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ABSTRACT

Those interested in Schenkerian theory will come away with a new historical perspective of Heinrich Schenker's ideas and work through the introduction of an unknown student. Questions will be raised about several scholars that are customarily known in the field of Schenkerian theory; Felix Salzer, Ernst Oster, and Oswald Jonas are credited with spreading Schenker's theory throughout the United States. However, evidence exists that casts uncertainty on the roles of these men as well as the accuracy of information relayed by them pertaining to Schenker's ideas. Are theorists today learning the true history of Heinrich Schenker, or are we being taught based on facts that are mainly second-hand?

Angelika Elias, a student of Schenker, studied privately with him for over twenty-five years until his death in 1935. Elias is unheard of by most scholars in the field; nevertheless, her studies with Schenker far exceeded those of the three men previously mentioned, or any of his students for that matter. The prevailing opinion of those who have actually heard of Elias is that she was a copyist. Even in prestigious collections like Oster's, Elias is often referenced as having copied something for Schenker. Yet, new evidence indicates that Elias may not have even been a copyist, but was one of Schenker's most dedicated and gifted students, friends, and assistants. Her analyses alone are proof that she was a gifted Schenkerian theorist in her own right; this claim is
supported through a careful examination of graphs of music that Elias and Schenker both analyzed independently.

Elias perished in the Holocaust and was nearly erased from the history of Schenkerian studies. Elias' work and relationship with Schenker could revise the foundation of Schenkerian history. By investigating these issues further, Elias is introduced as a major figure in Schenkerian theory and given recognition and credit that is long overdue for years of faithful study.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It is my hope that those who read this, and particularly those interested in Schenkerian theory, will come away with a new historical perspective on Heinrich Schenker’s ideas and work. In the least, some questions will be raised about those who are typically considered to be major figures in Schenkerian theory. The purpose of this investigation is to provide an accurate account of the students who were true followers of Heinrich Schenker, one in particular, as opposed to those who may be well known in the field today, but studied little, if at all, with Schenker himself. While my long-term focus is a much broader undertaking, it is my current intention to expose the “interior history” of Schenkerian theory by introducing one of the least known, but perhaps most talented, of Schenker’s students.¹

There are several scholars that are customarily known for their contributions to and teachings of Schenkerian theory. The top three that come to the mind of most are

¹ What I mean by “broader undertaking” is that while I have translated and studied hundreds of letters, diary entries, lesson plans and graphs by Schenker and Elias, there are still thousands more that need careful investigation, not only by Schenker, but by and about other students that have not received proper
Felix Salzer, Ernst Oster, and Oswald Jonas; these three men are credited with spreading Schenker’s ideas and theories to countless scholars and students. The common perception of their roles in Schenkerian practice is perhaps best summed up by Allen Forte in his Introduction to *Free Composition* in which he says:

“The tradition [of instruction of Schenker’s theory] continued with Felix Salzer at the Mannes School, a student of Schenker and Weisse, with Oswald Jonas, a student of Schenker, at Roosevelt College in Chicago, and with Ernst Oster, a student of Jonas, who taught in his private studio in New York for a number of years before being appointed to the faculties of the New England Conservatory of Music and the Mannes College of Music.”

However, evidence exists that casts doubt on the accuracy of the information relayed by these men about Schenkerian theory. Are theorists today really learning true Schenkerian theory, or are we being taught theories based on concepts only perceived to be Schenkerian?

For example, Oster, considered to be one of the great experts on Schenkerian theory, never actually met with Schenker. Instead he studied with Oswald Jonas while living as a young man in Berlin. After moving to Vienna due to the political climate, he met with Salzer, and studied Schenker’s graphs and other source materials with him. Oster also contributed to several issues of *Der Dreiklang*, a periodical edited by both Jonas and Salzer. While obviously well informed on the subject of Schenkerian theory, much of the information Oster acquired was second hand, and, as will shortly be seen, the

---

men that guided Oster may not have passed on completely accurate perspectives of Schenker’s ideas.

If Oster is sometimes considered to be the last great Schenkerian, that may be due to the fact that when Oster emigrated to the United States, Schenker’s widow, Jeanette Schenker, gave him a large and valuable collection of Schenker’s papers in order to save them from destruction by the Nazis. Through a careful study of Schenker’s archives did Oster gain first-hand knowledge of Schenker’s ideas; this experience later helped him to translate many of Schenker’s often cryptic writings.

Salzer, on the other hand, did personally study with Schenker from 1931 until Schenker’s death in 1935. Moreover, he spent years before this with Schenker’s star pupil, Hans Weisse. While he too was obviously well informed about Schenker’s ideas and analytical methodology, Salzer came up with his own alternate theory presented in his book *Structural Hearing.* Furthermore, some believe that when Salzer refers to his own theory as a development of Schenker’s ideas, he only calls attention to the fact that he has misunderstood the basis of Schenkerian theory. Salzer tried to expand what he thought was Schenker’s analytical approach to music beyond Brahms, and in doing this, Oswald Jonas says:

“Such an attempt was possible only through misinterpretation of Schenker’s basic theories, first of all his concept of tonality, and therefore is doomed to fail.”

If this opinion has merit, it, too, brings to question the accuracy of the information that Salzer may have relayed to Oster.

---

Oswald Jonas claims to have been a serious student of Schenker, and he, like the others, has imparted his knowledge of Schenkerian theory to numerous scholars. However, evidence found in lesson plans, letters and Schenker’s personal diaries indicates that Jonas only studied with Schenker for approximately one year after World War I, and then, like Salzer, continued his work with Hans Weisse.

In fact, Jonas and Schenker did not even get along, mainly due to their different political viewpoints. Though Jonas sent numerous letters to Schenker about music and Schenker’s theoretical ideas, for this period Jonas was studying under Weisse and his letters often went disregarded. In his personal diary, Schenker revealed his opinion of Jonas further when he said that Jonas was not fit to run the Schenkerian digest that was being planned at the time. (FN) The most persuasive evidence of the actual student-teacher relationship is found in an entry that questioned why Jonas kept writing to Schenker since he was not his student, but Weisse’s. (FN) Even further, an example of a typical remark made by Jonas in his letters to Schenker went, “ist ungemein liebenswürdig von Ihnen”, which translates to “it is unusually amiable of you”.5

Given these few examples, it seems clear by now that the portrayal of major Schenkerian figures may not be an accurate picture. Three of the most influential Schenkerians have been largely reliant on secondary source material, and each of them has interpreted Schenker’s ideas in different ways! How is one to know what objectives and concepts Schenker truly intended to pass along if not through the work and teachings of his students? Obviously, Schenker’s own publications serve as invaluable resources.

but many interpretations of Schenker's work have been grossly misunderstood and/or
distorted. While these scholars did have remarkable experience, and some personal
knowledge of Schenker's ideas, the crucial question remains: if these individuals were
not the true students of Schenker, who was?

* * *

Now meet Angelika Elias, a student of Schenker who studied privately with him
three times a week for over twenty-five years, until his death in 1935. Elias is largely
unknown by most scholars in the field. Nevertheless, her studies with Schenker, and her
personal relationship with him, far exceeded those of the three men previously
mentioned, or any of his students for that matter. Among Schenkerians, the prevailing
opinion of those who have actually heard of Elias is that she was a glorified, yet faithful,
copyist. Even in prestigious collections like Oster's, Elias is often referenced as having
copied something for Schenker. However, there is no evidence that indicates Elias as a
copyist in any of Schenker's notebooks or diaries; instead, it is made clear that Elias was
actually one of Schenker's most dedicated and gifted friends, supporters, and assistants.
As will be shown, her analyses alone are proof that she was a gifted Schenkerian theorist
in her own right. This claim will be supported through a careful comparison and study of
graphs of works that Elias and Schenker both analyzed independently.

---

5 Jonas, Oswald. A letter to Heinrich Schenker. 11/10/1932
6 In addition to years of letters and lesson plans, proof of Elias' extended study with Schenker can be found
in his lesson books, in which he writes about the Handel portrait Elias gave him to celebrate twenty-five
years together.
Due to the Holocaust, Elias, along with several other notable students (also not well known), perished, and as a result was nearly erased from the history of Schenkerian studies. While these other unfortunates, such as Robert Brunauer and Marianne Kahn also studied personally with Schenker and may deserve recognition for their contributions, I plan to concentrate on Elias as Schenker’s most prized student. Alone, her work and relationship with Schenker could revise the current understanding of Schenkerian history. By investigating Elias’ work and the complicated relationship she had with Schenker, my objective is to give Angelika Elias the recognition and credit she deserves for years of faithful study.
CHAPTER 2

ANGELIKA ELIAS: A BRIEF HISTORY

Angelika Elias was born on September 25, 1882, making her some fifteen years younger than Schenker. She was born and lived in Vienna for most of her life, though according to records she was a citizen of Istanbul, Turkey. She died in Ravensbrück concentration camp during the Holocaust on January 13, 1944, but aside from these facts many aspects of her life still remain a mystery. Very little is known as to the whereabouts of much of her work.

Elias’ mother passed away in 1934, apparently from natural causes; her brother Manolo, her sister, and father’s stories are not known, but they are all mentioned in Elias’ letters. It is believed that her father was a well-respected medical doctor, and that her sister was married with several children, though her married name is not known. Based on my research, I believe that her sister’s children would be the only possible living survivors left if they made it through that tumultuous time.

Elias’ training outside of her studies with Schenker is not known; it appears that Elias did teach, though when she began is unclear. A Vienna phone book from 1938 lists her as a piano teacher, and while there is no confirmed proof, some comments made by
Elias suggest that she was teaching Schenkerian theory, at least at some point following Schenker's death. The best evidence of her teaching is seen in a letter to Mrs. Schenker; Elias says:

"Ich lehr hier eifrig im „Freien Satz“ und fühle mich hiebei in die vergangenen schönen Zeiten zurückversetzt."\(^7\)

"I teach here [in Vent] enthusiastically in „Free Composition“ and I feel myself returned to past lovely times."

Elias also actively continued her own studies in Schenkerian theory after his death; this is confirmed by numerous letters to Mrs. Schenker that contain updates on current analyses that Elias was working on, along with other related topics.

Being Jewish was a terrible obstacle for Elias and her family to overcome during this period in the late 1930s, and the existence of an Antragsvermögen\(^8\) in her name had suggested that Elias did not survive the Holocaust. Recently, Elias' death date was confirmed through records I found in a Viennese archive, but no information, nor dates, has been found regarding her family's deportations or deaths. A brief search of the emigration records database failed to find anyone with the last name of Elias arriving in the United States from Austria during the 1930s or 1940s, so the whereabouts or existence of any descendants remains a question for the time being. However, Elias' sister probably had a different surname, and the circumstances of her children are not known; therefore, a more thorough search may prove to be worthwhile.

---

\(^7\) Elias, Angelika. A letter to Frau Schenker.

\(^8\) Antragsvermögen refers to the form that Nazis required the Jews to fill out in order to divest Jews of their assets.
CHAPTER 3

ELIAS AND SCHENKER

Elias' relationship with Schenker, both as a student and personally, goes far deeper than any other of his other students, and therefore deserves a significant amount of attention. However, it is crucial that their personal relationship not lead away from a careful evaluation of her work as a music theorist.

The intensity of Elias' relationship as a student to Schenker seems to parallel that of her personal relationship with him. Of all his students, she received the most hours, by far, in lessons per month as can be seen in Example 3.1 of one of Schenker's final lesson schedules on page 10.

Elias received a minimum of eleven hours per month in lessons. This amount could be even more, depending on the meaning behind "+4" (shown next to her row on the schedule). It is noteworthy that even though she was taught several hours more per month than Hoboken, Rothberger, or Felix Salzer, her work remains virtually unknown.
Another example of the special treatment given to Elias, even on a student basis, is mentioned in a letter to Schenker. In my understanding, she expressed her gratitude for continuing studies for free, though these lines, too, can be interpreted in more than one way. The lines, dated September 22, 1933, were as follows:

"Vielen, vielen Dank für Ihre neuerliche grosse Liebenswürdigkeit. Ich bin ja so glücklich, dass Sie es mir durch Ihre besonderen Gate ermöglichen, die einzig schönen Studien im gleichen Ausmaße wie bisher auch weiter fortzusetzen! Konnte doch mir der
Wille allein schon genügen, um meine Leistungen meiner Dankbarkeit nur halbwegs anzupassen! ... Da Sie es mir erlauben, komme ich also mit grösster Freude Dienstag den 3. Oktober um 12 Uhr herauf. Einstweilen auf diesem Wege nochmals innigen Dank und herzliche Grüße Ihnen und Ihrer lieben Frau von Ihrer Angi Elias“

“Many, many thanks for your renewed great kindness. I am so happy that you enable me through your exceptional generosity to further continue the fine studies to the same extent as before! If my will alone could suffice to make my achievements only halfway match my gratitude! ... Since you permit it, I will therefore come with greatest joy Tuesday, the third of October at 12 o’clock. Meanwhile fervent thanks for [letting me pursue] this path and sincere greetings you and your dear wife, from yours, Angi Elias”

Obviously these lines can be interpreted in more than one way, but another comment made by Elias several months before strengthens the idea that she was studying with Schenker free of charge. In a letter shown below, Elias implies that she was having financial troubles, and owes Schenker past due money as well as upcoming payment, probably for lessons. If my reading of this passage is correct, Elias’ financial problems set the stage for her future need to study at no cost.


“I have much more to tell you, but I am in such a hurry that I cannot put it all on paper. I would mention only the one thing. On the grounds I shared with you already in Vienna, in very slight conjunction with the terrible dance of prices, previously neglected and future obligations will be gladly fulfilled.”

The key words here are “previously neglected and future obligations”; I believe she is referring to financial obligations in this letter. However, even if she was having

---

financial trouble, another possibility is that lessons were exchanged for Elias’ copying services, though, again, there is little evidence to support this notion.

Though it is a common perception that Elias served as a copyist to Schenker, it is interesting that this task is not mentioned in any of her letters. Furthermore, Elias continuously wrote about which analysis she was currently working on, and her comments seem to indicate that she did much of this work alone:

"Nun aber hoffe ich [nicht] wieder möglichst ungestört der Musik widmen zu können und bis zum 1. Oktober noch den in Vent begonnenen Entwurf der Stimmsführung der Fuge von Handel — so weit es eben sein kann, zu Ende zu bringen."\(^{10}\)

"Now I hope to be able to dedicate myself once again to music, undisturbed as much as possible and up to the 1st of October, so far as I can, to bring to a close the sketch of the voice leading of the Fugue by Handel begun in Vent."

There is always the option that Schenker was guiding Elias in her analyzing via mail or telephone, but this seems unlikely given the detail involved in graphing. Further proof that Elias worked independently is shown in letters to Mrs. Schenker that were written after Heinrich Schenker’s death.

In one example, Elias says:

"Ich habe mich jetzt viel und mit Begeisterung mit Schenkern Capriccio op. 1 no. 2 beschäftigt, dann auch die „Appass. Sonata“ an der Hand des „Tonwille“ und der schonen Zeichen in meinem Notenheft wiederholt."\(^{11}\)

\(^{10}\) Elias, Angelika. A Letter to Heinrich Schenker.
"I have busied myself a lot, and with much enthusiasm, with Schenker's Capriccio Op. 1 No. 2, and then I have done over again the "Appassionata" Sonata with the Tonwille and the beautiful notations in my notebook at hand."

This passage shows that Elias regularly worked on her own, though with the instruction of Schenker's notes or sketches to compare her work against. She obviously found Schenker's guidance and support invaluable.

Schenker seemed to have a high opinion of Elias' input and work as well. It is notable that Elias analyzed many of Schenker's own compositions; a perusal of Schenker's lesson books suggests that Schenker did not assign his own pieces to any of his other students, especially on multiple occasions as he did with Elias. More importantly, Schenker obviously did not have the need to graph his own compositions, but was apparently pleased with the work Elias did on them. This conclusion is supported by her reactions to Schenker's comments in several letters, as well as positive feedback in his diary regarding his Opus 4, No.1 piano piece. Schenker's opinion is further reinforced by a lack of corrections in her sketches of his pieces. What follows not only shows an example of Schenker's opinion of Elias' work (implied by the reply in her letter), but supports the notion that Elias worked alone on her analyses before submitting them for approval and advice:

"Da ich hier nun einen Ruhepunkt gefunden habe, ist es mein erstes, Ihnen zu sagen, wie sehr es mich freute zu haben, dass Sie mit meiner Arbeit an Ihren op. 4 No. 1 nicht unzufrieden waren. Es gibt mir dies weiteren Mut zum vorwärts schreiben und nimmt mir etwas von der steten Sorge, im Verhältnis zu dem, was Sie mir geben, viel zu wenig zu leisten. Wenn mir die Portraittierung Ihres op. 4 No. 1 halbwegs gelungen ist, so habe ich ja auch das Ihnen allein zu verdanken, da mir ohne Ihr Zutun das Verständnis für die

Werke unserer grossen Meister und somit auch für Ihre Tonstücke versagt gewesen wäre. Es wird mich freuen im Oktober zu erfahren, was Sie an meiner Darstellung noch ausgesehen hätten und dann die Möglichkeit zu haben die verborgensten Feinheiten in Ihren wundervollen Klavierstücke zu hören. 12

"Since I have now found a resting place here, it is my first task to tell you how happy it made me to hear that you were not dissatisfied with my work on your Op. 4 No. 1. This gives me the extra courage to be forward in writing, and somewhat takes from me the constant worry, that in relation to it what you give me to work on is too little. If my depiction of your Op. 4 No. 1 has succeeded halfway, I have you alone to thank, because without your support my understanding of the works of our great masters and their pieces would have been denied. I will be glad to get to know in October what else you had perceived in my graph and then to have the opportunity to hear the most hidden details in your wonderful piano pieces."

Clearly, Elias is grateful for Schenker’s support. However, it is difficult to judge how this support compares to active guidance and/or advice. Apparently, Elias was confident in her capabilities as a student since she thought she had “too little” to work on, but was at the same time reliant on Schenker’s approval and input.

Elias was known to be a piano teacher, and probably a theory teacher as well. Even though Schenker was also a prominent piano teacher, there is nothing to show that she studied anything but theory with him.

* * *

There are many questions that still need answers pertaining to Elias’ personal relationship with Schenker, the main one being her motivation for remaining a student for so long. It is not unheard of to study with a teacher for a period of years, but twenty-five

years suggests a story. Did Elias simply continue lessons with Schenker because she was already there working as a copyist for the entire time? Did her role as a student slowly metamorphose into that of an assistant, perhaps an equal scholar? Or, was her personal relationship with him – mutual respect and affection – motivation enough?

During the years spanning from around 1907 to 1935, Elias wrote dozens of letters to Schenker. Many letters included familiar and what might be considered questionable remarks. The content of some of the letters truly helps to show the sense of a very comfortable and familiar relationship between the two; Elias wrote to him about a wide variety of topics, ranging from music and her own studies, to the weather, travel, health, gifts, and personal feelings. The content is not everything, though; the intimate language in some of Elias’ letters helps to further sustain the feeling of friendship that she obviously felt with Schenker. In a letter dated June 17, 1933, she writes:

"Und könnte doch auch ich die Möglichkeit haben, meine Dankbarkeit werktätig zu beweisen wie ich es so sehr ersehne!"  

"I wish I could have the chance to prove my gratitude in practice as I so long to do!"

Another example is shown here:

"Wiederum ist ein Jahr vergangen in welchem ich so viel Wunderbares erleben dürfte und wiederum kann ich mir mit dem bescheidenen Worte „Danke“ kommen, aus dem aber gewiss Ihr Dichterohr all das heraushebt, was mir auszusprechen nicht möglich ist."

“Again a year has passed in which I was able to experience so much that was wonderful and again I can come with the modest word “thanks”, from which, however, certainly your poet’s ear detects all that is not possible for me to express.”

No matter what conclusions can be drawn about the relationship between Elias and Schenker, there was obviously a very close friendship that even involved gifts. One instance of gift giving was indicated in a letter from Elias:

“Darum bitte ich Sie nochmals recht herzlich, die Brahms-Bände als Symbol meiner Dankbarkeit, sowohl Ihnen, als auch Brahms gegenüber, anzunehmen. Hoffentlich werden Sie die Feiertage angenehm verbringen!”

“Therefore I pray once again, quite sincerely, that you accept the Brahms volumes as a symbol of my gratitude, both to you as well as to Brahms. Hopefully you will spend the holidays pleasantly!”

More than one interpretation can be imparted to any of these lines; an alternative is a connection that goes beyond friendship, but a close platonic relationship is the most likely possibility. What must also be taken into account is that during these more formal and effusive times such an extremely close student-teacher relationship could have been perfectly customary.

In any case, Elias continued to write faithfully to Mrs. Schenker after Schenker’s death; it is obvious that she and Mrs. Schenker were also close friends, and this fact strengthens the likelihood of a purely innocent involvement between Elias and Schenker. Indeed, there are more topics related to actual Schenkerian theory in the letters to Mrs. Schenker than to Schenker himself. This is probably because any relevant study topics were addressed in Elias’ lessons. The letters to Mrs. Schenker suggest without doubt that

---

there was a mutual respect between Elias and Mrs. Schenker; it has also been made obvious that there was a close personal bond between Elias and both Schenkers.

CHAPTER 4

ELIAS’ WORK

While there is very little evidence that indicates Elias may have been a copyist for Schenker, she certainly spent a significant amount of time working on her own original graphs (some partly corrected by Schenker). A study of Schenker's lesson books as well as Elias’ notebooks proves beyond a doubt that Elias served as much more than a copyist,
and continuously worked on analyses that Schenker assigned for her. Example 4.1 shows a page from one of Schenker's lesson books, and though hard to read, it is still clear in showing the multiple pieces Elias was assigned at one time, not to mention the regularity of her visits with Schenker.

It is necessary to become familiar with Elias' notational and graphing style in order to differentiate between her marks and Schenker's in the following chapter. Figures 4.1 and 4.2 are graphs done by Elias of a piano piece by Schenker. Elias analyzes his Op. 4, No. 1 with such detail in her foreground graph that it appears almost as performance-ready as would an original score. Recall from the previous chapter Schenker had been pleased with Elias' work on his Op. 4, No. 1 piano piece based on his diary entry and content in her letter.¹⁷

Elias' clear and direct analytical style makes it easy for one to see how she arrived at each stage of her sketches. In this example she has continued and completed her work on Schenker's Op. 4, No. 1 with two middleground sketches as well as the Ursatz. There appear to be no corrections made on any of these examples, which could suggest a lack of assistance or revision on Schenker's part. However, the more likely reason for a scarcity of marks by Schenker is that the graph we see is a final product of many drafts done by Elias with Schenker's guidance; the fact that the piece is written by Schenker would only seem to make his opinion that much more crucial. In the next chapter we shall examine this process of drafts and revision.
17 Elias, Angelika. A Letter to Heinrich Schenker. "...it is my first task to tell you how happy it made me to hear that you were not dissatisfied with my work on your Op. 4 No. 1."
Figure 4.2 Elias’ foreground graph of Schenker’s Op. 4 No. 1
Figure 4.3 Excerpt from graph of Schenker's Caecilico Op. 1, No. 2, by Elias.
That said, did Schenker actually play a role in analyzing his own compositions? Did he use his own music as a basis for practicing his theory, or could he have used his graphs as a way of creating pieces?

A sample page from another graph done by Elias of Schenker's Capriccio Op. 1, No. 2 is shown in figure 4.3 on page 22. Like the previous graph, it has no perceptible corrections, but it too looks like a final draft. There is evidence that indicates Elias did write multiple drafts when she mentions this Capriccio in a letter to Frau Schenker (see page 16) though her letter does not pertain to the reanalyzing of this particular piece. In the same paragraph, Elias also mentions redoing the Beethoven "Appassionata" Sonata that she had already completed before.19

An example of Elias' work is shown in Figure 4.4 (page 24), in which Schenker has obviously made some alternate suggestions. The Brahms Op. 39, No. 4 Waltz contains some particularly good illustrations of Schenker's corrections, though Elias' and Schenker's separate markings may appear a bit less clear than in the original due to some discoloration and the age of the document. However, in the original copy of the analysis, Schenker's corrections are clearly marked and distinctly different from Angelika's penmanship.

As can be seen in the example, most of the corrections appear to be minute, consisting of the added slur, stems and/or brackets, but appearances can be deceiving, especially in Schenkerian analysis. In this example, and remarkably in every other graph

---

18 The entire graph was too lengthy to include whole, but can be found in Appendix A on pages 48 - 53.
19 See footnote 14 for citation and complete example, in which Elias writes: "I have busied myself...with Schenker's Capriccio Op. 1 No. 2, and then also I have done over again the "Appassionata" Sonata..."
The clearest instances of Schenker's corrections in this particular graph are the darker marks that occur in the lower right corner.

by Elias that I have in my possession, Schenker does not correct any harmonic portion of the analysis.

The main idea behind many of Schenker’s corrections is that Schenker was trying to show the connection in the music that was seemingly one step further than Elias was going. For example, Elias added stems to three bass notes that she must have considered
to be structurally important toward the end of the foreground. Schenker "corrected" her by adding a beam to those three notes, "G", "A", and "B", therefore drawing attention to a fundamental stepwise connection that was otherwise obscured with a complicated jumble of notes in between.

Another instance in this particular graph occurred in Elias' *Urlinie*, concerning the use of slurs. Elias connected scale degree 3 ("G") through the use of a dotted slur with another "G" three measures later; the dotted slur shows the prolongation of "G", but in doing this Elias focuses on a less structurally significant event and missed one that was more important (to an earlier level of the graph). Schenker corrects her by adding a solid slur from the same initial tone to a "G" that occurs eight measures later, drawing attention to a larger stretch of music over which scale degree 3 is harmonically prolonged. What is even more remarkable is that his slur indicates neighbor motion with "A" that Elias has seemingly overlooked at this level. At the same time, the scale degree 3 at the end of Schenker's slur is the beginning of the descent in the *Urlinie*. This one revision, while seemingly slight on the surface, ended up carrying over into an earlier structural level of the analysis. So, while Schenker's corrections may have appeared to be overly-precise (and some of them probably could have been), his observations were often critical in making decisions about fundamental aspects of the sketch, even at the later levels of graphing such as the foreground.

Even with those corrections, Elias obviously had a mature grasp of Schenker's theories as well as what he expected to see in the analyses. What is really interesting is in the corrections he suggested but that she did not make. As will be seen when comparing Elias' and Schenker's graphs of the Brahms Waltz No. 4 in the next chapter, Elias chose
a different scale-degree 2 to be part of the *Ursuline* than the one Schenker chose. Given his
careful examinations, it is hard to believe he missed this discrepancy, especially since it
occurs from the foreground all the way through an early middleground sketch.

Comparing Elias’ analysis of Waltz No. 4 with Schenker’s middleground graph
found in *Free Composition*, his designated scale degree 2 is even from a different
harmony than the one Elias chose to assign to the *Ursuline*. This issue will be further
discussed in Chapter 5.

Yet, it is still hard to tell how many attempts were made of each graph analyzed
by Elias; it would certainly make a difference if this were her first attempt or whether
there had been twenty other sketches previously drawn up of this Waltz. Elias may have
changed things after Schenker addressed the issue with her at a later time, or they may
have simply disagreed about this particular item.

While there are dozens of other pieces that Elias analyzed, those in this chapter
clearly demonstrate her competence and knowledge of Schenkerian theory. What remains
to be seen is how Schenker’s own analyses compare to hers.
CHAPTER 5

A COMPARISON OF ANALYSES

The majority of the surviving graphs done by Elias were of pieces that Schenker also analyzed at some point. This can be confirmed by comparing Elias' lesson plans with Laskowski's index of Schenkerian graphs.\(^{21}\) Notable among the exceptions are Elias' analyses of music composed by Schenker himself. Several speculations can be suggested from the fact that Elias analyzed many of the same pieces as Schenker, but a further comparison of some sketches by both of them is necessary to provide a more complete picture.

What follows is a series of examples taken from five of the sixteen Brahms Op. 39 Waltzes\(^{22}\) of graphs done by both Schenker and Elias.\(^{23}\) While many of Elias and Schenker's analyses share similar ideas, there are just as many instances where Elias and Schenker seem to reach different conclusions about the music.

The first illustrations show an example of Elias and Schenker's interpretations of Waltz No. 9; figures 5.1 and 5.2 are taken from graphs done by both of them. The most obvious similarity between them is that both Elias and Schenker gave primary structural importance to the fundamental bass line beginning on "F"; they both indicate this by

using stemmed open noteheads for those tones. However, a crucial difference between Elias' and Schenker's interpretations prevents Elias from concluding with stepwise motion in the bass as Schenker does; the difference, which could arguably be referred to as a mistake, is that Elias has seemingly disregarded analyzing the entire second ending after the foreground level of her graph. Elias and Schenker both begin on the same “I”, but Elias connects her tone to the first ending on “A” (with G# as a passing tone), while Schenker analyzes “I”-“G”-“A” into the second ending.

Both gave secondary importance to the chromatic ascending line; however, Schenker begins his by showing the first note, “A”, in the same register as the rest of the notes, while Elias does not seem to recognize “A” as part of the progression and leaves it

---

23 Brahms, Johannes. *Waltzes, op. 39*. No. 1 – 4 and 9 were used in the course of my research, mainly due to the fact that those particular waltzes are the ones that Schenker analyzed in one way or another.

24 I have recopied some of Elias' graphs by hand due to the poor quality of the originals.

25 An important distinction to keep in mind is that Elias' graph is an *Urlinie tafel* while Schenker's is a somewhat earlier middleground graph. Referring to Elias' Figure 5.3 is more appropriate and comparable when discussing open and closed noteheads.
in the original register. By doing this it becomes unclear as to whether or not she intends to show the “Bb” as the initial note of this figure.

The largest difference between the previous two examples is in register placement; this probably has to do with the fact that Schenker was working in the obligatory register, and on a somewhat earlier level of analysis than Elias. The “A”, “E”, and “D” that Schenker puts parentheses around can be found in the same places, but different registers, as Elias’ graph. When looking at her middleground graph in figure 5.3, which seems to be more comparable level than her previous graph to Schenker’s, Elias clearly shows descending thirds motion with the *Urlinie*. Schenker, on the other hand, pulls the “E” and “D” down into the bass register to show the passing motion from his initial note “F”.

![Figure 5.3 Elias’ graph of Waltz No. 9](image)

Lastly, in a general comment regarding both of their analyses, notice that each *Urlinie* ends on scale-degree 2, and over a dominant harmony. Waltz No. 10 resolves the
dominant harmony by beginning on a d-minor chord, the tonic from Waltz No. 9 but the new (minor) dominant in No. 10.

Unfortunately, there is no known analysis done of Waltz No. 10 by Schenker, but Elias completed all sixteen, and in her next analysis she does resolve the Urlinie all the way to scale degree 1, though in the new key of G major. This resolution can be seen in full detail in Appendix A.\textsuperscript{25}

Shown next are examples taken from the graphs of Waltz No. 4, measures 1–8. As had been mentioned briefly in the previous chapter\textsuperscript{26}, there is a discrepancy as to which note should function as scale degree 2 of the fundamental line between Elias and Schenker's analyses. As can be seen in Figures 5.4 and 5.5, Elias not only chose a different scale-degree 2 to put in the Urlinie, but one that was supported by a chord with a secondary-dominant function. Schenker indicates in his analysis that he believes scale-degree 2 of the Urlinie belongs over the dominant harmony, and that the II chord beforehand serves more of an anticipatory function than a supportive one. However,

\textsuperscript{25} See page 54.
looking at the score (see Appendix A), Schenker is giving weight to a note that does not exist! He uses an implied tone as scale-degree 2 in his *Ursuline*, while Elias uses the existing 2 and shows it prolonged over the dominant. Further, Schenker does not show where the *kopfton*, “G”, is going. Instead of showing how “G” is prolonged, Schenker gets too caught up with the parallel sixth chords. Elias, however, not only clearly shows “G” as being prolonged, but subarticulates #IV\(^7\) in her unfolding to spell out the continuation of “G” even further. Schenker is clearer in showing the unfolding in the bass

![Figure 5.5 Elias' graph of Waltz No. 4](image)

as well as making explicit the parallel motion that is occurring throughout this passage, but in many ways, Elias’ interpretation seems to be more precise.

\(^{26}\) This discussion can be seen on pages 25-26.
The comparison of these graphs is an excellent example of Elias using her knowledge and experience to come to analytical decisions, regardless of the fact that it may differ from Schenker's interpretation. Based on what decisions Schenker makes in his graph, Elias obviously used her personal judgment about where to put scale-degree 2 in the *Urlinie*. These figures show without a doubt that Elias has obviously spent time working alone and thinking independently about the decisions put into her graph.

A noteworthy instance of differences between Elias and Schenker's analyses were found in Brahms' Waltz No. 3. Shown in the following graphs, figures 5.6 and 5.7, the first variance occurs in the treatment of the "F⁸".

**Figure 5.6 Schenker's graph of Waltz No. 3**

**Figure 5.7 Elias' graph of Waltz No. 3**

![Schenker's graph of Waltz No. 3](image1)

![Elias' graph of Waltz No. 3](image2)
As can be seen in comparing Elias’ version with Schenker’s, Elias gives much less consideration to the $F^x$ in the first ending, even at the foreground level of her graph. Schenker’s example appears to come from some kind of middleground level, but he notates the same chromatic tone with its own roman numeral, giving it a larger amount of importance than Elias does. It is curious that Elias does not pay more attention to this tone considering it is supported by the third of the dominant harmony. What is even more interesting is that $F^x$ only occurs one other time in the entire piece of music during a dominant harmony; it is less obvious, hidden in an inner voice. Yet, Elias gives this second chromatic tone recognition all the way into her middleground level, while disregarding the first one – that occurred in an outer voice – after the foreground.

In her defense, the reason that the first F double-sharp was possibly seen as a passing tone, leading from the first ending back to the beginning is that she is analyzing this particular piece in two keys, $g^\#$ minor and B major! The “$F^x$” wouldn’t fit with a V chord in B major, as Elias has notated V/VII, meaning V in B major but VII in $g^\#$ minor. Again, this seems to be an instance where Elias uses great insight in her analysis.

However, Elias does make a mistake in trying to show too much in one graph; in measures five through seven she tries simultaneously to show passing motion, unfolding and subordination of the tonic to the dominant. This is not possible and is an oversight on Elias’ part.

What is also remarkable to me is that Elias did not acknowledge the dominant harmony (dominant in $g^\#$ minor) in measure 8 past her foreground level, while Schenker
recognizes it in an earlier level\textsuperscript{27}. Furthermore, Elias marks several examples of unfolding in the bass, but subsequently did not mark the one instance of unfolding in the bass line that Schenker indicated. It should also be noted that this is the only example I found in which their harmonic analyses contain discrepancies, not only in Elias' employment of dual keys, but in clarity and appearance of the roman numerals.

In Waltz No.2, Elias and Schenker came up with very similar sketches in some parts of the graph; this is certainly a step removed from the obvious differences of the past few examples. As can be seen in figures 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10, Elias' idea behind measures 1 – 8 follows extremely closely to Schenker's.

The similarities are obvious if you compare the first section (up to the repeat sign) of Elias' middleground (figure 5.10) with figure 5.8 by Schenker. It is almost as if seeing them go through the same thought process on paper. If you compare Elias' earliest graph with the second example by Schenker, the main difference between the two is in the register; otherwise, every other aspect is the same, right down to the places in the music from which the \textit{Urinie} was created.

My only other observation would be on the lack of a standard mark in Elias' graph to denote the interruption; instead of the usual parallel dashes, she uses brackets with a break in between scale-degree 2 and 3. But then, if the graph below is taken into account, it seems as though Elias originally marked scale-degrees 5 and 4 as part of the descending \textit{Urinie} before changing her mind or being corrected. In her

\textsuperscript{27} While the content makes the graph appear to be a middleground level, it is important to note that
Schenker is still using rhythmic, and not only structural notation at this point.
original, as well as in what I have tried to portray in my hand copied version, scale-degrees 5 and 4 appear to be crossed out and put into parentheses; it is unclear this time
as to whether she changed her mind or if Schenker corrected her graph. However, it seems a likely possibility that Schenker corrected her version – this would explain the striking similarities between their analyses for Waltz No. 2.

Perhaps the most interesting examples of all are found in the graphs of Brahms' Waltz No. 1. As can be seen in the following graphs (figures 5.11 – 5.14), Schenker obviously spent some time working with Elias on this analysis, though in many respects, their analyses came out completely different from one another. For this particular section it is necessary to have Elias' original copy of the graph so that Schenker's corrections can be separated from Elias' markings, but also my hand copy of her analysis in order to be able to clearly read the details of the graph.
Figure 5.11 Original Graph of Waltz No. 1 by Elias with corrections by Schenker.

Angelika Elias, Brahms Op. 39 Waltz No. 1. From the Oster Collection, reprinted with permission by the NYPL.
My copy of Elias' graph, seen in the previous example.
Upon a careful study of the previous four examples, I offer the possibility that Elias and Schenker worked together on this analysis. After studying the graphs carefully, my theory is that they could have began working together but came to different conclusions, and they have on previous occasions.

The later levels appear somewhat similar, especially when comparing the first eight measures of Elias' foreground to the first Schenker figure. However, even though Schenker obviously tried to shape Elias' analysis, they clearly came to some different conclusions at earlier levels of the graph.

Even without the previous examples, this graph is almost enough alone to show that Elias did her own work, and did not just blindly follow Schenker's lead. A look at the boxed-in section of Elias' graph reveals a section that is basically identical to the level of Schenker's graph that he labels "2nd level". One can be fairly sure, by the duplication as well as by his notational style, that Schenker added that section to Elias' graph as a suggested analysis. However, a comparison of both her and Schenker's analyses shows that Elias did not end utilizing that suggestion in any level of her graph; after the similar foreground, the next closest place is between Schenker's "1st level" and Elias' earliest level of analysis.

When studying Elias' original copy, Schenker's notes and corrections are evident and abundant. It is clear that he did not agree with much of her analysis; in fact, this graph represents the most marked-up work of Elias that I have seen to this point.

Even as their analyses begin to look more alike as they near the fundamental structure, Elias does not write in the obligatory register as Schenker does, and she never gets to the 3-2-1 *Urline* that he uses. Their clearest theoretical disagreement pertains to
the resolution of the neighbor tone. Schenker crossed out some of the scale-degrees in
Elias' original Urtinie (three systems from the top of her graph). Elias uses 3-4-3-2-1,
showing scale-degree 4 as part of the resolution from a line of the first order; however, a
close look at the top left hand corner of Elias' copy shows a mark that indicates 3-Nbn-3-
2-1. I believe Schenker wrote that in as a guide for Elias to instead treat scale-degree 4 as
a complete neighbor tone; supporting this idea is the fact that Schenker consistently
treated the neighbor tone as complete and consonant, even though it resolves as a
dissonance in this piece (the seventh of a IV chord). Further evidence of this
disagreement is shown in the fact that Schenker included this same tone as a nebennote in
his own graph (though it did not carry over to the Ursaiz). Elias included the nebennote
all the way into her background level, but does not treat scale-degree 4 as resolving to a
consonant tone, therefore leaving the nebennote incomplete; this does not follow
Schenker's theory, which makes it all the more notable.

Even their harmonic analyses of the piece are somewhat different until each
reaches an earlier graphing level; in Elias' foreground, Schenker has notated the roman
numerals he deems as appropriate underneath (these also occur in his graph of the piece).
Unfortunately, Elias' graph is hard to interpret in certain sections due to the excessive
corrections and dark markings; it can become hard to tell which were Schenker's
intentions and which were Elias' changes. Even so, both of their graphs of Waltz No.1
are filled with information, not only about their interpretations of the piece, but also about
Elias' and Schenker's work together.
As can be seen from the comparisons of this chapter, there is a strong likeness between Schenker and Elias' analytical style, as was to be expected from such a longtime student. Yet, Elias oftentimes made her own judgments about each graph, and as has been shown, her conclusions can be regarded as both thoughtful and skilled.

Based on this information the following scenarios can be intimated. One conceivable idea is that some of Elias' graphs, or at least her ideas, were used for some of the examples in *Free Composition* after working with Schenker on those pieces. Another possibility is that Schenker did rely, at least in part, on Elias' opinions and sketches; the fact that she was his leading student for so long only lends support to this claim. Regardless, Elias was obviously a very talented Schenkerian in her own right with a very in-depth understanding of Schenker's theories. Of course, other situations include Schenker having already analyzed the music before he assigned it to Elias, or her completing the graphs first; Schenker could have then corrected and shaped them to his liking, and not used much of her input.

Looking further here will help determine which scenario seems most likely, but no definite conclusions can be drawn at this time as to how much of an influence Elias and her work had on Schenker, if any at all.

In a letter to Mrs. Schenker, Elias wrote:

"„Beim Lesen des „Freien Satzes“ staune ich immer wieder über den Reichtum und die Schönheit der Bilder.""

"In reading *Free Composition*, I continue to be astounded at the richness and beauty of the graphs."

---

This might be hurtful to my suggestion that her graphs have been used as a reference to those in *Free Composition*, but Elias could be exclaiming about the hundreds of other examples that she did not see and study before. Therefore, this evidence alone remains inconclusive.

However, some comments made by Salzer help show a likely situation under which many of Schenker's other students developed their graphs, while also offering an explanation for the striking similarities that appear between them and Schenker's sketches. Salzer studied with Schenker and several other students in a weekly seminar during which a new publication of graphs was begun, *Five Graphic Music Analyses*. In *Five Graphic Music Analyses*, Salzer wrote an introduction in which he included remarks about his time studying with Schenker and assisting in the creation of the book. He says:

“Sometime before the seminar began its work Schenker gave me the following list of compositions which we were to analyze. At this time he planned to publish analytic studies of these works in the form of graphs. The analyses of the first five works listed make up the contents of this publication. The study of these five works and the most careful graphing of the results formed the core of the first winter’s work (1931 to 1932). Each of us was assigned a different composition; the work on the voice-leading graphs went through many stages until they represented Schenker’s point of view.”

Salzer continues to describe in more detail the way in which Schenker shaped each student’s graph:

“I am in no position to state when Schenker himself had completed analytic work on these five compositions. It was my impression that it was done before our sessions began... He led us step by step into all facets of voice leading and of musical synthesis. This kind of analysis can only be taught by one who has clarified for himself the analytical problems of a particular work. I shall never forget the highly persuasive and artistic manner in which he explained particular sections or passages, playing them on the piano, sometimes in “slow motion,” so as to make their voice leading clear.”

---

30 Taken from Salzer’s introduction to *Five Graphic Music Analyses.*
If this was the case with Schenker and Elias, a possibility that becomes more likely is that Schenker shaped her graphs as well, until they represented his ideas or existing analyses. Of course, having been his student for so long, and as has been seen, Elias had developed a more individual analytical style by the time *Free Composition* was in progress. Yet, even if she was working independently, after studying with Schenker for so many years Elias would have been profoundly influenced by his views. This discipline would be clearly evident in her graphs, whether or not Schenker was actively guiding her analysis.

Further evidence that Schenker's was the outweighing influence is in Salzer's assertion that a second series of *Five Graphic Music Analyses* was being planned by Schenker. Apparently *Free Composition* took over the majority of Schenker's schedule, but according to Salzer the graphs for the second series were well under way at the time of Schenker's death. If this is true, it is also possible that Elias was involved in the next series somehow, which would only give Schenker more reason to strictly monitor her analyses.

Despite all of this evidence, one can always look at the notational styles and labeling of the graphs involved in *Five Graphic Music Analyses* and see distinct differences between them. This suggests that at least some latitude was given to the students with regards to those particular areas. And, as has been seen, Elias not only came to different conclusions on several occasions, but went further in some of her analyses than Schenker. This offers the additional and very possible situation, that even if Schenker was exacting with his students, he may have not been as strict with Elias as he might have been with those who were less experienced or skilled.
CONCLUSION

With regards to Elias' role in Schenker's work, the scenarios that have been offered in the previous chapter are only a few of many possibilities. Unfortunately, for the time being they will remain just that—possibilities; there is no determining evidence as of yet to point definitively at one conclusion about Elias' influence and role in Schenkerian theory. Obviously, her role was a considerable one; she was much more than a copyist and clearly made contributions in the field, despite the fact that she has only one known publication.31 Even if Elias did do some copying for Schenker, she was first and more importantly a talented theorist, not to mention a close friend, student and likely, some kind of an assistant to Schenker.

My objective was to introduce Elias as a major player in Schenkerian theory, and to give her the long overdue recognition and credit she deserved. Surely, Elias qualifies as a "true student" of Schenker, much more so than the experts in the field today—Oster, Jonas, or Salzer. Her letters and graphs are evidence enough of this, not to mention Schenker's own diary entries and lesson plans. As has been shown, Elias' analyses were
oftentimes arguably more clear than those done by Schenker himself. It is tragic to think of what knowledge and experience Elias may have passed on had she not been a victim of the Holocaust.

Further research and investigation is needed to find out more about Elias’ life and her work. There are still many more documents to translate and numerous analyses to study so as to gain a better insight into Elias’ role in Schenkerian theory, as well as a clearer picture of Heinrich Schenker’s own life and work.

31 Elias published “Zwei Klavierstücke Aus Schumaanns “Album Für Die Jugend”” in *Der Dreiklang* in October of 1937. This is her only known publication.
APPENDIX A

SCORES, GRAPHS AND OTHER ANALYSES
APPENDIX A
Schenker, Capriccio Op.1, No. 2 – for use with page 22
APPENDIX A
Schenker Capriccio continued...
Schenker Capriccio continued...
Schenker Capriccio continued...
Schenker Capriccio continued...
Schenker Capriccio continued....
APPENDIX A

Brahms Waltz No. 10, Op. 39 – for use with page 30
APPENDIX A

For the enhancement of discussion on pages 37 – 42.

Walzer.
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APPENDIX A

For use with pages 34 – 36.
APPENDIX A

For use with pages 32 – 34.

Waltz No. 4 supplements pages 30 – 32.
Waltz No. 4 continued...
APPENDIX A
For use with pages 27–30.
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