction return, most notably in the form of motives, such as the G-A♭-G neighbor figure in the "Revolutionary" Etude.[13]

---

[11] For a detailed discussion of auxiliary progressions, see Chapter 4.
[12] L. Poundie Burstein, "The Non-Tonic Opening in Classical and Romantic Music" (Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1988), 100–102.
[13] Ibid., 104–107.

Basic Auxiliary Cadence Introduction: The Dominant Pedal

Among the fourteen mazurkas considered in this chapter, seven begin with an auxiliary cadence introduction: Opp. 6/2, 7/3, 7/5, 24/4, 50/2, 30/4, and 56/1. The introductions to Opp. 6/2, 7/3, 7/5, 24/4, and 50/2 represent the basic form of an auxiliary cadence introduction as they all open with a dominant pedal that functions as an extended upbeat to the initial tonic, which arrives at some point in the opening section of the mazurka, if not at the very beginning.[14]

Both Opp. 6/2 and 7/3 restate their introduction prior to the reprise, challenging the introduction's limitation to a "before-the-beginning" function and becoming an indispensible unit of the mazurka rather than a mere prefix to the main body of the piece. In Op. 6/2, the introduction's eight-bar dominant pedal drives toward the tonic at bar 10, the second bar of Section A_1 (Example 2-5 from Chapter 2). The dominant harmony that concludes Section B (bars 33–48) is then carried over as the introduction returns unchanged in bars 49–56, this time as a prefix to the reprise that provides an exact restatement of the first part of the three-part Section A_1 (bars 57–64), thus smoothly integrating the introduction into later music.

The eight-bar introduction in Op. 7/3 sounds with enough emphasis on the tonic (the first pitch) that *either* the tonic or the dominant might be heard as the main harmony, although this ambiguity is less marked than in some of the other mazurkas (Example 4-3 from Chapter 4). However, when the introduction returns in bars 77–84 as the prefix to the reprise following the retransition's dominant arrival, it sounds much more clearly like

[14] Although the reading of a dominant prolongation in the introduction is valid, the opening of Opp. 7/3 and 7/5 could be interpreted differently. I will explain this issue later in this chapter.

a composing-out of the dominant; also, the added chords make possible a harmonic interpretation with more emphasis on the dominant than on the tonic. Therefore, while one could conceivably read the initial introduction as prolonging either the tonic or the dominant, when the opening music returns in a new context, a dominant reading would be more logical in Op. 7/3.[15] Here, as elsewhere, a change of context gives the introductory music a different character.

Unlike the auxiliary cadence introductions in Opp. 6/2 and 7/3, those in Opp. 7/5, 24/4, and 50/2 never return. The latter two certainly prolong the dominant, but the tonality of Op. 7/5 is not immediately obvious. As noted earlier, in Op. 50/2, the eight-bar introduction composes out the dominant seventh chord on an E♭ pedal, delaying the tonic arrival until Section A_1 enters at bar 9 where the dominant pedal resolves (Example 5-4a). In Op. 24/4, the chromatic descent in the top voice binds the four-bar introduction and the opening of Section A_1 together (Example 5-3a). Although it is possible for one to ponder whether the introduction begins on a tonic or a dominant because of its bare octave F, Schenker notes in *Free Composition* that the fifth-progression and the fourth-progression in bars 1–12 appear in contrary motion where the tension caused by the accented passing note, $d♭^2$ supported by the dominant seventh at bar 5 does not resolve until c^2 and the tonic triad arrives at bar 12 (Example 5-9).[16] Therefore it would be more appropriate to read the entire introduction as a dominant prolongation that acts as an upbeat to delay the initial tonic.

---

[15] Note that if one hears the introduction on the tonic at the beginning of this mazurka, it would not represent an auxiliary cadence introduction.

[16] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 63 and Fig. 59,4.

Similar to the bare octave opening of Op. 24/4, the four-bar introduction of Op. 7/5 features an initial G, making it impossible to determine whether the piece is in C major or G major because the opening octaves could imply either the tonic or the dominant (Example 4-2 from Chapter 4).[17] Owing to the *Dal segno senza Fine* marking, the introduction never returns. The G octaves turn out to be the dominant and resolve to the C-major cadence at bar 8. However, the initial ambiguity surrounding the tonal function of G in the introduction becomes the focal point of this mazurka: as explained in Chapter 4, the piece sounds as if in C major, but it could also end in G, depending on the performance.

Elaborate Auxiliary Cadence Introduction

The auxiliary cadence introductions in the remaining two mazurkas, Opp. 30/4 and 56/1 are much more elaborate. In Op. 30/4, the four-bar introduction comprises an introductory auxiliary progression in a chromatic circle of fifths that drives toward the tonic at bar 5 where it overlaps with Section A_1 (bars 5–32) (Examples 2-9a and b from Chapter 2). As we saw in Op. 7/3, the introduction of Op. 30/4 returns as a formal prefix (bars 97–100) that functions tonally as part of the retransition, reestablishing C♯ minor as the tonic following the substantial B-major music in Section C (bars 65–96). Oswald Jonas notes that the return of the introduction explains the origin of $c♯^1$—the seventh of

[17] Despite the resemblance in sonority between the bare A♭ that opens Op. 30/3 and the initial octave on G in Op. 7/5, the tonality is not questioned in the former since the introduction's theme in bars 5–8 clarifies the opening A♭ as $\hat{5}$ in the context of D♭ major. In Op. 7/5, however, no such tune accompanies the bass F.

the supertonic seventh chord that begins the piece—as coming from the preceding major subdominant triad at bars 95–96.[18]

While all introductions exert a forward momentum toward the tonic, the introduction of Op. 56/1 obscures the tonality to an extreme, avoiding any harmonic references to the tonic and thereby heightening tonal tension that is released only when the much delayed B-major triad arrives. Beginning with a descending 10-5 sequence prolonging the subdominant harmony, the six-bar introduction overlaps with Section A_1 (bars 6–44) where the G-major triad (♭VI), the harmonic goal of the sequence attained through simple mixture arrives (Example 3-12b from Chapter 3).[19] The opening six bars, touching briefly on the tonic in bar 2 only to sequence through it, fail to establish the home key and therefore result in a moment of tonal ambiguity, ultimately forming part of an elaborate introductory auxiliary progression that spans bars 1–16. With its three exact restatements in bars 23–28, 81–86, and 143–148, the introductory music becomes integrated into the overall voice leading of the mazurka, each instance appearing as a prefix to the same opening material, almost resembling a ritornello within the piece's five-part formal design (Examples 3-12a and d).

Integral Part of a Mazurka

As discussed at the opening of this chapter, the "before-the-beginning" function of an introduction often causes such an opening section to be regarded as separable from the essential body of a piece. Thus, an introduction, by definition, should only appear prior to

[18] Oswald Jonas, "On the Study of Chopin's Manuscripts," *Chopin Jahrbuch* 1 (1956): 151–152. See also Schenker, *Free Composition*, Fig. 53,3.
[19] See Chapter 4 for details on the introduction of this mazurka.

the opening of a composition and is not supposed to make its return. But as we have already seen in several cases, introductions return either unchanged or in new contexts, and are integrated into the voice leading of the entire piece. Among the fourteen mazurkas studied in this chapter, only six have introductions belonging to the traditional category: Opp. 7/5, 24/4, 30/3, 50/2, 56/2, and 67/1. The majority of the mazurkas restate their introductions at some point in the middle of the piece.

Exact vs. Modified Restatement

Most often, the introduction returns unchanged as a prefix to the restatement of the opening section, as in Opp. 6/2, 30/4, 56/1, and 68/1. By contrast, both Opp. 6/3 and 7/3 modify the initial introduction, allowing a harmonic reinterpretation in its restatement. We saw earlier in Op. 7/3 that the added chords at bars 77–84, along with the fact that the return of the introduction follows the retransition's dominant arrival, facilitate a reading in the dominant instead of the initial interpretation of the introduction in the tonic *or* the dominant (Example 4-3 from Chapter 4).

The situation in Op. 6/3 is much more complicated because the eight-bar introduction, originally heard in the tonic, returns in various harmonic contexts. Uniquely among the mazurkas, part of the introduction, bars 5–8, returns four times but never in the tonic; rather, it comes back in the dominant at bars 17–20, 29–32, and 77–80, then in the subdominant at bars 65–68 (Example 5-7). The introduction's appearances in the tonic, dominant, and subdominant harmonies yield the fifth-related tonic-dominant or tonic-subdominant polarity that characterizes several of the mazurkas, a compositional resource Chopin frequently employs, as discussed in Chapter 4. Here, however, the

dominant and the subdominant versions of the introductory music do not threaten the tonic's status, nor do they cause tonal ambiguity since E major has been strongly established and confirmed in the opening section (bars 9–28).

The recurring introductions in Op. 6/3 are woven seamlessly into the overall fabric of the mazurka. Bars 17–20 form an interlude connecting Section A_1 and its written-out repeat; bars 77–80 carry the same function in the varied reprise (bars 69–90). Bars 29–32, however, could be heard either as a suffix to the opening section or the prefix to the two-part Section B (bars 33–49) since the music prolongs the dominant harmony that concludes the tonally open Section A_1 and begins Section B. These three recurrences in the dominant turn the tonic-defining introduction into an integral part of Op. 6/3. To surprise us even further, a subdominant version (bars 65–68) heads the reprise. Therefore, A major, the local key of Section C (bars 49–64), connects smoothly with the E-major reprise in a large-scale plagal progression, as shown in Example 5-7.

Return as the Coda

Any form of an introduction's return can challenge its conventional "before-the-beginning" heritage and surprise a listener. As I explained above, when an introduction repeats itself in the middle of a mazurka—be it unchanged, modified, or transposed—its music becomes integral to the voice leading and harmonic organization of the piece. Perhaps the most dramatic way of restating an introduction, and the final use of an introduction to be considered in this chapter is to use it as a coda and therefore essentially frame the composition with the same music. Traditionally, besides reinforcing the tonic,

a coda might summarize or settle thematic or harmonic conflict from earlier music.[20] As we will see, Opp. 17/4 and 24/2 are no exception, as the same music serves a summarizing purpose at the end, despite its having been presented initially as an introduction.

Earlier in this chapter I showed how the tonic status of the C-major triad in Op. 24/2 is constantly being challenged, appearing as perhaps the tonic, perhaps the mediant of the submediant, perhaps the dominant of the subdominant, or perhaps the subdominant of the dominant (Examples 4-7a and c from Chapter 4). The coda (bars 105–120), based on the introduction's music, summarizes the tonic-dominant and tonic-subdominant rivalry and eventually settles on C, reinforcing its tonic status at the last four bars of the mazurka.

In Op. 17/4, the four-bar introduction reappears at the end of the coda (bars 109–132); owing to a 5–6 shift on A, the mazurka has a poetic ending on a $^{6}_{3}$ chord over the tonic pedal (Example 2-3e from Chapter 2). Here, the music makes its final effort to present the principal ascending-third motive b-c^1-d^1, leaving the mazurka "in the enigmatic state in which it began."[21]

Conclusion

Successful introductions should provide a logical opening to a composition. Although few scholars have considered them an obligatory element of a piece due to their prefatory nature, my analyses of the fourteen mazurkas' introductions have demonstrated that an introduction could serve as the origin of major thematic or harmonic events, and that

---

[20] The rolegs of the coda in Chopin's mazurkas will be discussed in Chapter 7.
[21] Allen Forte and Steven E. Gilbert, *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis* (New York: Norton, 1982), 362. See Chapter 2 and Example 2-3 for the motivic development in Op. 17/4.

introductions often return in a variety of guises to integrate a piece's musical ideas. We should therefore be careful not to overlook the potential richness hidden in even the simplest opening.

Chapter 6

Reprises

Compared to other sections of a composition such as the exposition and the development of a sonata form, reprises tend to be neglected in musical research. Even a scholar as thorough as Schenker could write "u.s.w.," "Wdhlg," or "Reprise" in sonata-form movements that he otherwise analyzes in meticulous detail.[1] A probable reason why scholars have tended to focus less on the reprise must be that such restatements largely repeat earlier music, perhaps with decorative changes or a conventional tonal adjustment to keep a reprise in the home key. But a summary treatment of reprises can become problematic, especially when performing close readings of the music of Chopin, who brought such imagination to composing every aspect of sectional forms. For one thing, not all reprises are literal repeats. In the Chopin mazurkas, some reprises do restate the opening section more or less literally while others exhibit compositional rewriting that repays careful study. This is especially true for those mazurkas that have a tonally open first section and therefore demand new music to achieve tonal closure in the reprise, but it

[1] Heinrich Schenker, "Beethoven's Third Symphony: Its True Content Described for the First Time," in *The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook*, vol. 3 (1930), ed. William Drabkin, trans. Derrick Puffet and Alfred Clayton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 10–68 and 81–115. Schenker's *Tonwille* analyses often do the same. See Schenker, *Der Tonwille: Flugblätter zum Zeugnis unwandelbarer Gesetze der Tonkunst*, 10 vols. (Vienna: Tonwille Flugblätterverlag, 1921–1924).

also holds for works with a closed opening section, where a recomposition is not formally required. In general the principle of reprise as resolution holds true for many mazurkas.

With the exception of the Mazurka in B Minor/F♯ Minor, Op. 30/2, which does not return to its opening section, all the mazurkas analyzed in this dissertation contain at least one restatement of the first section. This chapter examines all sixteen of these to show that a reprise may carry a great variety of functions—such as a summary of melodic or motivic events, a reinterpretation of previous music, a resolution of tonal conflicts, or an expansion of musical ideas—be it a literal repeat or a rewritten version of the opening section. The following discussion begins with the simpler phenomenon of the exact restatement, followed by more complex cases in which the reprise is recomposed, lightly or more extensively.

Exact Restatement of Section A_1

According to *Grove Music Online*, reprise literally means repetition.[2] As the simplest compositional choice, an exact restatement of Section A_1 appears in the Mazurka in C Major, Op. 7/5 (Example 4-2 from Chapter 4), the Mazurka in C Major, Op. 33/3 (Example 3-2b from Chapter 3), and the Mazurka in B Major, Op. 56/1 (Examples 3-12a and d from Chapter 3). Both Opp. 7/5 and 33/3 are marked *Dal segno* while Op. 56/1 has a written-out reprise. Since I already discussed the tonal plan of these mazurkas in earlier chapters, they require no further illustration here. In Schenkerian terms, each displays a three-part form based on one of the categories recognized by Schenker, with Section B yielding a neighbor to the structural î or mixture in the *Urlinie*, the exception being

[2] Bruce Gustafson, "Reprise," in *Grove Music Online*, accessed 9 April 2010.

Op. 56/1, which has two restatements of the first section integrated into the complex and chromatic harmonic and voice-leading plan discussed in Chapter 3.

Truncated Return of Section A_1

For mazurkas that have a tonally closed first part of a three-part Section A_1, a full return is not required in the reprise; instead, tonal closure can be achieved by bringing only that section back, as in the Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 6/2 and the Mazurka in G Major, Op. 50/1. In the former, the eight-bar introduction returns in bars 49–56, after which Section A_2 states only the first part of the three-part Section A_1 in bars 57–64 and repeats it in bars 65–72 (Example 2-5 from Chapter 2). Since the first part of the opening section features an upper-voice fifth-progression and is tonally closed, a truncated restatement of this passage in the reprise is sufficient to achieve closure. To avoid redundancy at the repeat, Chopin signals an imminent ending by changes in performance indications: a *rubato* marking and a change of articulation from legato to slurred staccato. In addition, the rhythm of the top voice is slightly altered from a dotted pattern to even eighth notes on the downbeats of bars 65 and 66, and a diminution (triplet) is applied to the downbeat of bar 67. This attention to enhancing the expressiveness near the ending shows Chopin's sensitivity to the details of every musical element. On the other hand, the reprise of the Mazurka in G Major, Op. 50/1 simply repeats the first part of the tonally closed three-part Section A_1 in bars 57–72 with no surface modifications (Example 2-6 from Chapter 2), leaving new music to the extensive coda that follows the reprise.

Reinterpretation of the Beginning of Section A_1

To avoid a literal return of Section A_1 in the reprise, Chopin often makes changes at the beginning of the return, calling for harmonic reinterpretation of the opening music. The same concept applies to any section having a three-part formal design; that is, the third part repeats the first part but with a harmonic modification at the beginning, even if the tune in the top voice returns exactly.

The analysis by Edward Laufer of the opening section of the Mazurka in A Minor, Op. 7/2 provides an excellent illustration of this technique (Example 6-1).[3] Besides displaying the highly organic motivic relations I explained in Chapter 2, the mazurka presents a small drama surrounding the *Kopfton* e^2, which consistently struggles to find tonic support as it is always rhythmically displaced, appearing one bar too late. The rest of Section A_1 proceeds in a fairly regular manner, the perfect authentic cadence on A at bar 16 resulting in a tonally closed first part (bars 1–16) that confirms A minor as the tonic through a fifth-progression in the upper voice. In the second part of Section A_1 (bars 17–24), the music drives toward the dominant E in the bass via a series of descending tenths in bars 21–24. But when the bass reaches the dominant pitch at bar 24, the chord proves to be an applied dominant of the ensuing subdominant harmony that supports the return of the opening music.

From the standpoint of the reprise, an outstanding feature of this mazurka is the harmonic reinterpretation of the beginning of the initial theme in the last part of the three-

---

[3] Edward Laufer, "A Different Reading for the Same Music," paper read at the annual meeting of the Music Theory Society for New York State (Flushing, N.Y.: Queens College, 9 October 1993). Example 6-1 reproduces Laufer's Exx. 6-1 to 6-4.

part Section A_1 (bars 25–32). The piece had begun with a $^{6}_{4}$ chord above the tonic, containing a pair of neighbor-note diminutions that form the tones of a D-minor triad. Despite the reharmonization with a new bass note D on the downbeat of bar 25, the sonority that begins the reprise is familiar—the root-position D-minor triad at bar 25 shares tones with the opening $^{6}_{4}$ chord above the tonic A. Harmonically, however, the difference in bass notes causes these bars to function differently. While the $^{6}_{4}$ chord at bar 1 displaces a tonic with A as the root, the subdominant harmony supporting the return of the theme is a pre-dominant that leads to the dominant and its resolution, the submediant, at bars 27–28. In Laufer's reading of the middleground, the arrival of the submediant harmony at bar 28 is interpreted as the end of a large-scale 5–6 shift from the tonic, supporting a descent from e^2 to c^2. Subsequently, this submediant harmony becomes the applied dominant of the Phrygian II at bar 30, supporting $b♭^1$. To complete the *Urlinie* descent, an implied $b♮^1$ ($\hat{2}$) corrects $b♭^1$ ($♭\hat{2}$) in the following bar over the dominant seventh chord, which brings a^1 ($\hat{1}$) and the tonic at bar 32, concluding the opening section in A minor. Thus the difference of a single note at the beginning of the reprise affects all that follows, causing the return of the tonic harmony to be deferred to the end of Section A_1.[4]

[4] Another mazurka expanding a subdominant at its reprise is Op. 63/3, in C♯ minor, the reprise of which begins on an augmented-sixth chord. This feature was discussed by Eric Wen in "The Augmented-Sixth Chord as Support for Scale-Degree 3 in the Urlinie," paper read at the Fourth International Schenker Symposium (New York: The New School, 18 March 2006).

The analyses of four mazurkas are offered below to further illustrate how the reprise brings a harmonic reinterpretation of the opening music with an almost exact restatement of Section A_1.

Mazurka in C Major, Op. 24/2 (1834/35)

Written in five parts ($A_1BA_2CA_3$) with an introduction and a coda, Op. 24/2 prolongs its *Kopfton* e^2 ($\hat{3}$) via its upper neighbor, which is first supported by a subdominant harmony in Section B (bars 21–36) and then a Phrygian II in Section C (bars 57–88) (Example 3-5 from Chapter 3). The retransition (bars 85–88) provides an auxiliary progression in A minor in order to prepare for the ensuing Section A_3 (bars 89–104), the final return of the opening section. Despite an exact restatement of Section A_1 (bars 5–20), Section A_3 bears a harmonic reinterpretation. An implied e^2 over the submediant harmony at bar 89 now functions as a passing tone between the upper neighbor f^2 and the structural $\hat{2}$ rather than a true return of the *Kopfton*. The remaining music simply restates the opening section and concludes the *Ursatz* at bar 100. As in the Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 6/2 discussed above, Chopin modifies surface details to differentiate the reprise from the opening section: a new melodic figuration is given to the top voice at bars 102–103 just before the final tonic arrives.[5]

Mazurka in E Minor, Op. 41/1 (1838)

In Op. 41/1, Section A_2 (bars 57–64) begins after a substantial dominant pedal spanning bars 41–56 of Section B (bars 17–56) (Example 6-2). Because of an elided tonic

[5] The *National Edition* includes this decoration, not present in the Henle edition.

harmony, the opening bar of the reprise is supported by an applied V^4_2 chord, inverting the initial dominant seventh chord that began the mazurka.[6] Chopin also adds cover tones e^2 and b^1 in this final section, with the former serving initially as the upper neighbor of the cover tone $d\sharp^2$ from Section B as the dominant prolongation that spans the entire Section B continues across the formal boundary at the beginning of Section A_2. Embellished thus by a linear neighbor chord, the dominant harmony returns at bar 59, resolving to the delayed tonic at the following bar where the first upper-voice fifth-progression of the reprise concludes.

To further avoid an exact restatement and intensify the expressiveness, Chopin sets the music in *fortissimo*, thus differentiating it from the original passage in *piano* and emphasizing the dissonant sonority of the $^4_2$ chord at the onset of the reprise. The three motives from Section A_1—the plagal and Phrygian sonorities as well as the neighbor motion—return in their entirety in bars 57–64.[7] As in the opening section, the *Kopfton* fails to gain the support of a minor-mode tonic triad in both the antecedent and the consequent phrases. The conflict between $f\sharp^1$ and $f\natural^1$ is also restated in the two fifth-descents, one diatonic and the other Phrygian. All these tonal conflicts are expected to be resolved in the coda, but as I will explain in Chapter 7, they are summarized and reinforced instead.

---

[6] See also Schenker, *Free Composition*, trans. and ed. Ernst Oster (New York: Longman, 1979; rpt., Hillsdale, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 2001), Fig. 75.
[7] See Chapter 2 and Example 2-7 for the motivic organization of this mazurka.

Mazurka in F Minor, Op. 68/4 (1849)

I explained in Chapter 3 the foreground chromaticism that permeates Section A_1 (bars 1–23) of Op. 68/4 (Example 3-13 from Chapter 3). In the retransition (bars 32–40), a descending-fifth sequence presents a 7-10 linear intervallic pattern that drives the music downward toward an augmented-sixth chord at bar 39, a chord whose bass note D♭ enlarges the initial neighbor-note figure from bar 1, but now in the bass (Example 6-3). Also, at the end of the sequence (bars 37–40), Chopin provides the upper voice with an enlarged form of the $d♭^2$-c^2-b♮ segment of bars 1–2 that followed the mazurka's opening c^2. As the augmented-sixth chord resolves to the dominant at bar 40, the initial music returns over a dominant seventh chord instead of the $\frac{6}{3}$ chord that began the piece. The reprise's opening dominant harmony is prolonged until the bass regains C near the end of the antecedent, at bar 7 bis. Almost an exact repeat of Section A_1, the reprise deviates only in the first two beats of its first bar, a small but subtle change affecting a significant span of the music that follows, like the one in the Mazurka in A Minor, Op. 7/2.

Rather than composing out the tonic triad in bars 1–8 (see Example 3-13 from Chapter 3), the reinterpretation of the reprise's chromatic descending bass as a prolongation of the dominant seventh harmony suggests that the first eight bars of the reprise, beginning in bar 40, function as an auxiliary cadence that drives the music toward the tonic at the end of the phrase. Because of a *D.C. dal segno* marking, the rest of the music does exactly what it did before: within the antecedent-expanded consequent construction, the *Kopfton* $\hat{5}$ finds the root-position tonic support at the beginning of the expanded consequent, embellished again by its upper neighbor over the raised mediant

(♮III) at bar 15 bis. The final descent of the fifth-progression is completed by the perfect authentic cadence in F minor at bar 23 bis.

Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 50/3 (1841/42)

The initial statement (bars 1–4), or the "subject" of Op. 50/3 establishes g♯^{2} as the *Kopfton* (Example 2-8a from Chapter 2). A tonally ambiguous theme, it can be supported by either C♯ minor or G♯ minor, allowing harmonic reinterpretation when it returns. In the last part of the three-part Section A_1 (bars 33–41), the "subject" returns; however, in a significant change from the opening, the dominant pedal remains throughout without resolving to the tonic and therefore the "subject" is heard in the dominant, leaving the opening section tonally open (Example 6-4a). Likewise, despite a literal repetition of Section A_1 for 40 bars, Section A_2 (bars 93–181) begins by restating the "subject" over a dominant harmony rather than the tonic because the dominant harmony that concludes Section B (bars 45–92) still lingers and does not resolve until the tonic triad arrives at bar 97. Since the fifth-progression already ends at bar 97, rather than presenting î as an inner voice as it did in bar 5, the music in bars 98–108 is reinterpreted as presenting a double neighbor motion around î, unlike in Section A_1 where the fifth-progression spans the entire first part (bars 1–16).

Recomposition of the Tonally Open Section A_1

So far we have considered mazurkas for which Chopin makes a relatively straightforward compositional choice for the reprise—a literal repetition, a truncated restatement, or a harmonic reinterpretation of Section A_1. Many mazurkas, however, require a tonal

adjustment in the reprise because the opening section is tonally open and its literal restatement would not provide a tonal closure without being rewritten.

There are several different ways to introduce new endings in these mazurkas, the easiest being to rewrite the cadential unit at the end of the reprise so that the piece will conclude in the home key. For instance, in the Mazurka in E Major, Op. 6/3, Section A_1 (bars 9–32) presents an eight-bar phrase and its repetition that ends with a tonicization of the dominant, leaving the section tonally open (Example 5-7 from Chapter 5); Chopin has to give the reprise (bars 69–90) a new ending to achieve tonal closure in E major. The reprise provides a literal restatement of almost the entire opening section, reestablishing the *Kopfton* $\hat{3}$ at bar 72 and initiating the *Urlinie* descent to $\hat{2}$ at bar 75 over the pre-dominant, followed by the arrival of the structural dominant in the ensuing bar. The dominant is prolonged thereafter until the music reaches the new ending at bars 87–88, a straightforward cadential progression completing the *Ursatz* and concluding the mazurka with a perfect authentic cadence in its home key. This two-bar cadential unit is repeated to reinforce the closure, ending the piece in *pianissimo*. Thus, the rewritten four-bar closing phrase gives Op. 6/3 a tonally closed Section A_2 without changing the regular four-bar hypermeter, contrary to other kinds of expanded closing phrase that do affect the underlying hypermeter. These occur frequently in Chopin's music because of his use of "concluding expansions" toward the end of the compositions. This technique will be illustrated below.

Concluding Expansion

While a simple alteration of the cadential unit at the end of the reprise fulfills the need for closure, as we just saw in Op. 6/3, it does not generate much excitement since the conventional four-bar hypermeter remains intact. By introducing new musical materials, however, Chopin can open new possibilities for the traditional role of the reprise. In all of Chopin's music, especially in the dances, phrase expansions often serve this purpose. Concerning the crucial role of expansions in general, Charles Burkhart observes:

> Expansion is a rich compositional resource, not only for its expressive possibilities, which are infinitely various, but also because it promotes a sense of growth, development, and sometimes of climax.[8]

The discussion of phrase expansion has a long and rich history in the music theory literature. Expansions have been discussed by many theorists since the mid-eighteenth century, such as Koch, Reicha, Riemann, and Schenker, whose theory of structural levels enhances a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. As Schenker noted, for a phrase to be considered expanded, we have to hear it with reference to a norm, or "prototype," Schenker's *Vorbild*. Expansion happens when we find additional music *within* a phrase, *before* the cadence; extension, on the other hand, refers to the lengthened music *outside* a phrase, *after* the cadence.[9] For this reason, expansion is not synonymous with coda, which lies outside of the main body of a piece.

---

[8] Charles Burkhart, "Chopin's 'Concluding Expansions,'" in *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music: Essays in Performance and Analysis*, ed. David Witten (New York: Garland, 1997), 96.
[9] Ibid., 95–96.

More recently, phrase expansion has been revisited and revived in music research owing to a rising interest in rhythm theory, most notably by William Rothstein.[10] In his book *Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music*, Rothstein suggests that expansion is not especially prominent in Chopin's music, which largely exhibits regular four-bar or eight-bar phrases. Rather, Chopin uses surface articulation to weaken phrase regularity and voice leading to join phrases together, some of his later works even approaching the "endless melody" so prized in Wagner's music.[11] While Burkhart agrees with Rothstein's observation, he adds that Chopin frequently employs concluding expansions, which are enlargements of the closing phrase of a piece or of a large closed section within a piece. This expanded phrase occurs before the coda, often overlapping with it.[12]

In Schenkerian theory, an expansion is at a lower structural level than the prototype, the norm. As a lengthened version of an earlier phrase, the expanded phrase almost always provides a climactic conclusion and builds up energy for the ensuing coda if there is one. Concluding expansion is used so often by Chopin that Burkhart proposed it as a key stylistic element.[13] For a fuller illustration, we will now turn to Burkhart's analysis

---

[10] William Rothstein, "Rhythm and the Theory of Structural Levels" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1981), Chapter 7; and Rothstein, *Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1989; rpt., Ann Arbor: Musicalia Press, 2007), Chapter 3.

[11] Rothstein, *Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music*, 214–248.

[12] Burkhart refers to coda as an *extension* of the closing tonic, a section that is subordinate to the main body of a composition. See Burkhart, "Chopin's 'Concluding Expansions,'" 115 n4.

[13] Concluding expansion is found in eleven etudes of Chopin: they are Nos. 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 from Op. 10 and Nos. 1, 8, 9, 11, and 12 from Op. 25. For the specific location of the prototype phrase and its expansion in each of these etudes, see Burkhart, "Chopin's 'Concluding Expansions,'" 115 n5. The author also discusses the concluding expansion in the Grande Polonaise Brilliante, Op. 22 and Scherzo No. 2, Op. 31; see Burkhart, "Chopin's 'Concluding Expansions,'" 103–106.

of the Mazurka in A♭ Major, Op. 59/2.[14] Burkhart's detailed analysis removes the need for me to offer my own of this piece.

Mazurka in A♭ Major, Op. 59/2 (1845)

Written in ternary form with a 23-bar coda, Op. 59/2 has a concluding expansion at the end of Section A_2. Example 6-5a shows four segments in the reprise (bars 69–88), which Burkhart terms W, X, Y, and Z.[15] The first three of these segments are four-bar phrases while the last one is the expanded phrase spanning eight bars and overlapping with the beginning of the coda at bar 89. The reprise as a whole comprises "a double parallel period,"[16] in which W-X is a prototype for Y-Z. What causes the expansion in segment Z is a sudden switch to a chromatic progression that first leads the bass up chromatically to E♮, an enharmonic spelling of F♭, then divides the octave into falling major thirds E-C-A♭-F♭ that prolongs ♭VI, which Burkhart reads as the upper third of an expanded subdominant (Example 6-5b).[17] Burkhart states that extreme chromaticism is not uncommon in Chopin's concluding expansions: to heighten the expressiveness, expansion frequently involves highly chromatic music, as if "the 'extra' time (the expansion) is expressed via extra notes in the sense that the chromatics are extra to the more fundamental diatonicism."[18]

In a later article, Burkhart points out that the dive into chromaticism in the concluding expansion of Op. 59/2 almost threatens the "stylistic consistency" of the

---

[14] Ibid., 97–99.
[15] Ibid., 100. Example 6-5a is taken from Burkhart's Example 4.2a.
[16] Ibid., 99.
[17] Ibid., 99–102. Example 6-5b reproduces Burkhart's Example 4.2b-c on p. 101.
[18] Ibid., 99.

mazurka. However, it is acceptable precisely because it takes place within the expansion, the "nonessential" music lying "outside the norm"; had it appeared in the prototype phrase, it would have been "too much."[19] In saying this Burkhart comments that norms of diatonic tonal progression can be stretched most convincingly at the point where the phrases embodying those unusual progressions are also enlarged, thus allowing for a high degree of coordination between tonal organization and phrase rhythm. In passages like this, one can sense some of what Chopin probably learned from his study of earlier composers like Bach and Mozart, who often embedded their most daring progressions within phrase expansions.

Discussing possible classical models for Chopin's concluding expansions, Burkhart proposes that Chopin might have modeled such techniques on passages in classical sonata-form movements, particularly those toward the end of the second theme in the exposition and the reprise,[20] and in the second exposition in the first movement of a concerto where the soloist plays an extended progression leading to the cadential trill.[21] Burkhart's observation tallies well with the discussion by William Caplin of the expanded cadential progression in classical sonata-form movements.[22] Although we might be tempted to include eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century Italian opera—with

---

[19] Charles Burkhart, "The Phrase Rhythm of Chopin's A-flat Mazurka, Op. 59, No. 2," in *Engaging Music: Essays in Music Analysis*, ed. Deborah Stein (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 10.

[20] Burkhart identifies fourteen concluding expansions in the following piano sonatas of Mozart: K. 279/I and II, K. 281/II, K. 283/II and III, K. 309/I, K. 330/III, K. 332/I and II, K. 333/I, K. 457/I, K. 533/I, K. 570/I, and K. 576/I. See Burkhart, "Chopin's 'Concluding Expansions,'" 116 n13.

[21] Ibid., 106.

[22] William E. Caplin, "The 'Expanded Cadential Progression': A Category for the Analysis of Classical Form," *Journal of Musicological Research* 7/2–3 (1987): 216–257.

which Chopin had numerous encounters in Warsaw and especially in Paris—as a possible inspiration for concluding expansions, Burkhart cautions that the stretched endings of arias and finales are often in codas, not concluding expansions that occur within the main body of the piece.[23] He concludes that although Chopin's many student efforts in sonata form reveal certain compositional weaknesses, Chopin still found ways to adapt techniques of the sonata tradition to "the simpler forms that came more naturally to him. It is one way that his music, for all its startling originality, is related to an older tradition."[24]

As mentioned earlier, Caplin is also aware of the phenomenon Burkhart named "concluding expansion," which is equivalent in many cases to what Caplin terms the "expanded cadential progression."[25] Based on the formal theories of Arnold Schoenberg and Erwin Ratz, Caplin's theory explores the expanded cadential progression used particularly to close a loose-knit subordinate theme (second subject) in a classical sonata-form movement. The expanded cadential progression is commonly initiated by an evaded cadence, and it often involves an expanded dominant that delays the tonic arrival. Such expansion of the cadential harmonies at the close of a theme might relate to earlier music, spin out sequences, or even generate new musical ideas; it is often equivalent to what

---

[23] Burkhart, "Chopin's 'Concluding Expansions,'" 116, n15.
[24] Ibid., 114.
[25] Caplin, "The 'Expanded Cadential Progression," 216–257. Janet Schmalfeldt further develops the idea, exploring the "one-more-time" technique, which extends the cadential function and thereby expands the form; see Schmalfeldt, "Cadential Processes: The Evaded Cadence and the 'One More Time' Technique," *Journal of Musicological Research* 12/1–2 (1992): 1–52.

Tovey called a "cadence phrase" or "cadence theme," translated from the German term *Schlussgruppe*.[26] The cadential expansion is also noted by other scholars of classical form such as Charles Rosen and Leonard Ratner. Rosen claims that "the extended cadential gesture was second nature" to the classical composers;[27] for Ratner, the expansion reinforces and extends "an *area* of arrival."[28]

Although Caplin focuses on the expanded cadential progression in the classical sonata-form movement, his idea could be applied to the mazurkas of Chopin. In the Mazurka in A Minor, Op. 59/1, for example, the cadential evasion at bar 114 results in a dominant prolongation that ends only at bar 123, reaching the perfect authentic cadence at bar 130 (Example 3-16 from Chapter 3). A delayed tonic arrival caused by an expanded cadential dominant also appears in two C♯-minor mazurkas: in Op. 30/4, it occurs in bars 124–136, closing at bar 139 (Example 2-9b from Chapter 2); in Op. 50/3, the "standing on the dominant" leads to an extensive two-part expansion (bars 133–181) with the final cadence arriving only at bar 181 (Example 6-4b). On a different note, instead of prolonging the cadential dominant, the Mazurka in B Minor, Op. 33/4 stands on the Phrygian II in bars 185–199 before a perfect authentic cadence arrives at bar 200, forming a similar expansion but with a more remote underlying harmony (Example 6-6).

Obviously, many theorists have noticed an expanded closing phrase as a common compositional practice at the end of a piece, and their studies contribute to Burkhart's

---

[26] Donald Francis Tovey, *The Forms of Music* (New York: Meridian Books, 1956), 210.
[27] Charles Rosen, *Sonata Forms*, rev. ed. (New York: Norton, 1988), 79.
[28] Leonard G. Ratner, *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1980), 46.

study of the "concluding expansion." Schenker's contribution to this topic is especially valuable as it can allow a high degree of precision by allowing the expanded phrase to be measured against an underlying prototype, whether or not that prototype is present earlier in the piece. The case in Op. 59/2 discussed by Burkhart is relatively straightforward, although the voice leading within the expansion is highly advanced; the prototype and the expanded phrases are contiguous. In other cases the two could lie at some distance from each other. Typically, a composition written in three-part form has the prototype phrase concluding Section A_1 and the expanded phrase ending Section A_2. I will demonstrate such writing in two Chopin mazurkas—Opp. 7/3 and 33/4.[29]

Mazurka in F Minor, Op. 7/3 (1830/31)

The initial eight-bar theme of Op. 7/3 returns at bar 85 where Section A_2 begins, restating the opening music and reestablishing the *Kopfton* c^2 (Example 4-3 from Chapter 4). As the middleground graph shows, Section A_2 brings back the neighbor c-d♭-c motive inherited from the introduction.[30] Because Section A_1 (bars 9–24) ends with a perfect authentic cadence in the dominant, the reprise needs a new ending, which enters at bar 99, sustaining a tonic pedal until the mazurka concludes at bar 105. While the *Urlinie* descends, the two-bar closing unit (bars 99–100) is heard two more times in bars 101–105, and only the last statement results in the definitive closure, pushing the top voice to a registral extreme (f^4) over a plagal progression. Since the *Urlinie* descent takes place over a tonic pedal, this mazurka lacks a bass arpeggiation supporting the *Urlinie*'s

[29] For an additional example, see the Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 30/4, the ending of which was discussed in Chapter 2 (Example 2-9b).
[30] See the discussion in Chapter 4 regarding the motivic content of the introduction.

second branch, as explained in Chapter 4. The plagal progression, however, enhances the feeling of closure in the absence of a typical cadential bass line.

Mazurka in B Minor, Op. 33/4 (1837/38)

Op. 33/4 will require a more extensive discussion since it is one of the longest mazurkas, having a rondo-like sectional organization that explores remote tonal regions. Besides having so many sections, the piece is also somewhat unusual as its overall character lends it the narrative quality of a ballad or ballade. I will touch on this aspect of the mazurka at the end of the analysis.

Section A_1 contains two statements of a 24-bar idea and establishes B minor as the home key; Section B_1 (bars 49–64) dives abruptly into the remote key of B♭ major (♭I); after a written-out repeat of Sections A_1 and B_1, a two-part Section C (bars 105–151) extensively prolongs B major, the tonic major; and finally, following a retransition (bars 152–168) that is based on the materials from Section C, an expanded Section A_3 (bars 169–200) concludes the piece in B minor. With each change of tonality comes a change of mood, resembling the narrative quality of a ballade: from the melancholic Section A_1 to the agitated Section B_1, to the two-part Section C—first, *cantabile* (bars 105–136) and then exuberant and joyful (bars 137–151). The original mood prevails in the end, however, as the opening music returns in the final reprise.

Example 6-6 offers a voice-leading analysis of the mazurka.[31] Section A_1 (bars 1–48) comprises a 24-bar period and its restatement. In the antecedent (bars 1–12), the *Kopfton* f♯^{2} descends to an implied c♯^{2} over the half cadence at bar 12 where an interruption occurs. The consequent follows in bars 13–24, restating the first four bars of the antecedent and answering it again in a lower register but now with a different contrasting phrase that tonicizes C major in bars 17–23, supporting c♮^{2} (♮$\hat{2}$) in the upper voice. The phrase ends on a half cadence at bar 24 where an implied c♯^{2} (♯$\hat{2}$) corrects its chromatic counterpart at the interruption.

Except for the last bar, the restatement of the opening 24-bar period is essentially an exact repetition. At bar 48, Chopin rewrites F♯ as G♭, leaving the section tonally open in a new way. G♭ will now become the upper neighbor to F♮, which functions as the enharmonic dominant to the ensuing Section B_1 in B♭ major (♭I). The G♭-F♮ neighbor motive will then dominate the upper voice throughout Section B_1. At the chromatic voice exchange in bars 62–64, G♭ turns back to F♯; Chopin therefore changes F♯ to G♭ to get into Section B_1 and reverses the process to get out of the section. The return of F♯ brings back the initial F♯-G-F♯ neighbor motive, preparing for the upcoming written-out repeat of Sections A_1 and B_1 (bars 65–104).

The dual function of F♯ going up to G in the opening f♯^{2}-g^2-f♯^{2} neighbor motive (bars 1–2) and down to f♮ during the tonicization of C major (bars 13–22) and the

[31] Measure numbers in Example 6-6 follow those in the *National Edition*, not the Henle edition. The editors of the *National Edition* follow copies owned by Chopin's pupils in which the repetition beginning at bar 65 restates bars 25–48 rather than 1–48, as in the Henle edition. Users of the Henle edition will need to add 24 to all the measure numbers in Example 6-6 from bar 89 on.

reinterpretation of F♯ as G♭ (bars 48 and Section B) are the principal chromatic elements of the mazurka. In the first part of the two-part Section C, the music explores this chromatic idea further: the opening f♯^{2}-g^2-f♯^{2} motive is transformed first into f♯^{2}-g♯^{2} (bars 105–106) in the local key of B major via a chromatic passing tone, f𝄪^{2}, bringing G♮ back in enharmonic form. This F♯-(F𝄪)-G♯ idea is repeated immediately in the bass in bars 107–109 before the top voice presents its descending version, G♯-F𝄪-F♯ in bars 110–112. Moreover, on a higher level, the initial F♯-G-F♯ motive comes back as F♯-F𝄪-F♯ in bars 105–113 with the neighbor note F𝄪 supported by a D♯-major triad at bar 112. Although F𝄪, the enharmonic ♭$\hat{6}$, is a chromatic passing tone in the foreground, it almost refers back to Section B_1, which also uses the same scale degree in the form of G♭-F in the local key of B♭ major.

The second part of Section C, beginning at bar 137, remains in B major. There is an abrupt and exuberant shift to the high register in *forte*, and suddenly the music becomes almost completely diatonic, contrasting with the dense chromaticism in the earlier section. The dramatic change of mood, the introduction of high register, and the use of G♯ celebrate B major with minimal chromaticism. The upper neighbor motive remains as a common element, however, now expressed as F♯-G♯, and Chopin also brings back other ideas from earlier sections, such as the statement-answer gesture in different registers from Section A_1 and the dotted rhythm figure from Section B_1. In developing these earlier ideas all in the tonic major, Section C thus serves to unify the mazurka.

In the retransition (bars 152–168), Chopin changes course unexpectedly, as if changing his mind, dropping the melody into the same low register as the one in the

C-major passage within the opening section. At a time when the newly celebrated f♯-g♯ motive seems so firmly established, f♯-g♮ returns ominously in bars 162–168. Meanwhile, a third-progression forms in the single line of this retransition, changing d♯ to d♮, reestablishing B minor at bar 164. With the return of the home key and the repetitive emphasis on g♮, the retransition leads to Section A_3 (bars 169–200), the final restatement of the opening section with an expansion starting at bar 191.

Section A_3 reestablishes the opening $f♯^2$-g^2-$f♯^2$ neighbor motive and the C♮-C♯ conflict from before. After a middleground interruption at bar 180, the *Urlinie* begins its final descent, only to arrive at c♮ over a C-major triad at bar 185, as it did in Section A_1.[32] This time, however, a new ending (bars 191–200) prolongs C major even further, isolating and repeating the falling fifths, g^1-$c♮^1$. Both G and C♮ have been important members of the $f♯^2$-g^2-$f♯^2$ motive and the C♮-C♯ conflict, and Chopin highlights these two notes emphatically in the final bars of the mazurka by reducing everything to just these two notes. Just as in the retransition where the f♯-g♯ motive in B major seems to prevail, here the music seems to want to rest on C major, the Neapolitan key. However, Chopin once again reintroduces B minor at the last bar, similar to the way he does toward the end of the retransition when f♯-g♮ returns and reestablishes B minor. Here, we only hear the grim return of B minor in the last bar. In the top voice, $c♯^1$ finally replaces its chromatic counterpart $c♮^1$, ending the *Urlinie* and concluding the mazurka with a perfect authentic cadence in the home key as the final dominant-tonic (F♯-B) answers the falling fifth c-g.

[32] For clarity of voice leading, I normalized the register in the upper voice in my graph.

Although the closing gesture of the last two bars might not seem convincing because of its abruptness and the strong Neapolitan harmony that precedes it, this distinctive ending captures the essence of the mazurka by prolonging the tension of the C♯-C♮ conflict and pairing it with G, the neighbor note from the F♯-G-F♯ motive that organized so much activity in the top voice. As Schenker points out, "the special effect of this whole Mazurka depends upon the following fact: that the tension of ♮$\hat{2}$ persists until the last bar, where the diatonic $\hat{2}$ finally appears."[33] This poetic quality is also observed by Wilhelm von Lenz, a Russian music writer who studied with Liszt and also met Chopin:

> This piece is a *Ballade* in all but name. Chopin himself taught it as such, stressing the narrative character of this highly developed piece, with its ravishing trio [B major: bars 129ff]. At the very end a bell tolls a heavy bass carillon G–C–G–C—and the sudden arrival of the final chords sweeps away the cohort of ghosts, Chopin would say.[34]

My analysis of chromaticism and motivic organization confirms the narrative quality noted by Lenz. For it is the aspects of motivic repetition and tonal contrast highlighted in the voice-leading analysis that help lend each section a particular character and impart to the sequence of sections the quality of a ballad with a refrain, yielding patterns that we as listeners can identify with in a variety of different story lines, or simply with the idea of storytelling as such.

---

[33] Schenker, *Free Composition*, 71 and Fig. 74,2.

[34] Wilhelm von Lenz, "Übersichtliche Beurtheilung der Pianoforte-Kompositionen von Chopin," *Neue Berliner Musikzeitung* 26/37 (1872): 291; cited in Jean-Jacques Eigeldinger, *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher as Seen by His Pupils*, ed. Roy Howat, trans. Krysia Osostowicz and Naomi Shohet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 75. Eigeldinger suggests that this stanzaic mazurka probably relates more to a poetic ballad than a ballade; ibid., 150 n180.

Expansion

Concluding expansion, as just described, is common in Chopin's music, but the category does not cover works having a regular expanded section attached to the reprise. In addition to the concluding expansion, which affects the closing phrase, expansion often includes an extensive passage either introducing new musical ideas or developing former ones, as in Opp. 50/3 and 56/3.

Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 50/3 (1841/42)

The motivic B♯-B♮ and F♯-F𝄪 clashes return in the reprise of Op. 50/3 as the music literally repeats the first two parts of the three-part Section A_1 (bars 1–44), which was left tonally open (Example 6-4a).[35] The final part of the reprise (bars 125–181), needing to bring a closure in C♯ minor, cannot be a simple restatement of the last part of Section A_1 which ends on the dominant at bar 44. After the "subject" returns over the dominant harmony at bar 125, the music drives toward a two-part expansion, which begins at bar 133 (Example 6-4b). Based on the melodic idea from bars 9–12, the first part of the expansion (bars 133–157) generously extends the dominant and finally confirms the tonic at the cadence in bar 157, although Chopin weakens the tonic resolution by placing $\hat{4}$–$\hat{3}$ in the top voice. The *Urlinie* attempts to descend in bars 153–157 as $f♯^1$ and e^1 appear over the dominant-tonic progression. The definitive descent, however, does not begin until later, at bar 161, where $f♯^1$ appears over the pre-dominant harmony.

The second part of the expansion (bars 157–181) presents the most intense chromaticism of Op. 50/3. To use Rosen's words, the music here shows "Chopin's

[35] See Chapter 2 and Example 2-8a for the motivic organization of this mazurka.

harmony at its most masterly," and "Wagner was to be heavily in debt to passages such as this."[36] The music features two cycles of an ascending-third sequence D-F-G♯-B-D that completely divides the octave and prolongs a D-major triad (Phrygian II), the pre-dominant. The D♮-D♯ struggle remains throughout the sequence, but D♯ finally negates the Phrygian $\hat{2}$ at bar 172, just before the climactic cadential $V^{8}_{6\,4}$ arrives, a voicing Chopin often reserves for dominants that carry the greatest structural and rhetorical weight. In the following bar, the structural V^{6}_{4} supports e^2 in the inner voice, covered by $g♯^2$ that is elaborately embellished by its upper and lower neighbors that highlight F𝄪 for the last time. B♯ prevails, and the prolonged e^2 and the cadential V^{6}_{4} resolve to $d♯^2$ and the dominant seventh chord at bar 180, leading to the closing tonic at the ensuing bar where the *Urlinie* descent is completed.

In his analysis of Op. 50/3, Carl Schachter identifies a three-phase closing group in the reprise: the first two phases correspond to my two-part expansion, and the last phase is the 12-bar coda. For Schachter, the closing group "gives the impression of a commentary on the dance, quoting its most significant elements, but placing them in a new light."[37] In other words, although Chopin draws on the "subject" and the scalar passage of Section A_1, the music in the reprise appears in a grander fashion via expansion and an eruption of chromaticism. With reference to the second phase, the "Tristan music," Schachter claims

---

[36] Charles Rosen, "Chopin: From the Miniature Genre to the Sublime Style," in *The Romantic Generation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), 438–439.
[37] Carl Schachter, "Counterpoint and Chromaticism in Chopin's Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Opus 50, Number 3," *Ostinato rigore: Revue internationale d'études musicales* 15 (2000): 130.

> Chopin's ability to integrate even his most extreme chromatic passages into the surrounding compositional fabric is . . . unmatched by any composer of his time; . . . one aspect of this integration is the quasimotivic use of characteristic and piece-specific chromatic sounds. Here, the characteristic sound is, of course, F𝄪 /G♮.[38]

Indeed, F𝄪 and G♮ appear in almost every bar of this section. The enharmonic play ends at bar 173 where the cadential V_4^6 chord arrives; F𝄪, the first chromatic note of this mazurka, rectifies G♮, its enharmonic form, and continues its function as the lower neighbor to $\hat{5}$ until being corrected by F♯ over the dominant seventh chord at bar 180. We will see in Chapter 7 that while the coda quotes the initial "subject," F𝄪 never returns.

Mazurka in C Minor, Op. 56/3 (1843)

In Op. 56/3, Section A_1 (bars 1–48) begins with an auxiliary progression, reaching the *Kopfton* e♭^{2} and the tonic triad at bar 2 (Example 4-6 from Chapter 4). The opening statement is answered down a fourth, arriving at a half cadence at bar 9. A further repetition of the initial music follows immediately but appears an octave lower to allow for greater melodic range, resulting in a coupling. The expected answer never comes; rather, the music rests on a D-minor pedal, juxtaposing C♯ and C♮. When the music reaches the half cadence at bar 23, the *Urlinie* had attempted two descents, both being interrupted. An exact repetition of the first 22 bars follows. However, the pedal on the pre-dominant harmony in bars 38–48 stops short of the dominant. Section A_1 therefore remains tonally open as it concludes on $\hat{2}$ over the D-minor pedal, which functions as the upper third of the ensuing Section B (bars 73–134) that features B♭ $\frac{\text{major}}{\text{minor}}$ as its local key (Example 3-11 from Chapter 3).

---

[38] Ibid., 131.

After the interruption of the *Urlinie*, Section A_2 (bars 137–189) reestablishes the *Kopfton* over the tonic harmony at bar 138 (Example 6-7). It repeats bars 1–36 of the tonally open Section A_1; as before, it encounters multiple failures in completing a third-progression. In order to achieve tonal closure, Chopin has to provide a new ending in C minor. Indeed, the *Kopfton* returns yet again at bar 170 over the tonic triad, initiating an expansion three bars later where the bass begins a chromatic descent f-e♭-d♭-c-B♮ and arrives at bar 181 at B♭ (♭VII), the upper third of the upcoming structural dominant. The subtonic harmony recalls the substantial B♭-$\frac{\text{major}}{\text{minor}}$ Section B, where the juxtaposition of local $\hat{3}$ (d♮^{2}) in the B♭-major outer parts (bars 73–88 and 121–134) and its inflection d♭^{2} in the B♭-minor middle part (bars 89–121) (Example 3-11 from Chapter 3) provides a resource for later developments in the reprise and the coda (bars 189–220).

Rosen regards this mazurka as "one of the most daring and original . . . in harmony, texture, and phrase structure,"[39] and the contrapuntal and chromatic writing in the expansion (bars 173–189) is likely to be "of great help to Wagner."[40] Jim Samson also comments that the expansion represents an "almost Wagnerian enharmony and contrapuntal intricacies."[41] In the final bars of Section A_2, although both the subtonic and the dominant harmonies support the structural $\hat{2}$, the music picks up the Phrygian $\hat{2}$ (d♭^{2}) from Section B and the C♯-C♮ conflict from bars 14–22, respelling C♯ as D♭ in bars 185–186. D♮ finally rectifies D♭ at bar 188 over the dominant seventh chord, and C♮ claims its victory at the perfect authentic cadence in the following bar where the *Ursatz* is

[39] Rosen, "Chopin: From the Miniature Genre to the Sublime Style," 439.
[40] Ibid., 445.
[41] Jim Samson, *Chopin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 223.

completed with a Picardy third. The mazurka continues with an elaborate coda, which will be discussed in Chapter 7.

Recomposition of the Tonally Closed Section A_1

The expansions discussed so far concern mazurkas that have a tonally open Section A_1 that requires a varied reprise to achieve tonal closure. For mazurkas with a tonally closed opening section, however, Chopin occasionally writes an expanded reprise, as in the Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 41/4 (Example 3-14 from Chapter 3) and the Mazurka in A Minor, Op. 59/1 (Example 3-16 from Chapter 3). Since both pieces have been discussed in Chapter 3, I will refrain from repeating my analyses here except for noting that while not necessary, these reprises are rewritten for aesthetic purposes.

Conclusion

The mazurkas of Chopin are often conventional in their formal design, most following the traditional three-part structure. While some restate the opening section literally in the reprise, others modify earlier music either to avoid exact repetition or to achieve tonal closure. Surface changes of dynamics, register, texture, and melodic embellishments are common, providing variety and fulfilling expressive and aesthetic purposes. On the other hand, structural changes of tonal organization and motivic material cause functional differences that often call for a reinterpretation of earlier music or the introduction of a concluding expansion or an expansion proper, reinforcing and also developing former musical ideas. For Rosen, the expansion in Chopin's mazurka is

> a new section, which spins out the material into new forms, sometimes by an imitation of Classical development technique, at other times by forming

> new melodies with the motifs or by finding new motifs related in character. In a sense, Chopin does not properly expand the small forms, he adds to them, extends them. These additions—transitional passages or codas—are most often free in style and openly contrapuntal in texture, sometimes elaborately so. What keeps the large structure from falling apart is Chopin's art of blurring the frontiers between different sections, and his unfailing sense of polyphonic continuity, above all the rich continuity of the inner voices which is the hallmark of his style.[42]

Rosen views the long coda as Chopin's main innovation to the mazurka genre, providing "a kind of free contrapuntal meditation on the previous material" and thereby "transforms the short, conventional form into a more imposing work." We will look at this "most personal invention" of Chopin in the next chapter.

[42] Rosen, "Chopin: From the Miniature Genre to the Sublime Style," 453.

Chapter 7

Codas

"Coda," which stems from the Latin word "cauda," is the Italian word for "tail."[1] It is a section that brings final closure to a work of music or literature. Although musicians tend to associate codas and closure with musical elements of melody, harmony, rhythm, and the like, closure is no less discussed in literary criticism. According to Don Fowler, in modern criticism, closure refers to:

1. the concluding section of a literary work;
2. the process by which the reader of a work comes to see the end as satisfyingly final;
3. the degree to which an ending is satisfyingly final;
4. the degree to which the questions posed in the work are answered, tension released, conflicts resolved;
5. the degree to which the work allows new critical readings.[2]

These criteria could apply equally well to musical works, where bringing a "satisfyingly final" ending, answering questions, releasing tension and resolving conflicts, and "allowing new critical readings" may serve crucial technical and aesthetic purposes. One might expect, therefore, that scholars would have directed significant

---

[1] David Smyth provides a detailed etymology of the word "coda" in his dissertation. See Smyth, "Codas in Classical Form: Aspects of Large-Scale Rhythm and Pattern" (Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1985), 7–14.

[2] Don Fowler, "Second Thoughts on Closure," in *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*, ed. Deborah H. Roberts, Francis M. Dunn, and Don Fowler (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 3.

attention to codas, and indeed a few such studies have appeared, but even so, not enough effort has been invested in the study of this closing section. In fact, even the definition of coda itself is often variable, and is often confused with the term "codetta." It will be helpful to consider some of these discussions to arrive at a view that will serve the purposes of this dissertation, since codas appear frequently and with a variety of functions in the Chopin mazurkas.

In *Grove Music Online*, Roger Bullivant defines coda as

> the last part of a piece or melody, the implication being of some addition being made to a standard form or design. . . . The most important use of the term 'coda' is in sonata form, where it refers to anything occurring after the end of the recapitulation (but not to an expansion within the recapitulation before its original codetta or closing is reached).[3]

To supplement Bullivant's definition, James Webster adds "in rhythmic terms, the coda has been called a gigantic 'afterbeat' to the form as a whole."[4] Arnold Schoenberg also held that a coda is "extrinisic," lying outside the essential body of a composition:

> Since many movements have no codas, it is evident that the coda must be considered as an extrinsic addition. . . . In fact, it would be difficult to give any other reason for the addition of a coda than that the composer wants to say something more.[5]

The theorist whose work most informs this entire dissertation, Schenker, defines the coda based on the background structure. In contrast to form-related definitions like the

---

[3] Roger Bullivant, "Coda," in *Grove Music Online*, accessed 9 February 2010.
[4] James Webster, "Sonata Form," in *Grove Music Online*, accessed 11 March 2010.
[5] Arnold Schoenberg, *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*, ed. Gerald Strang (London: Faber, 1967), 185.

one given in *Grove Music Online*, Schenker's view regards the coda as similar to its literal meaning, "tail." For Schenker,

> the middleground and background . . . determine the definitive close of a composition. With the arrival of î the work is at an end. Whatever follows this can only be a reinforcement of the close—a coda—no matter what its extent or purpose may be.[6]

In other words, a piece achieves its structural conclusion when the *Ursatz* is completed; coda is only a foreground phenomenon in Schenkerian analysis, a suffix extending a closure already reached with the completion of the *Ursatz*.

As I pointed out earlier, a common misconception about the coda is that it is interchangeable with codetta. To distinguish between these two terms, Paul M. Walker sees codetta as "a brief coda. . . . A short conclusion to a movement or piece."[7] It would be rather difficult to determine the precise extent of "brief" or "short" in Walker's definition; he leaves it to context. William E. Caplin dissents, making clear that a codetta is *not* a small coda. In Caplin's useful distinction, a coda is a relatively large unit comparable to an exposition, development, and recapitulation, comprising one or more themes each ending with a perfect authentic cadence, while a codetta, which may attach to any theme, not just the final one, is a relatively small unit rarely exceeding four bars in length and simply prolonging the root-position tonic by circling around î. In his monumental work on formal function, Caplin calls coda an optional section following the

---

[6] Heinrich Schenker, *Free Composition*, trans. and ed. Ernst Oster (New York: Longman, 1979; rpt., Ann Arbor: Musicalia Press, 2001), 129.
[7] Paul M. Walker, "Codetta," in *Grove Music Online*, accessed 9 February 2010.

fundamental melodic, harmonic, and tonal closures of the recapitulation, a view that accords with Schenker's.[8]

While the definitions of coda often refer to classical sonata theory, the idea can nonetheless be applied to Chopin's mazurkas, most of which are written in ternary form. In this chapter, coda refers to "structural coda";[9] that is, it is a concluding section after the *Urlinie* descent and the structural cadence, as in Schenker's view cited above.

The State of Research on Codas

As we have seen in the various definitions, a coda is commonly taken to be something extrinsic and therefore not as essential to composition. It is, however, unthinkable to omit a coda in a performance. Why then would it seem permissible to stop an analysis at the end of the reprise, a common practice held by many music analysts? The answer seems to lie in the fact that closure in music is often considered synonymous with tonal closure: in Schenkerian terms, when the *Ursatz* is completed, the main tonal action of a composition is considered finished. This concept, though true in one sense, carries the danger of causing us to overlook closures in other aspects of music that often take place in the coda, such as motive and tonal tension. While tonal closure is of undeniable significance, the

---

[8] William E. Caplin, *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 179.

[9] Esther Cavett-Dunsby first devises the term "structural coda" in Cavett-Dunsby, "Mozart's Codas," *Music Analysis* 7/1 (1988): 31–51.

awareness of closures in secondary musical elements often brings crucial insights into the overall understanding of a piece.[10]

To account for the considerable neglect codas have suffered in music research, Joseph Kerman and Esther Cavett-Dunsby suggest that coda, unlike exposition and development, lacks a common definition and function.[11] According to Kerman, traditional sonata-form theory

> breaks down completely at the coda. . . . one simply cannot find a common function for codas, as one can for expositions, developments, and recapitulations, over the 150-year history of sonata form. That is why in the technical language of sonata form 'coda' is the one term that does not refer (however imperfectly) to a musical function, but merely to a position.[12]

In her research on Mozart's codas, Cavett-Dunsby proposes that the coda, besides recasting melodic and harmonic materials, serves to highlight motivic and poetic ideas and bring resolution and registral completion, a phenomenon sometimes comparable to Schenker's obligatory register. She also observes that a coda can anticipate later music in a multi-movement work.[13] In her critique of unjust attitudes toward codas, Cavett-Dunsby writes:

> We all know that what bothers us most about a difficult conversation is not how it begins but how it ends. And our enjoyment of a detective story is largely conditioned by not knowing 'who dunnit' until the final pages. . . . Given our everyday preoccupation with conclusions, the

---

[10] Anson-Cartwright, "Concepts of Closure in Tonal Music: A Critical Study," *Theory and Practice* 32 (2007): 6.
[11] Joseph Kerman, "Notes on Beethoven's Codas," in *Beethoven Studies* 3, ed. Alan Tyson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1982), 141; Cavett-Dunsby, "Mozart's Codas," 32.
[12] Kerman, "Notes on Beethoven's Codas," 141.
[13] Cavett-Dunsby, "Mozart's Codas," 31–51.

> predilection of music theorists for dealing with the opening of movements and how they continue is curious. Schenker was notorious in this respect. He dealt with three kinds of beginnings: stepwise ascent, arpeggiation[,] and overlapping. But he never proposed a theory of what happens after the Fundamental Structure closes. . . . Yet the very term 'coda' is in a sense pejorative, since it carries the connotation of a surplus or even gratuitous kind of composition. It was Schoenberg who taught us that the very first notes written by a composer ought to be taken seriously by theorists. But it was Schenker who, perhaps unwittingly, influenced us not to look too carefully at the very last notes, though there is not a shred of evidence that these last notes are written, or listened to, with any less care than the first.[14]

Such a charge against Schenker and his followers may contain a grain of truth, but the same could also be said of almost all music theorists. As Robert G. Hopkins notes, music scholars should be cautioned against thinking codas as extraneous:

> Viewing a coda as whatever follows the end of the recapitulation invites the attitude that the coda is always an appendage to the movement proper—that it is something of an after-thought, a superfluous attachment.[15]

Even Charles Rosen, a distinguished music scholar of the Classical style, once fell short when it comes to the study of codas. Following Kerman's disappointment over the little discussion of codas in Rosen's *Sonata Forms*,[16] a new chapter on codas was added to the revised edition,[17] in which the author says "the purpose of a coda is, if we take a common-sense attitude, to add weight and seriousness: like an introduction, it promotes dignity."[18]

---

[14] Ibid., 47.
[15] Robert G. Hopkins, "When a Coda is More than a Coda: Reflections on Beethoven," in *Explorations in Music, the Arts, and Ideas: Essays in Honor of Leonard B. Meyer*, ed. Eugene Narmour and Ruth A. Solie (Stuyvesant, N.Y.: Pendragon, 1988), 393.
[16] Charles Rosen, *Sonata Forms* (New York, Norton, 1980).
[17] Rosen, *Sonata Forms*, rev. ed. (New York: Norton, 1988), 297–352.
[18] Ibid., 304.

Dignity—"the quality or state of being worthy, honored, or esteemed"[19]—is exactly what the coda deserves. Like the exposition, development, and recapitulation, the coda should be considered a vital section of a composition worthy of our exploration, especially because "the structural significance of codas is not well understood."[20] Thus far only Beethoven's codas have enjoyed significant attention as topics in their own right,[21] probably because Beethoven is considered to have given the coda an important role and weight in his sonata-form movements, treating the coda not merely as an extension or conclusion but as an integral part of a piece's structure, providing thematic and harmonic completion, final recapitulation, and tonal resolution. As Kerman correctly points out:

> Again and again there seems to be some kind of instability, discontinuity, or thrust in the first theme which is removed in the coda. The aberration may be linear, harmonic, rhythmic, registral, or textural, but in any case the coda has a function over and above that of 'saturating the ear with the tonic chord,' in Rosen's phrase.[22] In addition to this harmonic function it has a thematic function that can be described or, rather, suggested by words such as 'normalisation,' 'resolution,' 'expansion,' 'release,' 'completion,' and 'fulfillment.' . . . With Beethoven a sonata-form movement is also 'the story of a theme'—the first theme—and the exciting last chapter of that story is told in the coda.[23]

---

[19] *Merriam-Webster Online*, accessed 10 April 2010.
[20] Webster, "Sonata Form."
[21] To name a few: Kerman, "Notes on Beethoven's Codas"; Hopkins, "When a Coda is More than a Coda"; and Robert P. Morgan, "Coda as Culmination: The First Movement of the 'Eroica' Symphony," in *Music Theory and the Exploration of the Past*, ed. Christopher Hatch and David W. Bernstein (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 357–376.
[22] Rosen, *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven* (New York: Norton, 1971), 394.
[23] Kerman, "Notes on Beethoven's Codas," 149–150.

Understanding the significance and necessity of Beethoven's codas could aid our appreciation of codas in later nineteenth-century music, including those in the Chopin mazurkas that are also indispensible in the overall form. My goal in this chapter is to show that Chopin's codas, in addition to bringing a final closure to a mazurka, also function as "much more than mere appendices or epilogues."[24]

Summary of Earlier Music and Resolution of Tonal Conflicts

Acknowledging the need for attention to codas is really only a first step, since a coda can serve many compositional purposes that differ from piece to piece. In their discussion of codas, Rosen, Kerman, and Robert P. Morgan describe them, respectively, as settling "unfinished business,"[25] bringing "thematic completion,"[26] and attaining "culmination"[27] of the work. According to Caplin's theory of formal function, coda has a post-cadential, "after-the-end" function since formal and structural closures have already been achieved, but Caplin also agrees with Schoenberg's idea that a coda enables the composer "to say something more." In this sense, the coda exerts "compensatory functions" in which "the composer can make up for events or procedures that were not fully treated in the main body of the movement," such as recalling earlier thematic ideas and fulfilling the implications left unrealized in earlier music.[28] In a later article, Caplin suggests that codas are generally motivated by

---

[24] Anson-Cartwright, "Concepts of Closure in Tonal Music," 6.
[25] Rosen, *Sonata Forms*, rev. ed., 324.
[26] Kerman, "Notes on Beethoven's Codas," 151.
[27] Morgan, "Coda as Culmination," 357–376.
[28] Caplin, *Classical Form*, 179.

> the need either to dissipate the energy accumulated in the process of achieving the end or to sustain (or even to boost) such energy in order to reinforce the sense of arrival. . . . [Often, the use of coda avoids] an overly abrupt cessation of musical activity at the moment of cadential arrival" by confirming, reinforcing, or emphasizing the structural cadence.[29]

Caplin's view is therefore in accordance with those of Rosen, Kerman, and Morgan, perceiving the coda as a response to earlier musical events.

Regarding Chopin's codas in particular, Jeffrey Kallberg claims that the composer expresses in his codas a need "to establish a structural link with the body of the mazurka—here the similarities in their melodic formations—in order to function most effectively."[30] He also notices a momentary increase in tension in the codas of Chopin's mazurkas, often with a reinterpretation or development of earlier musical ideas, adding considerable length to these works.[31] In addition, Kallberg proposes that codas may serve an intra-opus function to culminate a particular collection of mazurkas:

> Chopin in fact deploys his codas with careful attention to their position within the opus. Specifically, Chopin tends to reserve his most complex and musically significant codas for the concluding numbers of opuses. In eight of the eleven published sets, the final number presents either the only coda of the opus or a coda at once more developmental and more crucial to the balance of the work than one in any number preceding it.[32]

---

[29] Caplin, "The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57/1 (2004): 90.
[30] Jeffrey Kallberg, "The Problem of Repetition and Return in Chopin's Mazurkas," in *Chopin Studies*, ed. Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 21.
[31] Kallberg, "Compatibility in Chopin's Multipartite Publications," *The Journal of Musicology* 2/4 (1983): 404.
[32] Ibid., 407. The three sets of mazurka deviating from this trend are Opp. 6, 7, and 33. Kallberg still holds this opinion in his later article titled "Hearing Poland: Chopin and Nationalism," in *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music*, 2nd ed., ed. R. Larry Todd (New York: Routledge, 2004), 225–227.

Peter Gibeau takes an analytical approach similar to Kallberg's, but his findings show that only four sets of mazurkas have the longest coda in their concluding numbers: Opp. 6, 17, 24, and 56. Gibeau's study thus disagrees with Kallberg's (Example 7-1).[33] My analyses, however, do not follow the approach Kallberg and Gibeau used; rather than studying the significance of the ordering of mazurkas within an opus, I examine the coda in each of the chosen mazurkas individually to reveal how coda contributes to an organic whole.

Structural Coda vs. Formal Coda

A useful distinction drawn by John Rink is that between "structural coda," the post-closure type described by Schenker, and what Rink terms a "formal coda," which occurs before the structural î and introduces new material to a recapitulation. Such a "formal coda" is best regarded as an expansion or extension that typically prepares and highlights the structural cadence.[34] While these definitions might be clear enough, in practice scholars may disagree on which type of function any particular coda might serve, given that codas may assume a large share of the burden of bringing a work to a close. Rink's analysis of Chopin's Nocturne in E♭ Major, Op. 9/2 provides a case in point.

---

[33] Peter Gibeau, "Chromaticism as a Middleground Phenomenon in Selected Mazurkas of Chopin" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin–Madison, 1992), 106, Table 3. Example 7-1 is a copy of Gibeau's Table 3.

[34] John Rink, "'Structural Momentum' and Closure in Chopin's Op. 9, No. 2," in *Schenker Studies* 2, ed. Carl Schachter and Hedi Siegel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 112–113. Chapter 6 discussed examples of formal codas, which I refer to as expansion or what Charles Burkhart named "concluding expansion." See Burkhart, "Chopin's 'Concluding Expansions,'" in *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music: Essays in Performance and Analysis*, ed. David Witten (New York: Garland, 1997), 95–116.

In his analysis of Op. 9/2, Rink offers a strong argument for where the "structural coda" begins, questioning Schenker's readings of the nocturne. He challenges the implication Schenker conveyed by leaving the staves empty after the completion of the *Urlinie* descent at bar 24, an implication that the ten-bar coda has no structural function (Example 7-2a).[35] Rink claims, contrary to Schenker, that the structural conclusion does not arrive in the reprise of this three-part nocturne, in part because the cadence is metrically unaccented but also because a ten-bar coda within a twenty-four-bar main body results in a formal imbalance atypical of Chopin. Although the last ten bars might begin as a coda, Rink claims they do not continue the way a coda would. He goes on to explain this ambiguity:

> Chopin as it were "deceives" us into hearing the beginning of a structural coda, but then thwarts the anticipation of imminent closure when the music suddenly takes a new direction, in what retrospectively is perceived as no more—and no less—than a *formal* coda (to repeat, a final passage within the main body of a work, before the structural descent). . . . A two-bar structural coda then follows in bars 33–34.[36]

To bolster his interpretation, Rink emphasizes that the expressive markings of *poco rubato*, *sempre* ***pp***, *dolcissimo*, *con forza*, *stretto*, *fortissimo*, fermata, and *senza tempo*, as well as the use of a registral peak, show the forward-driving music after bar 24. He places the structural closure only at bar 33, followed by a two-bar "structural coda."[37]

---

[35] Schenker, "Further Consideration of the Urlinie: II," in *The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook*, vol. 2 (1926), ed. William Drabkin, trans. John Rothgeb (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 5, Fig. 8. See also Schenker, *Free Composition*, Fig. 84. Schenker's analyses are reproduced in Example 7-2a.
[36] Rink, "'Structural Momentum,'" 114.
[37] Ibid., 110, 113–116.

Rink puts forward a convincing analysis of the structural continuation of the nocturne through bar 33, improving on Schenker's reading and also emphasizing the ambiguous quality of the piece's seeming closure at bar 24 (Example 7-2b).[38] Essentially, the "formal coda" (expansion) begins at bar 24 while the "structural coda" begins at bar 33. From this we can conclude that while structural and formal closures often coincide, they need not occur simultaneously, as in this nocturne.[39] For Rink, a "formal coda" in Chopin's music that introduces new ideas into the recapitulation before the structural î arrives is better considered based on the specific "contextual function," such as "expansion, extension, generation of momentum, peroration, and so forth."[40] I hold the same view in this dissertation and therefore all the codas discussed in this chapter are "structural codas," referred to simply as "coda" hereafter. As mentioned earlier, Rink's "formal codas" were discussed in Chapter 6 in the context of expanded reprises.

Analyses

The codas of seven mazurkas are analyzed below to demonstrate how Chopin recasts earlier music and resolves tonal conflicts in these final sections. Four of these codas have been discussed in previous chapters: the Mazurka in A Minor, Op. 17/4; the Mazurka in C Major, Op. 24/2; the Mazurka in E Minor, Op. 41/1; and the Mazurka in G Major, Op. 50/1. The codas of the remaining three mazurkas—the Mazurka in C♯ Minor,

[38] Example 7-2b is taken from Rink's Example 5 on p. 119.
[39] Anson-Cartwright, "Concepts of Closure in Tonal Music," 5.
[40] Rink, "'Structural Momentum,'" 113.

Op. 50/3; the Mazurka in B Major, Op. 56/1; and the Mazurka in C Minor, Op. 56/3—have not been previously discussed and will therefore be fully considered in this chapter.

Mazurka in A Minor, Op. 17/4 (1833/34)

In Chapters 2 and 4, I discussed the motivic organization of Op. 17/4 with reference to David Beach's analysis of the work,[41] showing how the coda (bars 108–132) displays chromaticism and the ascending-third motive B-C-D inherent in earlier music and quotes the four-bar introduction as a postlude to conclude the piece (Example 2-3 from Chapter 2). Chopin's use of the introduction as the mazurka's last phrase makes the work "an ideal Romantic fragment: complete and provocative, well-rounded and yet open."[42] Complete and well-rounded, for the mazurka ends with the music of the introduction on a tonic pedal over A; provocative and open, for the lack of a root-position A-minor triad at bar 132 alluded to a possible tonal ambiguity. William Thomson shares a similar interpretation of the final cadence, which provides

> one of the most provocative endings in all music history, the capping ambiguity of all. The unquestionable finality of A minor, driven home in measures 124–128 is enigmatically displaced by the sound of an F major triad in first inversion. And thus Chopin's brief little piece fades back into the ambiguous haze from which it emerged.[43]

---

[41] David Beach, "Chopin's Mazurka, Op. 17, No. 4," *Theory and Practice* 2/3 (1977): 12–16.
[42] Rosen, "Chopin: From the Miniature Genre to the Sublime Style," in *The Romantic Generation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995), 419.
[43] William Thomson, "Functional Ambiguity in Musical Structures," *Music Perception* 1/1 (Fall 1983): 23.

Mazurka in C Major, Op. 24/2 (1834/35)

Chapters 4 and 5 described Op. 24/2 as an extreme case that illustrates how a tonal rivalry latent in the introduction plays out later in the piece. The alternating C-major and G-major triads cause an initial tonal uncertainty by allowing two possible readings: if we hear a tonic-dominant progression in C major, the introduction succeeds in defining the tonality of the mazurka; on the other hand, if we hear a subdominant-tonic progression in G major, the tonic status of C major is being challenged (Example 4-7a from Chapter 4). As I noted earlier, Chopin continues to suggest different hearings of the C-major triads, which appears as the tonic or the subdominant in the introduction, the mediant in the opening Aeolian theme (bars 5–12), and the dominant in the Lydian passage in Section B (bars 21–36).

In the coda (bars 105–120), the tonic-dominant and tonic-subdominant polarity is summarized. Chopin not only brings back the music of the introduction but also gives us a subdominant version of it, recapping the harmonic rivalry (Example 4-7c from Chapter 4). By this point, however, we know that the C-major triads represent the tonic and that the coda serves to prolong and confirm C major through the repetitive plagal and tonic-dominant motion, finally settling on the home key at the end of the coda. Even so, the coda provides a retrospective look at one of the key issues that organized the piece as a whole.

Mazurka in E Minor, Op. 41/1 (1838)

I demonstrated in Chapters 2 and 4 how the initial fifth relationship between the E-minor and A-minor harmonies develops in Op. 41/1. The piece expresses a sense of tonal ambiguity at its outset: is the initial chord tonic or dominant (Example 2-7a from Chapter 2)? The A-minor triad, heard in retrospect as the subdominant, and the persistent Phrygian $\hat{2}$ both suggest a possible A-minor tonic that threatens the tonic status of E minor; even Chopin himself wavered, first naming A minor the tonic and then changing to E minor.[44] The final descent over a plagal progression creates further tonal unsettledness (Example 2-7c from Chapter 2). Rather than fulfilling the expectation by bringing a tonal resolution among E minor, the Phrygian mode, and the A-minor sonority, the coda (bars 64–68) reinforces the conflict and restates the opening neighbor motive in the alto (b-c^1-b) over yet another plagal progression, settling once again on the Phrygian melody c^2-g^1-$f♮^1$-e^1 (Example 2-7b from Chapter 2). The prevailing F♮ affirms the unresolved dispute between the minor and the Phrygian modes, a quality Chopin resists correcting in order to preserve the characteristic sound of this mazurka.[45]

Mazurka in G Major, Op. 50/1 (1841/42)

In Chapter 2, I explained the large-scale motivic relationship that spans Op. 50/1, including the two-part coda (bars 73–104) that brings back not only the b^1-e^2-d^2 figure and the E♭-D and the c^2-b^1 neighbor motives but also develops the neighbor motion

[44] Jeffrey Kallberg, "Hearing Poland: Chopin and Nationalism," in *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music*, 2nd ed., ed. R. Larry Todd (New York: Routledge, 2004), 239.
[45] See Chapter 2 for Schenker's explanation on the persistent F♮.

a♯[1]-b♮[1] that originated in bar 4, respelling it first as b♭[1]-b♮[1] in the alto in bars 73–76 and then reverting to A♯-B♮ in bars 78, 80, and 88 (Example 2-6 from Chapter 2). Therefore, despite its failure to rectify the pervasive E♭ to the diatonic E♮, the coda strengthens the organic motivic relationship on the musical surface of the mazurka.

Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Op. 50/3 (1841/42)

With the completion of the *Ursatz* at bar 181, the twelve-bar coda of Op. 50/3 begins, repeatedly presenting the initial "subject" in the left hand with a descant above, which emphasizes the motivic fourth (or fifth) D♯-G♯ (Example 7-3a). Among the issues one might expect the coda to address is the juxtaposition of F𝄪-F♯ and B♮-B♯ inherited from the "subject" and the overall harmonic scheme, clashes that give the mazurka its essential sound (Example 2-8 from Chapter 2). An additional question to this point has centered on the direction of the folk-derived raised $\hat{4}$ (F𝄪), a direction that remains questionable—that is, whether F𝄪 functions as the leading tone that rises to G♯, or whether it falls to F♯, or turns into G♮. We had already heard this in the opening, where F𝄪 rises up to G♯ in bars 1–2 but falls to F♯ through an elision at bars 8–9 as the anticipated cadence on G♯ is not realized (Example 2-8a from Chapter 2). And later, with the bass's chromatic G♯-G♮-F♯ descent first appearing in bars 69–70 and then in bars 141–147, an enharmonic relation between G♮ and F𝄪 became possible (Example 7-3b).[46]

[46] The chromatic G♯-G♮-F♯ descent in the bass is shown in the *National Edition*, on which I based my analysis, but is absent in the Henle edition. See Frédéric Chopin, *Mazurken*, ed. Ewald Zimmermann (Munich: G. Henle, 1975), 92; and Fryderyk Chopin, *Mazurkas*, *The National Edition of the Works of Fryderyk Chopin*, series A, vol. 4, ed. Jan Ekier and Paweł Kamiński (Cracow: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1998), 114.

Although these many occurrences of F♯-F𝄪 (or G♮) fail to tell the exact direction of the resolution of F𝄪, the conflict does finally resolve in the coda where F♯ holds forth and completely replaces its chromatic counterpart F𝄪 or its enharmonic form G♮ (Example 7-3a). The clash between B♮ and B♯, on the other hand, remains over the tonic pedal as if the G♯-minor sonority hinted at initially in the "subject" refuses to yield to C♯ minor despite the defeat of its leading tone F𝄪. Carl Schachter also comments on the treatment of the F♯-F𝄪 and B♮-B♯ conflicts:

> Significantly the F𝄪 of bar 2 has been replaced by its diatonic counterpart F♯. The chromatic tone has completed its task of helping to bring closure to the tonal structure, and it is excluded from this almost completely diatonic concluding phrase, whose only vestige of chromaticism is the B natural B♯ contrast integral to the tonality. Not only is the phrase diatonic, but also it relies to a considerable extent on the most austere diatonic intervals, octaves, fifths, and fourths. . . . The final gesture—$\hat{5}$–$\hat{1}$ in fortissimo octaves—is brusque almost to the point of brutality, an ending unlike any other in the Chopin mazurkas.[47]

The tonic pedal stops at bar 189 where the motivic fourth (or fifth) D♯-G♯ is expressed as C♯-G♯. Although C♯ minor, depicted by the tonic pedal, prevails in the coda, a complete root-position tonic triad appears only once on the downbeat of bar 183. The final gesture, G♯-C♯, announces a dominant-tonic progression in *fortissimo* octaves, ruthlessly denying G♯ minor and triumphantly declaring C♯ minor's victory.

In this particular mazurka we see a tendency in Chopin to restore some, but not necessarily all, diatonic elements in his codas. One chromatic element will often remain at the end, as a kind of poetic reminder, while the others get absorbed into the final

---

[47] Carl Schachter, "Counterpoint and Chromaticism in Chopin's Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Opus 50, Number 3," *Ostinato rigore: Revue internationale d'études musicales* 15 (2000): 134.

diatonic sound. This allows Chopin's endings to convey both a retrospective view of the mazurka's characteristic sounds and a sense that the various tonal conflicts have been addressed by the end.

Mazurka in B Major, Op. 56/1 (1843)

Since Chapters 3, 4, and 5 revealed the motivic and tonal characteristics of Op. 56/1, I will offer only a summary here. In this mazurka, Chopin showcases a challenging tonal scheme that displays chromatic mediant relations among G major (♭VI), B major, and E♭ major (III×) (Example 3-12a from Chapter 3). The juxtaposition between G major and B major not only allows d♮^{2}, the lowered *Kopfton*, to anticipate the diatonic d♯^{2} at bar 16 but also brings out the contrast between the D♮-E-D♮ and the diatonic D♯-E-D♯ neighbor motives in bars 6–8 and 16–18 respectively, the latter of which turns into its enharmonic twin E♭-F♭-E♭ in bars 76–80 of Section B_1 (bars 45–81) where E♭ major, the enharmonic mediant major, is the local tonic (Examples 3-12b and c from Chapter 3). In addition, Section B_1 supports e♭^{2} as the enharmonic *Kopfton* and therefore allows further exploitation of chromatic and enharmonic relationship surrounding $\hat{3}$ (Example 3-12d from Chapter 3).

We now turn to the last section of Op. 56/1 (bars 165–204), a "long developmental coda,"[48] that revisits many of these motives and brings tonal resolution to the complex harmonic scheme (Example 7-4). The coda begins with a transformed version of the introduction's left-hand melody, borrowing its rhythmic pattern in particular. The music

[48] Jim Samson, *The Music of Chopin* (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), 119.

confirms B major as the tonic through numerous cadences, restating the initial D♯-E-D♯ motive in bars 173–177 and 197–201 without bringing back its inflected form D♮-E-D♮. More importantly, Chopin discards the prominent chromatic mediant relation ♭VI-I-III𝄪 (G major-B major-E♭ major) from the tonal plan, emphasizing the diatonic ones I-VI-IV-II-(V-I) instead in a linear sequence in bars 181–197.

Following a large-scale arpeggiation from b^1 to b^2 over a prolonged tonic in bars 169–181, the music reinterprets E♭ major—the enharmonic mediant major that becomes the local tonic of Section B_1—as an applied dominant seventh chord at bars 181, 184, and 187, drawing that chromatic sound more squarely into the diatonic orbit of B major. The melody begins its octave-descent back to b^1, a completely diatonic line supported by a series of descending thirds in the bass preparing the final perfect authentic cadence at bar 197. The descending diatonic thirds perfectly counteract the prominent rising thirds (I-III𝄪-V) that span bars 16–93 (Examples 3-12a, b, and d from Chapter 3). Perhaps it is this unique tonal treatment to which Jim Samson refers when he addresses Chopin's individual harmonic and contrapuntal writing as providing

> a sophisticated solution to the formal problem of achieving satisfactory closure in a repetitive, essentially stanzaic structure. The piece as a whole is entirely symptomatic of Chopin's capacity to write to certain self-created formulae without ever repeating himself.[49]

Besides summarizing the neighbor motive in the final bars, Chopin brings back b^2 once again, recalling the note that not only begins the coda at bar 165 but also initiates

---

[49] Samson, *Chopin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 223. Although Samson does not point to the diatonic descending thirds as correcting the chromatic ascending ones, his words could be well applied to this situation.

the octave-descent at bar 181. Having resolved the tension resulting from the chromatic harmonies (III$^{\times}$ and ♭VI) and the lowered *Kopfton* d♮^{2}, the mazurka ends with a final tonic arpeggiation d♯^{2}-f♯^{3}-b^{4} and an affirmative third d♯^{1}-b-d♯^{1} over a tonic pedal, celebrating with pure diatonicism B major's absorption of the previous chromatic elements.

Mazurka in C Minor, Op. 56/3 (1843)

With the outer parts (bars 73–88 and 121–134) in B♭ major and the middle part (bars 89–121) in B♭ minor, the substantial three-part Section B of Op. 56/3 enables the juxtaposition of local $\hat{3}$ (d♮^{2}) with its chromatic inflection d♭^{2} while prolonging the subtonic (B♭), the upper third of the dominant (Example 3-11 from Chapter 3). The introduction of the Phrygian $\hat{2}$ in this remote harmonic context, through mixture in B♭ $\frac{\text{major}}{\text{minor}}$, provides a resource for subsequent development in the coda (bars 189–220), which begins after the conclusion of the *Ursatz* that features a Picardy third in the inner voice. Rather than referring to the opening section, the coda picks up the Phrygian $\hat{2}$ from the B♭-$\frac{\text{major}}{\text{minor}}$ Section B, emphasizing ♭$\hat{2}$ and $\hat{4}$ as the upper neighbors to $\hat{1}$ and ♮$\hat{3}$ respectively (Example 7-5). Following the authentic cadence at bars 204–205, a fragment of the opening theme enters in the left hand but begins on the raised *Kopfton* e♮. D♮ attempts to correct D♭, as it did in Section B, and succeeds from bar 213 onward. The mazurka ends in the tonic major, Chopin retaining e♮^{1}, the Picardy third that accompanied the end of the *Ursatz* and began the coda.

Conclusion

Rosen deems the lengthy coda as the main formal innovation Chopin contributed to the mazurka because the concluding section presents "a kind of free contrapuntal meditation on the previous material."[50] All seven codas considered in this chapter pick up, restate, and even develop earlier music or motives. While tonal conflicts in Opp. 24/2, 50/3, 56/1, and 56/3 are settled in the codas, those in Opp. 17/4, 41/1, and 50/1 remain. However, these unresolved conflicts should not be seen as a failure in releasing tonal tension; rather, a continued element of slight unrest captures the essential sonority and contributes to the characteristic well-roundedness in each case. The return of the tonally ambiguous introduction in Op. 17/4, the settling on E minor, Phrygian mode, and A minor in Op. 41/1, and the restatement of the middle section's emphatic E♭-D upper neighbor motive as a metamorphosis of the initial E♮-D motive (bar 5) in Op. 50/1 reflect each piece's individuality; therefore, these conflicts should be held intact, *not* rectified.

Rink observes that Schenker's definition of coda, or rather "structural coda," corresponds to many Chopin works:[51]

> These conclusions vary from just one or two bars to passages of considerable length, which either restate material used earlier in the work (thereby effecting large-scale synthesis) or present new melodic or

---

[50] Rosen, "Chopin: From the Miniature Genre to the Sublime Style," 453. In an earlier writing, Rosen proposed that Mozart is "the inventor of the contrapuntal coda"; see *Rosen, Sonata Forms*, rev. ed., 314. The contrapuntal virtuosity of the coda in the finale of the "Jupiter" Symphony is perhaps the best example of Mozart's unsurpassed technique, for it is the culmination of the entire movement. To draw a general observation among the Classical masters, Rosen comments that while Mozart's codas present "a survey of the themes," Haydn's settle the "unfinished business," both of which have great influence on Beethoven"; ibid., 324.

[51] Rink, "'Structural Momentum,'" 112.

> harmonic ideas. What they all have in common is their position outside the fundamental structure, that is, after the structural cadence.[52]

In addition, Rink notes that in order to distinguish the final section of Chopin's work from earlier statements of the same music, the composer not only places the resolution of "dissonance or tonal tension" in the coda but also shows his sensitivity to closure via various means, including the use of "rests, fermatas, reversed dynamics, and performance indications such as *rubato* and *smorzando*."[53]

Such detailed attentiveness to closure, often coupled with the use of a registral peak, is easily found in the seven mazurkas I analyzed. For instance, rests are carefully placed toward the ending in all of them, and Opp. 17/4, 24/2, and 41/1 each has a fermata as the piece concludes. With regard to dynamic and performance indications, Chopin writes *sempre più piano* and *calando* in Op. 17/4; *sotto voce* in Opp. 17/4 and 24/2; *rallentando* in Op. 41/1; *slentando* in Op. 50/3, with a marking from *pianissimo* to *fortissimo*; a contrasting *forte* in Opp. 50/1 and 56/1; and *diminuendo* in Op. 56/3. The abundant and meticulous attention given to heighten expressiveness at the ending of these mazurkas makes them highly affecting pieces.

A crucial question about codas remains to be answered: If a coda exhibits such importance in bringing closure and resolution to a composition, and the disclosure of the coda's integral role within a piece provides so much insight into the perception of the work, why have codas not been considered in earnest by music scholars? Perhaps the answer to this question lies beyond the scope of this dissertation, but the rewards of

---

[52] Ibid., 113.
[53] Ibid., 119.

studying this closing section as I have shown in this chapter will hopefully spark some interest in the research on codas.

Epilogue

Considered solely as a music genre with Polish folk influence, mazurkas are valuable to study because they are so closely associated with Chopin who stylized, cultivated, and elevated them as an art form uniquely his own. But by using Schenkerian analysis, this dissertation expanded the range of issues to consider in the mazurkas, providing original contributions to several areas of music theory, including the study of ambiguity, phrase expansion, introductions, reprises, and codas. The Chopin mazurkas were thus the basic repertoire, but this study opens areas for research in other works of Chopin and in the music of other composers.

Since my approach to tonal and formal aspects of the mazurkas is fundamental to music written by Chopin and other composers, I will here suggest some future research directions based on the ideas developed in this thesis, starting with those that are related to the mazurka genre or to the music of Chopin. An obvious application is to extend my findings to other music besides the mazurkas discussed here. Given the rich historical background of the genre, Chopin's mazurkas, deemed the pinnacle of the genre, would benefit from a study of mazurkas written before and after his, such as those composed by

Józef Elsner, Oskar Kolberg, Karol Kurpiński, Karol Mikuli, Maurycy Moszkowski, and Władysław Żeleński, Ignacy Jan Paderewski, and Karol Szymanowski.[1]

While my dissertation focuses on seventeen mazurkas that best exemplify Chopin's handling of tonal and formal organization of the genre, I would encourage future endeavors to explore the remaining mazurkas so as to discover further subtleties in Chopin's musical language. Some of the mazurkas only touched on here, such as Opp. 17/3 and 63/3, would repay further study in Chopin's treatment of enharmonic relationships between formal sections. Several late mazurkas could also help refine and deepen our appreciation of the issues raised in this dissertation. Opp. 59/3 and 63/1, for example, besides their richness in the use of modal mixture, both have potential for further demonstrating the technique of expansion in the reprise, a key stylistic element of Chopin.

In addition to the mazurkas, my discussion of tonal ambiguity might help explain how tonality governs or elucidates the formal organization of other pieces by Chopin. For instance, the ternary design of the Waltz in D♭ Major, Op. 70/3 is articulated by a tonic-subdominant-tonic harmonic scheme. However, a momentary ambiguity arises in the three-part Section B: while the outer parts are in the local key of G♭ major (IV), the middle part features a return of D♭ major that could be heard possibly as a true tonic or the dominant of G♭. Therefore, the question of tonal ambiguity caused by the polarity between two fifth-related tonalities is again brought to the surface in this waltz.

---

[1] Ewa Dahlig-Turek, for instance, contributes to the study of rhythm in the pre- and post-Chopin mazurkas. See Dahlig-Turek, "The Mazurka Before and After Chopin," paper read at the Third International Chopin Congress (Warsaw: University of Warsaw, 26 February 2010).

On the other hand, the two-key scheme of the Waltz in F Minor/A♭ Major, Op. 70/2 poses a challenge to the tradition of monotonality as the piece begins in F minor but ends in A♭ major, a closely related key. One might recall my discussion of directional tonality in explaining similar tonal structures of the Op. 31 Scherzo, the Op. 38 Ballade, and the Op. 49 Fantasy. But here, as in our study of the apparently two-key mazurka Op. 30/2, a closer look at Op. 70/2 is needed to determine if the phenomenon of incompleteness plays a role in this waltz—that is, whether the piece is incomplete at its end or its beginning.

Just as the mazurkas display techniques present in other genres, the mazurka itself may appear in a composition of another type, such as the third movement of the Concerto in F Minor, Op. 21 and the Polonaise in F♯ Minor, Op. 44. The inclusion of a mazurka in the midst of a larger work may affect the overall perception of that composition, allowing for potentially rich and subtle generic interplay within a piece, this being another area deserving further study.

Several of the topics in music theory considered in this dissertation could be expanded further as well. For instance, motivic enlargement and advanced chromatic writing are central to much music written in the nineteenth century, as in the works of Brahms, Chopin, Schubert, and many others. The use of modality in the music of the romantic era might also benefit from a study of the historical development of modes; more specifically, a careful look at how J.S. Bach—Chopin's favorite composer—handles both

the Phrygian and major/minor modes in his chorales, cantatas, and organ music could aid the understanding of modal applications in later music.

Issues of semantic closure, touched on in this thesis, could be explored in greater detail. A piece with complete thematic or harmonic closure might leave other musical conflicts unsettled; for example, tonal tension that remains unresolved until the end of a composition, such as the Phrygian $\hat{2}$ in the Mazurka in E Minor, Op. 41/1 or the F♭ in the Polonaise-Fantasy, Op. 61, might cause a sense of openness despite being crucial to the overall sonority of the piece.[2] Pieces such as these could be a source for developing theories of incompleteness or closure.

The formal topics in this study also hold promise for expansion as further research in introductions, varied reprises, and codas is long overdue. For example, the introductions in the songs, waltzes, and polonaises of Chopin or those in the works of Schubert and Brahms would likely shed light on the tonal or formal design of the composition. Also, a comparative study in formal and structural codas might help explain how composers strive to bring a balance between the thematic and harmonic closures as well as elucidate the overall formal structure of the work.

One question that lies beyond the scope of this dissertation but which could be influenced by my research is the matter of performance implications. As a pianist, I also wish to apply my analyses to aid or explain performance choices, such as accentuating the main

---

[2] William Rothstein, "The Form of Chopin's 'Polonaise-Fantasy,'" in *Music Theory in Concept and Practice*, ed. David Beach, James Baker, and Jonathan Bernard (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1997), 337–359.

melodic or rhythmic motives or emphasizing chords of harmonic importance or moments of ambiguity. Other possible uses of the research presented in this thesis might include the applications to rhetorical aspects of performance such as gesture and ornamentation, the approach to pedaling and rhythmic freedom or tempo *rubato*, the bringing out of inner voices, the evaluation of recordings, arrangements, or alternative versions of a work, the choice of instrument, and the design of recital programs. While it was not possible to address these issues here, my hope is that the findings of this dissertation will prove suggestive to further research in these important areas.

In conclusion, this dissertation has provided only a beginning of exploring the special qualities that place Chopin's mazurkas, as Jean-Jacques Eigeldinger said, at the "heart of his oeuvre."[3] We enjoy listening to a musical work that has a convincing ending; similarly, I take pleasure in concluding this study at a point that is just enough to illustrate the range of applicability of Chopin's various compositional techniques, be it motivic organization, the treatment of chromaticism, the functions of the reprise, or any of the others discussed here. I hope this thesis will inspire continuation and expansion of this research in the years to come, a project I look forward to taking on and one that I hope others will undertake as we music theorists continue to explore and explain these remarkable pieces of music.

[3] See Chapter 1, note 1.

Bibliography

Agawu, V. Kofi. "Concepts of Closure and Chopin's Opus 28." *Music Theory Spectrum* 9 (1987): 1–17.

Anson-Cartwright, Mark. "Concepts of Closure in Tonal Music: A Critical Study." *Theory and Practice* 32 (2007): 1–17.

Bartók, Béla. "The Relation of Folk Song to the Development of the Art Music of Our Time." In *Béla Bartók Essays*, 320–330. Edited by Benjamin Suchoff. London: Faber & Faber, 1976.

Beach, David. "Chopin's Mazurka, Op. 17, No. 4." *Theory and Practice* 2/3 (1977): 12–16.

———. "Schenkerian Theory." *Music Theory Spectrum* 11/1 (1989): 3–14.

———. "Schubert's Experiments with Sonata Form: Formal-Tonal Design Versus Underlying Structure." *Music Theory Spectrum* 15/1 (1993): 1–18.

Bellman, Jonathan D. *Chopin's Polish Ballade: Op. 38 as Narrative of National Martyrdom*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Bent, Ian. "Heinrich Schenker, Chopin and Domenico Scarlatti." *Music Analysis* 5/2–3 (1986): 131–149.

Berry, David Carson. *A Topical Guide to Schenkerian Literature: An Annotated Bibliography with Indices*. Hillsdale, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 2004.

Brown, Matthew. "The Diatonic and Chromatic in Schenker's Theory of Harmonic Relations." *Journal of Music Theory* 30/1 (1986): 1–33.

Bullivant, Roger. "Coda." In *Grove Music Online*. Accessed 9 February 2010.

Burkhart, Charles. "Schenker's 'Motivic Parallelisms.'" *Journal of Music Theory* 22 (1978): 145–175.

———. "Chopin's 'Concluding Expansions.'" In *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music: Essays in Performance and Analysis*, 95–116. Edited by David Witten. New York: Garland, 1997.

———. “The Phrase Rhythm of Chopin’s A-flat Mazurka, Op. 59, No. 2.” In *Engaging Music: Essays in Music Analysis*, 3–12. Edited by Deborah Stein. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. “The Two Curious Moments in Chopin’s E-flat Major Prelude.” *In Structure and Meaning in Tonal Music: Festschrift in Honor of Carl Schachter*, 5–18. Edited by L. Poundie Burstein and David Gagné. Hillsdale, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 2006.

Burstein, L. Poundie. “The Non-Tonic Opening in Classical and Romantic Music.” Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1988.

———. “The Off-Tonic Return in Beethoven’s Piano Concerto No. 4 in G Major, Op. 58, and Other Works.” *Music Analysis* 24/3 (2005): 305–347.

———. “Unraveling Schenker’s Concept of the Auxiliary Cadence.” *Music Theory Spectrum* 27/2 (2005): 159–185.

Cadwallader, Allen. “Foreground Motivic Ambiguity: Its Clarification at the Middleground Levels in Selected Late Piano Pieces of Johannes Brahms.” *Music Analysis* 7/1 (1988): 59–91.

———. “Form and Tonal Process: The Design of Different Structural Levels.” In *Trends in Schenkerian Research*, 1–22. Edited by Allen Cadwallader. New York: Schirmer Books, 1990.

Caplin, William E. “The ‘Expanded Cadential Progression’: A Category for the Analysis of Classical Form.” *Journal of Musicological Research* 7/2–3 (1987): 216–257.

———. *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

———. “The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions.” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57/1 (2004): 51–117.

Cascelli, Antonio. “Schenker’s Chopin: The Unpublished Material in the Oster Collection at the New York Public Library.” Ph.D. diss., University of Southampton, 2003.

———. “Chopin as Salon Composer: Schenker’s Reception of Chopin.” In *Chopin’s Musical Worlds: The 1840s*, 83–96. Edited by Artur Szklener. Warsaw: Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, 2007.

Cavett-Dunsby, Esther. “Mozart’s Codas.” *Music Analysis* 7/1 (1988): 31–51.

Chopin, Fryderyk. *Mazurkas. The National Edition of the Works of Fryderyk Chopin.* Series A, Vol. 4. Edited by Jan Ekier and Paweł Kamiński. Cracow: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1998.

———. *Complete Works, Volume 10, Mazurkas*. Edited by Ignacy J. Paderewski. Warsaw: Fryderyk Chopin Institute, 1949.

———. *Mazurken*. Edited by Ewald Zimmermann. Munich: G. Henle, 1975.

Cohn, Richard. "The Autonomy of Motives in Schenkerian Accounts of Tonal Music." *Music Theory Spectrum* 14/2 (1992): 150–170.

Cone, Edward T. "Ambiguity and Reinterpretation in Chopin." In *Chopin Studies* 2, 140–160. Edited by John Rink and Jim Samson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Dahlig-Turek, Ewa. "The Mazurka Before and After Chopin." Paper read at the Third International Chopin Congress. Warsaw: University of Warsaw, 26 February 2010.

Dahlig, Piotr. "On Attempts at Interpreting Chopin's Mazurkas from an Ethnomusicological Perspective." In *Chopin in Paris: The 1830s*, 107–119. Edited by Artur Szklener. Warsaw: Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, 2006.

Delacroix, Eugène. *Journal de Eugène Delacroix*. 3 vols. Edited by André Joubin. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1932.

———. *The Journal of Eugene Delacroix.* Translated by Walter Pach. New York: Crown, 1948.

Downes, Stephen. "Mazurka." In *Grove Music Online*. Accessed 7 February 2008.

Drabkin, William. "Chopin, Schenker, and 'Musical Form.'" *Ostinato rigore: Revue internationale d'études musicales* 15 (2000): 173–86.

[Guck, Marion A. and Charles J. Smith.] "*Quaestionis gratia*: Curious Curtailment or Cliffhanger? (Or Cop-Out?)" *In Theory Only* 2/10 (1977): 35–39.

Eibner, Franz. "Chopins kontrapunktisches Denken." In *Chopin Jahrbuch 1956*, 103–122. Edited by Franz Zagiba. Vienna: Amalthea, 1956.

———. "Über die Akkorde im Satz Chopins." In *Chopin Jahrbuch 1970*, 3–24. Edited by Franz Zagiba. Vienna: Notring, 1970.

Eigeldinger, Jean-Jacques. *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher as Seen by His Pupils*. Edited by Roy Howat. Translated by Krysia Osostowicz and Naomi Shohet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

———. *Frédéric Chopin: Esquisses pour une Méthode de Piano.* Paris: Flammarion, 1993.

———. *L'univers Musical de Chopin*. N.p.: Fayard, 2000.

———. *Frédéric Chopin*. Paris: Fayard, 2003.

Ekier, Jan. "On Questions Relating to the Chronology of Chopin's Works. Methods. A Few Examples Concerning Compositions from the Last Period." In *Chopin's Musical Worlds: The 1840s*, 169–188. Edited by Artur Szklener. Warsaw: Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, 2007.

Everett, Walter. "Deep-Level Portrayals of Directed and Misdirected Motions in Nineteenth-Century Lyric Song." *Journal of Music Theory* 48 (2004): 25–68.

Federhofer, Hellmut. *Heinrich Schenker: Nach Tagebüchern und Briefen in der Oswald Jonas Memorial Collection*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1985.

Forte, Allen, and Steven E. Gilbert. *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis*. New York: Norton, 1982.

Fowler, Don. "Second Thoughts on Closure." In *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*, 3–22. Edited by Deborah H. Roberts, Francis M. Dunn, and Don Fowler. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Grabowski, Christophe and John Rink (eds.). *Annotated Catalogue of Chopin's First Editions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Gibeau, Peter. "Chromaticism as a Middleground Phenomenon in Selected Mazurkas of Chopin." Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin–Madison, 1992.

Goldberg, Halina. *Music in Chopin's Warsaw*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Gustafson, Bruce. "Reprise." In *Grove Music Online*. Accessed 9 April 2010.

Hatten, Robert. "Aspects of Dramatic Closure in Beethoven: A Semiotic Perspective on Music Analysis via Strategies of Dramatic Conflict." *Semiotica* 66/1–3 (1987): 197–209.

Hedley, Arthur (ed.). *Selected Correspondence of Fryderyk Chopin*. Translated by Arthur Hedley. London: Heinemann, 1962.

Helman, Zofia. "Correspondance de Chopin: Aspects de la Nouvelle Édition (Vol. 1, 1816–1831)." Paper read at the Third International Chopin Congress. Warsaw: University of Warsaw, 25 February 2010.

Hopkins, Robert G. "When a Coda is More than a Coda: Reflections on Beethoven." In *Explorations in Music, the Arts, and Ideas: Essays in Honor of Leonard B. Meyer*, 393–410. Edited by Eugene Narmour and Ruth A. Solie. Stuyvesant, N.Y.: Pendragon, 1988.

Hyer, Brian. "Chopin and the In-F-Able." In *Musical Transformation and Musical Intuition: Eleven Essays in Honor of David Lewin*, 147–166. Edited by Raphael Atlas and Michael Cherlin. Roxbury, Mass.: Ovenbird, 1994.

Jonas, Oswald. *Einführung in die Lehre Heinrich Schenkers*. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1934. Revised edition, 1972.

———. "On the Study of Chopin's Manuscripts." *Chopin Jahrbuch* 1 (1956): 142–155.

———. *Introduction to the Theory of Heinrich Schenker: The Nature of the Musical Work of Art*. 2nd English translation. Translated and edited by John Rothgeb. Ann Arbor: Musicalia Press, 2005.

Kallberg, Jeffrey. "Compatibility in Chopin's Multi-Partite Publications." *Journal of Musicology* 2/4 (1983): 391–417.

———. "Chopin's Last Style." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 38/2 (1985): 264–315.

———. "The Problem of Repetition and Return in Chopin's Mazurkas." In *Chopin Studies*, 1–23. Edited by Jim Samson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

———. "Small 'Forms': In Defense of the Prelude." In *The Cambridge Companion to Chopin*, 124–144. Edited by Jim Samson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

———. "Hearing Poland: Chopin and Nationalism." In *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music*, 221–257. 2nd edition. Edited by R. Larry Todd. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Kamiński, Paweł. “Between the Work and the Source. The Theoretical and Practical Aspects of the Editing of the Urtext.” In *Chopin’s Work. His Inspirations and Creative Process in the Light of the Sources*, 83–99. Warsaw: Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, 2002.

Kerman, Joseph. “Notes on Beethoven’s Codas.” In *Beethoven Studies* 3, 141–159. Edited by Alan Tyson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1982.

Kielian, Marianne. “*Exempli gratia*: When Repetition is not Repetition . . . (Chopin’s Mazurka in G Minor, Op. 67/2).” *In Theory Only* 2/8 (1976): 20–24.

Kinderman, William. “Directional Tonality in Chopin.” In *Chopin Studies*, 59–75. Edited by Jim Samson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Kopp, David. *Chromatic Transformations in Nineteenth-Century Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Korsyn, Kevin. “Integration in Works of Beethoven’s Final Period.” Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1983.

———. “Towards a New Poetics of Musical Influence.” *Music Analysis* 10/1–2 (1991): 3–72.

———. “Directional Tonality and Intertextuality: Brahms’s Quintet Op. 88 and Chopin’s Ballade Op. 38.” In *The Second Practice of Nineteenth-Century Tonality*, 45–83. Edited by William Kinderman and Herald Krebs. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.

Krebs, Harald. “Alternatives to Monotonality in Early Nineteenth-Century Music.” *Journal of Music Theory* 25/1 (1981): 1–16.

———. “Techniques of Unification in Tonally Deviating Works.” *Canadian University Music Review* 10/1 (1990): 55–70.

———. “Tonal and Formal Dualism in Chopin’s Scherzo, Op. 31.” *Music Theory Spectrum* 13/1 (1991): 48–60.

———. “Some Early Examples of Tonal Pairing: Schubert’s ‘Meeres Stille’ and ‘Der Wanderer.’” In *The Second Practice of Nineteenth-Century Tonality*, 17–33. Edited by William Kinderman and Herald Krebs. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.

———. “Metrical Disturbances in Chopin’s ‘Third Ballade.’” In *Analytical Perspectives on the Music of Chopin*, 139–155. Edited by Artur Szklener. Warsaw: Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, 2003.

Laskowski, Larry. *Heinrich Schenker: An Annotated Index to His Analyses of Musical Works*. Stuyvesant, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 1978.

Laufer, Edward. “A Different Reading for the Same Music.” Paper read at the annual meeting of the Music Theory Society for New York State. Flushing, N.Y.: Queens College, 9 October 1993.

———. “On Chopin’s Fourth Ballade.” In *Keys to the Drama: Nine Perspectives on Sonata Forms*, 157–175. Edited by Gordon Sly. Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2009.

Lenz, Wilhelm von. “Übersichtliche Beurtheilung der Pianoforte-Kompositionen von Chopin.” *Neue Berliner Musikzeitung* 26/37 (1872): 289–292.

Lester, Joel. “On ‘*Quaestionis gratia*,’ *ITO* 2/10: 35–39.” *In Theory Only* 3/1 (1977): 31.

———. “Harmonic Complexity and Form in Chopin’s Mazurkas.” *Ostinato rigore: Revue internationale d’études musicales* 15 (2000): 101–120.

Levy, Janet M. “Beginning-Ending Ambiguity: Consequences of Performance Choices.” In *The Practice of Performance: Studies in Musical Interpretation*, 150–169. Edited by John Rink. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

McCreless, Patrick. “Schenker and Chromatic Tonicization: A Reappraisal.” In *Schenker Studies*, 125–145. Edited by Hedi Siegel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

———. “The Hermeneutic Sentence and Other Literary Models for Tonal Closure.” *Indiana Theory Review* 12 (1991): 35–73.

McKee, Eric. “The Interaction of Tonal Structure and Phrase Structure as an Aspect of Form in Tonal Music.” Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1994.

———. “Auxiliary Progressions as a Source of Conflict between Tonal Structure and Phrase Structure.” *Music Theory Spectrum* 18/1 (1996): 51–76.

———. “Dance and the Music of Chopin: The Waltz.” In *The Age of Chopin: Interdisciplinary Inquiries*, 106–161. Edited by Halina Goldberg. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.

Merriam-Webster Online. Accessed 10 April 2010.

Meyer, Leonard B. *Emotion and Meaning in Music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Michatowski, Kornel and Jim Samson. "Chopin." In *Grove Music Online*. Accessed 7 February 2008.

Milewski, Barbara. "Chopin's Mazurkas and the Myth of the Folk." *19th-Century Music* 23/2 (1999): 113–135.

———. "The Mazurka and National Imaginings: Poland, Frédéric Chopin, Karol Szymanowski." Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 2002.

———. "Chopin and Folk Music?" In *Chopin and His Work in the Context of Culture*, Volume 1, 464–474. Edited by Irena Poniatowska. Cracow: Polska Akademia Chopinowska, Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, Musica Iagellonica, 2003.

Morgan, Robert P. "Coda as Culmination: The First Movement of the 'Eroica' Symphony." In *Music Theory and the Exploration of the Past*, 357–376. Edited by Christopher Hatch and David W. Bernstein. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

———. "Symmetrical Form and Common-Practice Tonality." *Music Theory Spectrum* 20/1 (1998): 1–47.

———. "Chopin's Modular Forms." In *Variations on the Canon: Essays on Music from Bach to Boulez in Honor of Charles Rosen on his Eightieth Birthday*, 185–204. Edited by Robert Curry, David Gable, and Robert L. Marshall. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2008.

Niecks, Frederick. *Frederick Chopin as a Man and Musician*. 2 vols. London: Novello, Ewer and Co., 1888.

Nowak, Tomasz. "Fryderyk Chopin in [the] Context of Trends in Dance Culture from the First Half of the Nineteenth Century." Paper read at the Third International Chopin Congress. Warsaw: University of Warsaw, 27 February 2010.

Nowik, Wojciech. "The Work of *Frédéric Chopin* in the Light of the Theoretical Conceptions of the First Half of the Nineteenth Century." In *Analytical Perspectives on the Music of Chopin*, 227–240. Edited by Artur Szklener. Warsaw: Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, 2003.

Oster, Ernst. "The *Fantaisie-Impromptu*: A Tribute to Beethoven." In *Aspects of Schenkerian Theory*, 189–207. Edited by David Beach. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

Parks, Richard S. “Voice Leading and Chromatic Harmony in the Music of Chopin.” *Journal of Music Theory* 20/2 (1976): 189–214.

Paschałow, Wiaczesław. *Chopin a Poliska Muzyka Ludowa*. Cracow: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1951.

Petty, Wayne C. “Chopin and the Ghost of Beethoven.” *Nineteenth-Century Music* 22/3 (1999): 281–299.

———. “Thoughts on Schenker’s Treatment of Diminution and Repetition in Part III of *Free Composition*, and Its Implications for Analysis.” In *Structure and Meaning in Tonal Music: Festschrift in Honor of Carl Schachter*, 73–78. Edited by L. Poundie Burstein and David Gagné. Hillsdale, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 2006.

Phipps, Graham H. “A Response to Schenker’s Analysis of Chopin’s Etude, Opus 10, No. 12, Using Schoenberg’s ‘Grundgestalt’ Concept.” *The Musical Quarterly* 69/4 (1983): 543–569.

Poliński, Aleksander. *Chopin*. Kijow: L. Idzikowski, 1914.

Ratner, Leonard G. *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1980.

Rink, John. “Chopin and Schenker: Improvisation and Musical Structure.” *Chopin Studies* 3 (1990): 219–231.

———. “Tonal Architecture in the Early Music.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Chopin*, 78–97. Edited by Jim Samson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

———. “Schenker and Improvisation.” *Journal of Music Theory* 37/1 (1993): 1–54.

———. “‘Structural Momentum’ and Closure in Chopin’s Op. 9, No. 2.” In *Schenker Studies* 2, 109–126. Edited by Carl Schachter and Hedi Siegel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Rosen, Charles. *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven*. New York: Norton, 1971.

———. *Sonata Forms*. New York: Norton, 1980. Revised edition, 1988.

———. “Chopin: From the Miniature Genre to the Sublime Style.” In *The Romantic Generation*, 410–471. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Rothgeb, John. “Chopin’s C-Minor Nocturne, Op. 48, No. 1, First Part: Voice Leading and Motivic Content.” *Theory and Practice* 5/2 (1980): 26–31.

———. “Thematic Content: A Schenkerian View.” In *Aspects of Schenkerian Theory*, 39–60. Edited by David Beach. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

Rothstein, William. “Rhythm and the Theory of Structural Levels.” Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1981.

———. “Phrase Rhythm in Chopin’s Nocturnes and Mazurkas.” In *Chopin Studies*, 115–141. Edited by Jim Samson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

———. “Chopin: Nocturnes, Mazurkas, and Études.” In *Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music*, 214–248. New York: Schirmer Books, 1989. Reprint, Ann Arbor: Musicalia Press, 2007.

———. “Rhythmic Displacement and Rhythmic Normalization.” In *Trends in Schenkerian Research*, 87–113. Edited by Allen Cadwallader. New York: Schirmer Books, 1990.

———. “The Americanization of Heinrich Schenker.” In *Schenker Studies*, 193–203. Edited by Hedi Siegel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

———. “Ambiguity in the Themes of Chopin’s First, Second, and Fourth Ballades.” *Intégral* 8 (1994): 1–50.

———. “Beethoven with and without *Kunstgepräng*: Metrical Ambiguity Reconsidered.” In *Beethoven Forum* 4, 165–193. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.

———. “The Form of Chopin’s ‘Polonaise-Fantasy.’” In *Music Theory in Concept and Practice*, 337–359. Edited by David Beach, James Baker, and Jonathan Bernard. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1997.

———. “Chopin and the B-Major Complex: A Study in the Psychology of Composition.” In *Ostinato rigore: Revue internationale d’études musicales* 15 (2000): 149–172.

———. Review of Articles on Schenker and Schenkerian Theory in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. *Journal of Music Theory* 45/1 (2001): 204–227.

———. “Like Falling Off A Log: Rubato in Chopin’s Prelude in A-flat Major (Op. 28, No. 17).” *Music Theory Online* 11/1 (March 2005).

———. “Circular Motion in Chopin’s Late B-Major Nocturne (Op. 62. No.1).” *In Structure and Meaning in Tonal Music: Festschrift in Honor of Carl Schachter*, 19–32. Edited by L. Poundie Burstein and David Gagné. Hillsdale, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 2006.

———. “Common-Tone Tonality in Italian Romantic Opera: An Introduction.” *Music Theory Online* 14/1 (2008).

Salzer, Felix. *Structural Hearing: Tonal Coherence in Music*. 2 vols. Corrected Edition. New York: Dover, 1961.

Samson, Jim. *The Music of Chopin*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.

———. *Chopin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

———. “Chopin’s Alternatives to Monotonality: A Historical Perspective.” In *The Second Practice of Nineteenth-Century Tonality*, 34–44. Edited by William Kinderman and Herald Krebs. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996.

———. “The Challenge to Analysis.” In *Analytical Perspectives on the Music of Chopin*, 9–19. Edited by Artur Szklener. Warsaw: Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, 2003.

Schachter, Carl. “Rhythmic and Linear Analysis, Durational Reduction.” *Music Forum* 5 (1980): 197–232.

———. “Analysis by Key: Another Look at Modulation.” *Music Analysis* 6/3 (1987): 289–318.

———. “Chopin’s Fantasy, Op. 49: The Two-Key Scheme.” In *Chopin Studies*, 221–253. Edited by Jim Samson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

———. Review of *The Music of Chopin* by Jim Samson and *The Music of Brahms* by Michael Musgrave. *Music Analysis* 8/1–2 (1989): 187–191.

———. “The Prelude in E Minor, Op. 28, No. 4: Autograph Sources and Interpretation.” *Chopin Studies* 2, 161–182. Edited by John Rink and Jim Samson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

———. “Chopin Prelude in D Major, Op. 28, No. 5: Analysis and Performance.” *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy* 8 (1994): 27–45.

———. “The Triad as Place and Action.” *Music Theory Spectrum* 17/2 (1995): 149–169.

———. “Structure as Foreground: ‘*Das Drama des Ursatzes*.’” In *Schenker Studies* 2, 298–314. Edited by Carl Schachter and Hedi Siegel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

———. “Either/Or.” In *Schenker Studies*, 165–179. Edited by Hedi Siegel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

———. “Counterpoint and Chromaticism in Chopin’s Mazurka in C♯ Minor, Opus 50, Number 3.” *Ostinato rigore: Revue internationale d’études musicales* 15 (2000): 121–134.

———. “Idiosyncrasies of Phrase Rhythm in Chopin’s Mazurkas.” In *The Age of Chopin: Interdisciplinary Inquiries*, 95–105. Edited by Halina Goldberg. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.

Schenker, Heinrich. *Harmonielehre.* Stuttgart: Cotta, 1906.

———. *Der Tonwille: Flugblätter zum Zeugnis unwandelbarer Gesetze der Tonkunst*. 10 vols. Vienna: Tonwille Flugblätterverlag, 1921–1924.

———. “Beethoven: Sonate Opus 2 Nr. 1” In *Der Tonwille* 2, 25–48. Vienna: Tonwille Flugblätterverlag, 1922.

———. *Der freie Satz*. 2 vols. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1935.

———. “F. Chopin: Etude in F Major, Op. 10, No. 8.” In *Five Graphic Music Analyses*, 47–51. New York: Dover, 1969.

———. “F. Chopin: Etude in C Minor, Op. 10, No. 12.” In *Five Graphic Music Analyses*, 53–61. New York: Dover, 1969.

———. *Free Composition*. 2 vols. Translated and edited by Ernst Oster. New York: Longman, 1979. Reprint, Hillsdale, N.Y.: Pendragon Press, 2001.

———. *Harmony*. Translated by Elisabeth Mann Borgese. Edited by Oswald Jonas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

———. *Counterpoint: A Translation of Kontrapunkt by Heinrich Schenker*. 2 vols. Edited by John Rothgeb. Translated by John Rothgeb and Jürgen Thym. New York: Schirmer Books, 1987. Reprint, Ann Arbor: Musicalia Press, 2001.

———. “Chopin: Etude in E♭ Minor, Op. 10, No. 6.” In *The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook*, Vol. 1(1925), 81–89. Edited by William Drabkin. Translated by Ian Bent. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

———. “Chopin: Etude in G♭ Major, Op. 10, No. 5.” In *The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook*, Vol. 1 (1925), 90–98. Edited by William Drabkin. Translated by Ian Bent. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

———. “Further Consideration of the Urlinie: II.” In *The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook*, Vol. 2 (1926), 1–22. Edited by William Drabkin. Translated by John Rothgeb. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

———. “Beethoven’s Third Symphony: Its True Content Described for the First Time.” In *The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook*, Vol. 3 (1930), 10–68 and 81–115. Edited by William Drabkin. Translated by Derrick Puffet and Alfred Clayton Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Schmalfeldt, Janet. “Cadential Processes: The Evaded Cadence and the ‘One More Time’ Technique.” *Journal of Musicological Research* 12/1–2 (1992): 1–52.

Schoenberg, Arnold. *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*. Edited by Gerald Strang. London: Faber, 1967.

Siepmann, Jeremy. *Chopin, The Reluctant Romantic*. London: Gollancz, 1995.

Sly, Gordon. “Developing the Analytical Point of View: The Musical ‘Agent.’” *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy* 19 (2005): 51–63.

Smialek, William. *Frederic Chopin: A Guide to Research.* New York: Garland, 2000.

Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Smyth, David. “Codas in Classical Form: Aspects of Large-Scale Rhythm and Pattern.” Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1985.

Straus, Joseph. *Remaking the Past: Musical Modernism and the Influence of the Tonal Tradition*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Swartz, Anne. “The Mazurkas of Chopin: Certain Aspects of Phrasing.” Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1973.

———. “Folk Dance Elements in Chopin’s Mazurkas.” *Journal of Musicological Research* 4/3–4 (1983): 417–25.

Szklener, Artur (ed.). *Chopin in Performance: History, Theory, Practice*. Warsaw: Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, 2004.

Thomas, Adrian. “Beyond the Dance.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Chopin*, 145–159. Edited by Jim Samson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Thomson, William. “Functional Ambiguity in Musical Structures.” *Music Perception* 1/1 (Fall 1983): 3–27.

Tovey, Donald Francis. *The Forms of Music*. New York: Meridian Books, 1956.

Treitler, Leo. “History and the Ontology of the Musical Work.” *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 51/3 (1993): 483–497.

Viljoen, Nicol. “The Drone Bass and Its Implications for the Tonal Voice-Leading Structure in Two Selected Mazurkas by Chopin.” *Indiana Theory Review* 6/1–2 (1982–1983): 17–35.

———. “The Motivic, Structural, and Formal Implications of Mixture for Chopin’s Mazurka Op. 30, No. 3.” *South African Journal of Musicology* 11 (1991): 143–152.

———. “The Raised Fourth Degree of the Scale in Chopin’s Mazurkas.” *Acta Academica* 32/1 (2000): 67–85.

Walker, Paul M. “Codetta.” In *Grove Music Online*. Accessed 9 February 2010.

Weber-Bockholdt, Petra. “Wie Chopin seine Stücke beginnt.” In *Chopin and His Work in the Context of Culture*, Volume 1, 349–358. Edited by Irena Poniatowska. Cracow: Polska Akademia Chopinowska, Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, Musica Iagellonica, 2003.

Webster, James. “Sonata Form.” In *Grove Music Online*. Accessed 11 March 2010.

Wen, Eric. “The Augmented-Sixth Chord as Support for Scale-Degree 3 in the Urlinie.” Paper read at the Fourth International Schenker Symposium. New York: The New School, 18 March 2006.

Witkowska-Zaremba, Elżbieta. “Versification, Syntax and Form in Chopin’s Mazurkas.” *Polish Music Journal* 3/1 (2000).

Witten, David. “The Coda Wagging the Dog: Tails and Wedges in the Chopin Ballades.” In *Nineteenth-Century Piano Music: Essays in Performance and Analysis*, 117–185. Edited by David Witten. New York: Garland, 1997.

Yih, Annie. “Connecting Analysis and Performance: Practical Issues for Developing an Effective Approach. A Case Study.” In *Chopin in Paris: The 1830s*, 215–236. Edited by Artur Szklener. Warsaw: Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, 2006.