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In recent years a considerable amount of attention has been given to the writings of Heinrich Schenker. In numerous books, articles, and dissertations, scholars have dissected, examined and argued about his theories.

That Schenker's writings continue to bring about controversy is understandable, for there is a widespread misunderstanding of his theories by those who apply his organic concept of structure to musical styles that are far removed from the musical context with which he was concerned. Schenker, himself, based his theories only upon a body of musical literature that spans the time from J. S. Bach to Brahms. This limitation is supported by the dedication he wrote in his monograph (1912) on Beethoven's Ninth Symphony: "To Johannes Brahms, the last of the German masters." 1

Many of Schenker's essays and monographs have been translated into English. 2 Yet, to date, a complete translation of his magnum opus, Neue musikalische Theorien und

1 "Dem Andenken des letzen Meisters Deutscher Tonkunst Johannes Brahms."

2 David Beach's article "A Schenker Bibliography" (Journal of Music Theory, 23/2, Fall 1979) is a comprehensive, annotated listing of Schenker's works. Also, the Readings in Schenker Analysis edited by Maury Yeston (Yale University Press, 1977) includes the most important books, monographs, and articles relative to Schenker studies.
Phantasien von einem Künstler has not been fully realized. The purpose of this dissertation is to provide a complete translation of Kontrapunkt, thereby making available in English the complete New Musical Theories and Fantasies. Kontrapunkt does not enjoy the eminence among English readers that Harmony, Free Composition, and some of his other essays do. Although some of its passages have appeared in translation in a variety of papers, books, and articles, nothing approximating a complete translation into English has been realized. Yet, Kontrapunkt remains an important work; in it, Schenker begins a "reductive" procedure that finds final expression in his last works, Fünf Urlinie-Tafeln and Der freie Satz.

This dissertation is divided into two volumes. Volume I contains a "Preface," "Schenker's Biographical Sketch," an "Introduction" that provides an overview of the content of Kontrapunkt, and a final section entitled "Concluding Remarks" that highlights some of the concepts presented in Kontrapunkt.

New Musical Theories and Fantasies is a three-part work covering over thirty years of writing. Part I, Harmonielehre (1906) was translated by Elizabeth Mann Borgese (edited by Oswald Jonas) and published by the University of Chicago Press (1954). And while there are two English translations of Part III, Der freie Satz (1935)--T. Howard Kreuger's unpublished doctoral dissertation (The University of Iowa, 1960) and Ernst Oster's translation Free Composition (New York: Longman Press, 1979)--there is no complete translation of Part II, Kontrapunkt (Volume I, 1910; Volume II, 1922).
After this introductory section, the complete translation of Kontrapunkt I (1910) is presented with the appended "Notes to Kontrapunkt I." These notes include annotations and musical examples that Schenker mentioned but did not provide. The "Notes" also contain the complete passages of text from which Schenker has extracted fragmentary quotations. These passages are provided in order to enhance the needed contextual continuity.

Volume II of the dissertation contains a complete translation of Kontrapunkt II (1922), a set of annotative notes entitled "Notes to Kontrapunkt II." These notes serve the same function as do those of Kontrapunkt I.

Schenker did not bother to cite complete bibliographical information or consistently to include the page numbers of his secondary sources. Therefore, the sources and musical references that he failed to provide are included in my annotative notes. These are indicated within the body of this edited translation by Arabic numbers with asterisks set in parentheses, e.g., (*1), (*2), (*3), etc. Since most of Schenker's own asides, commentaries, and source citations appear within the body of the original text (creating, I believe, an interruption of the sentence flow), I have moved them to footnotes in the translation and have indicated them with the graphic symbol + .

To assist the reader in following the German text, the original pagination is given in square brackets [ ] at the left-hand side of the page. All translations of primary
and secondary sources are mine, unless otherwise credited.

All page references in the body of the translation refer to the original pagination of Schenker's two volumes. This practice applies to cross references in Schenker's text, page references in the footnotes within the body of the translation, and page references in the "Notes" that are appended to each volume. To avoid confusion, all page numbers in the translation that refer to the original German pagination have been underlined as a reminder to the reader. However, in order to make a specific subject heading easier for the reader to locate, the "Table of Contents" of both Kontrapunkt I and Kontrapunkt II contain the original German pagination as well as the dissertation pagination.

Schenker had a penchant for using the exclamation point. Obviously, he used them to mark an event or thought that he wished to draw to the reader's attention. In general, these have been retained in the translation; however, his practice of using italics for emphasis has not been carried over.

As with any translation, the translator is confronted with problems that require arbitrary resolutions and decisions. In Schenker's writings the level of difficulty and number of problems are formidable. To being with, his writing style is seldom easily accessible. Not only is his line of thought complex, but he tends to over-use metaphors, imagery, extended sentence structures, and at times sheer bombast. It would even be fair to say that his writing style is not totally
understandable to native German readers. Even Wilhelm Furtwängler, who frequently consulted with Schenker on performance scores, made this observation about Schenker's writing style:

... despite his unique intelligence, Schenker was not able to write down his knowledge in the very precise, clear-cut terms that would be both essential and desirable. Perhaps during his later years a kind of Talmudic over-refinement came to the fore, or perhaps the extraordinary isolation and loneliness which by necessity made him a true voice "crying in the wilderness" prevented his speaking out with absolute clarity. . . .

Further compounding the problem of translating Schenker's prose into English is the fact that many German words cannot be rendered by a simple English equivalent. At times the translator must use several English words in order to replace a single German one, in which case the reader must rely on the context to illuminate the meaning. One such word is the ubiquitous Stufe. Translations such as "scale-degree," "scale-step," or "harmonic scale-degree," "harmonic scale step," cannot adequately render the meaning of this word. Only after studying Schenker's writings and the evolution of his thought processes can the reader understand that the Stufe is not necessarily a simple, individual chord, but a harmonic, mental "guide" whose unfolding and inter-

---

4 Wilhelm Furtwängler, Ton und Wort, Aufsätze und Vorträge (Wiesbaden: Brockhaus, 1954), p. 200 f. [Earlier in his book Furtwängler reports how Schenker's monograph on Beethoven's Ninth Symphony came into his hands while he was a conductor in Lübeck.]
relation is achieved by the voice-leading principles found in counterpoint.

The terms Synkope and Vorhalt merit comment as well. Although a Synkope—or syncopation—can be either a consonant or dissonant figure, it may be translated "suspension," in the sense that the word itself points to the components of a [dissonant] suspension: preparation-dissonance-resolution. Vorhalt also translates as "suspension"; it, however, refers to the suspension's function as a "delay" of the expected harmonic tone. Thus, only "true" suspensions are Vorhalten (\(\sim 9--8\) and \(\sim 4--3\)); and when these are not being discussed, Schenker uses the more general term Synkope.

Schenker uses a variety of terms that are no longer in common use: for example, "antiparallels," which he uses to describe successive perfect consonances (5-5, 8-5, 8-8, 5-1, etc.) taken in contrary motion, or "nonparallel direct" motion, which he refers to as successive consonances in the same direction, the second of which is perfect (3-1, 6-8, etc.). Other terms such as "descending leading tone" (the second scale degree) and "ascending leading tone" (the seventh scale degree) become clear in the context.

Since there are numerous small errors in both the musical examples and the German text, it seemed appropriate to correct these without comment.

In reading both volumes of Kontrapunkt, it is important to realize that even though Volume II (1922) appeared twelve years after Volume I (1910), Schenker conceived both
volumes as part of an integral work. In Volume I Schenker provides an overview of both volumes:

It will suffice, therefore to present the theory of the cantus firmus, composition in two, three, four, and more parts using the familiar five species, and finally, as newly added materials, the transition to free composition.

Volume I often refers to discussions that will be found in Volume II. Likewise, in Volume II there are numerous references to subject matter that was projected for inclusion in the third volume of Kontrapunkt, i.e., Der freie Satz. The planned order of the Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien was:

Band I. Harmonielehre

Band II¹. Kontrapunkt. Cantus firmus; der zweistimmige Satz

Band II². Kontrapunkt Forsetzung; Der drei-und mehrstimmige Satz

Band II³. Kontrapunkt Forsetzung; Der freie Satz

Clearly, his intent was to show how the voice-leading principles of strict counterpoint are operative, though disguised, in free composition.

---

⁵ Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 25.

⁶ In this translation, Band I has been rendered Harmonielehre; Band II¹ and Band II² have been rendered Kontrapunkt I and Kontrapunkt II respectively; Band II³ has been rendered Der freie Satz.
SCHENKER'S BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Some confusion continues to exist about Schenker's birth and death dates. Several sources give June 19, 1867 as his birthdate; others give June 19, 1868. Even Oster's recent translation of *Der freie Satz* gives the latter date. The confusion, if not entirely eliminated, seems convincingly resolved in Sonia Slatin's dissertation entitled "The Theories of Heinrich Schenker in Perspective." Slatin's correspondence with Margarethe Wesei, official registrar at the Israelitische Kultusgemeinde produced the following letter dated December 28, 1964:

---


10 According to Dr. Slatin, the Israelitische Kultusgemeinde functions as a central source of investigation and organization of records in connection with matters of importance to Austrians of the Jewish faith.
We have made a variety of diverse official inquiries in connection with your recent letter concerning Dr. Heinrich Schenker in order to be able to transmit accurate information to you. We can now notify you as follows: Dr. Heinrich Schenker was born on June 19, 1867 in Wisniowczyk, Galicia. On November 10, 1919 he was married in Vienna to Mrs. Jeanette Kornfeld (nee Schiff), who was born in Aussig, August 31, 1874.11

A similar confusion exists concerning Schenker's death date. The dates range from January 13, 1935 to January 22nd of the same year. In the letter cited above, Margarethe Wesei writes: "Dr. Schenker died January 14, 1935 in Vienna."12

We know very little about Schenker's youth. According to Michael Mann, "Schenker revealed his musical gifts while still in grammar school . . . and toured Eastern Europe as a 'prodigy' pianist."13 Supposedly it was at this time that Schenker came to the attention of the pianist Carl Mikuli, a pupil of Chopin.14

Even his arrival date in Vienna is disputed. We do, however, have the date of Schenker's entrance to the University

11 Slatin, "The Theories of Schenker," p. 3.
12 Slatin, p. 3.
of Vienna. In a letter to Dr. Slatin dated July 20, 1966, Franz Gall, Director of Archives at the University writes:

In reply to your recent request . . . I can inform you that Heinrich Schenker, born to the surgeon Johann Schenker at Wisniowczyk, Galicia, was registered in the Faculty of Law in the winter semester of 1884-1885, at 17 years of age.15

While attending the University of Vienna, Schenker's tuition was apparently paid through a private scholarship. According to Oswald Jonas, the stipend enabled Schenker to enter both the University and the Conservatory.16 We know that Schenker studied counterpoint for two years at the Conservatory under the tutelage of Anton Bruckner. However, no one seems to know with whom he studied piano and music theory prior to his coming to Vienna.

During the 1890's, Schenker first tried his hand at composition and musical criticism. His musical output was small and, except for a few songs (Lieder, Op. 3), all his works were written for the piano. His piano works include Etudes (Op. 1, 1897), Fantasie (Op. 2, 1898), Fünf Kleine Stücke (Op. 4), Inventionen (Op. 5), Ländler (Op. 10),

15 Slatin, "The Theories of Schenker," p. 7. [According to Slatin, Dr. Gall's letter states that Schenker continued at the university through the summer semester of 1888. Slatin writes: "He [Dr. Gall] does not mention a doctorate in law; presumably, however, that was the degree earned by Schenker in 1888."

Syrische Tanze,¹⁷ and several arrangements for piano, four hands, of music by Handel, J. S. Bach, and C. P. E. Bach.

But far more important than the musical output were the critical reviews and essays written for numerous periodicals and newspapers. Most (eighteen) appeared in Die Zukunft, a periodical published in Berlin (ed. Maximilian Harden, 1892-1919). Newspapers in which Schenker's writings appeared were Das Musikalische Wochenblatt (ed. Fritsch, Leipzig), Die Abenpost (a supplement to the Wiener Zeitung), Der Kunstwerk (Munich), Neue Revue (Vienna) and Die Zeit (Vienna). Schenker's concert reviews in Die Zeit attracted the attention of the Dutch baritone Johannes Messchaert (1857-1922). Eventually, Messchaert engaged Schenker as his accompanist for a concert tour. Because of this and other activities as conductor and composer, Schenker attracted the attention of Brahms, as well as the two leading concert pianists of the day, Eugene d'Albert (1864-1932) and Ferruccio Busoni (1866-1924). Both Brahms and Busoni recommended Schenker to their publishers, Simrock, and Breitkopf & Härtel--firms that subsequently published Schenker's songs and piano compositions. Schenker's position was also enhanced by the fact that Busoni and d'Albert included Schenker's piano works in several of their programs.

By this time, Schenker had become involved more in writing about music than in composition itself. This interest

¹⁷ Some of these four-handed pieces were orchestrated by Schönberg.
must have finally diverted his attention from a possible career as a concert pianist or composer and toward that of the music theorist. Remarks in his writings make it apparent that Schenker found little correlation between conventional music theory and musical composition. He often referred to Bruckner's sarcastic comment that although he (Bruckner) propogated the "rules," naturally he did not abide by them while composing.

As his essays attest, Schenker directed his studies to the musical masterpieces and theoretical literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The latter included treatises of C. P. E. Bach, Rameau, Fux, Cherubini, and Albrechtsberger, to name only a few. His investigation and comparison of theoretical writings and musical compositions led him in 1902 to issue a revised edition of the keyboard sonatas of C. P. E. Bach.\(^\text{18}\) Four years later Schenker's Harmonielehre was published by Cotta (Stuttgart & Berlin) on d'Albert's recommendation.\(^\text{19}\) The publication of Harmonielehre proved to be a turning point in Schenker's life, for, with this publication, he abandoned composition entirely and began to devote himself to writing about the basic principles underlying musical masterpieces.


\(^{19}\) Heinrich Schenker, Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien von einem Künstler; Erster Band: Harmonielehre (Stuttgart: J. C. Cotta Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1906.)
Also about this time, when the new edition of C. P. E. Bach's Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen appeared,\textsuperscript{20} Schenker reexamined his 1902 edition of the sonatas (selections) and published in 1908 a revised edition, which included an analytical supplement entitled Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik (A Contribution to Ornamentation).\textsuperscript{21}

The next year, 1909, Schenker's analysis of J. S. Bach's Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue appeared,\textsuperscript{22} followed in 1910 by the first volume of Kontrapunkt.\textsuperscript{23} In 1912 his monograph on Beethoven's Ninth Symphony appeared and was widely read and well received by critics and musicians.\textsuperscript{24} In fact,  


it was through this publication that the famous conductors Wilhelm Furtwängler and Bruno Walter came to know Schenker's works.25


In 1922 the second volume of Kontrapunkt was published.27 The next publications were Der Tonwille (1921-24),28 a facsimile and introduction to Beethoven's Sonata, Op. 27, No. 2 (1921),29 an edition of the complete Beethoven piano sonatas (1921-1923),30 and Das Meisterwerk in

25 In 1919 Furtwängler arranged to meet Schenker. From 1920 on, Furtwängler visited Schenker whenever he was in Vienna in order to discuss and consult with him on the works he was conducting. It was Furtwängler who financed the publication of Schenker's Jahrbuch III, 1930. (The receipt is in the possession of Ernst Oster's estate.) See also, Ton und Wort by W. Furtwängler (Wiesbaden: F. A. Brockhaus, 1954). 26 Schenker's edition of Op. 106 was never published.


28 Heinrich Schenker, Der Tonwille, Flugblätter zum Zeugnis umwandelbarer Gesetze der Tonkunst einer neuen Jugend dargebracht (Vienna: A Gutmann Verlag, 1921-24). This appeared in ten issues and was later republished in three volumes by Universal Edition.


der Musik (1925-1930). In the last years of his life, Schenker published Fünf Urlinie-Tafeln (1932), J. Brahms: Octaven und Quinten (1934) and Der freie Satz (1935).

Throughout his research and writings, Schenker stressed the importance of preserving autograph manuscripts, and, indeed, he made a considerable contribution to the field of autograph study. Anthony van Hoboken, a student of Schenker, established the Photogramm Archive in Vienna in October 1927. It is housed in the Austrian National Library in Vienna, and Schenker was its curator until his death.

31 Heinrich Schenker's Das Meisterwerk in der Musik consists of three "Yearbooks": Jahrbuch I (1925), Jahrbuch II (1926), Jahrbuch III (1930). (Munich: Drei Masken Verlag.)


35 The primary function of the Archive is to collect and preserve the autographs for posterity and to make photocopies of them available upon request.
Schenker died on January 14, 1935, and was buried in the Central Cemetery in Vienna. He left voluminous notes and materials at the time of his death. These include an incomplete essay on interpretation, Die Kunst des Vortrages, which was in the possession of Oswald Jonas (1897-1978) and was to be published by Universal Edition under his supervision. The numerous unpublished analytical sketches that Ernst Oster (1908-1977) had are now housed in the Music Division of the New York Public Library, Special Collections, and cataloged as the "Oster Collection." The complete diaries of Schenker, along with a considerable amount of other materials owned by Oswald Jonas (1897-1978), are housed at the University of California, Riverside, Library as part of the "Oswald Jonas Memorial Collection." Other manuscripts are in the possession of Felix Salzer.

Following his death, his estate and manuscripts went to his widow, Jeanette Schenker. Fearing the Nazis would destroy the manuscripts in the Anschluss, she entrusted them to her husband's faithful followers. During World War II, Jeanette Schenker perished in a concentration camp.
INTRODUCTION

We stand before a Herculaneum and Pompeii of music: All musical culture is buried. Even the tonal material is ravaged—that foundation of music which artists, drawing from within themselves (and going beyond the scanty instruction of the overtone series), have completely reconstructed! Music—the most dream-like and "created" of the arts, the one that most of all experienced severe pangs of discovery, and therefore the one that was the latest given to us—this youngest of the arts, is lost:6

With these words Heinrich Schenker begins the Preface of his Kontrapunkt I (1910) decrying the lamentable conditions of musical art as he saw them. In Kontrapunkt II (1922) he writes:

What a dreadful picture of despair and impotency the present offers us; what a contrast it is to an epoch of genuine artistic creativity and artistic predisposition!: . . .
In short, we are living in an epoch that future historians will designate as truly asinine, an epoch whose relationship to art, I repeat, is totally hostile.37

Is it any wonder, then, in this imagined atmosphere of musical nihilism, that Schenker undertook the task of "redeeming" musical art from the deplorable conditions he perceived?

In his writings, Schenker railed against mediocrity, the common man, composers, performers, teachers, editors, and democracy, which he condemned as the "breeding ground" for

36 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. vi.
37 Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, pp. viii; xi.
mediocrity. Both Kontrapunkt I and Kontrapunkt II contain extensive tirades on these subjects. As far as he was concerned, only the genius—a German one, of course!—could forge progress and return to music its intended spiritual content. In Das Meisterwerk in der Musik III he writes:

After two centuries of absolute loyalty to Rameau, theory must finally decide to abandon his way, and return to the theory of the horizontal [dimension] as the only source of content and connection. It is certainly not my intention to plead for the national defense of the spirit when I say that German musicians must free themselves from the Versailles-chains of that French "Enlightenment" if they do not want to forego their musical superiority permanently, and indeed lose their musical ear in general. This liberation must take place, even if the German wishes to be "pacified" by foreign mediocrity rather than by his own genius.38

Aside from the odious references to the German "genius" that pervade his writings (many of which become more biting following World War I), Schenker did offer many astute and imaginative observations about musical structure and perception. For example, he firmly believed that only by the patient development of a truly perceptive ear can an individual grow to understand the true meaning of what master composers learned and experienced. Only then can the true "biological life" of tones be understood, for, in his view,

tones do have "lives of their own." In his Harmonielehre he writes:

We should get accustomed to seeing tones as creatures. We should learn to assume in them biological urges as they characterize living beings. We are faced, then, with the following equation: In nature: procreative urge \rightarrow repetition \rightarrow individual kind. In music, analogously: procreative urge \rightarrow repetition \rightarrow individual motif.

Later, in Das Meisterwerk in der Musik I, he writes:

Music is the living movement of tones in the nature-given tonal space, the compositional unfolding of Nature-given chords. The law of life—motion—which, as procreation, transcends the boundaries of individual existence is also carried by man into the chord that Nature has commended to his ear. Everything in music depends upon this movement, this procreative force. Nevertheless, all procreation is the spontaneous gift of life-bestowing Nature.

How, then, does counterpoint relate to the "biological life" of tones or the "chord of Nature"? Simply, it is through the principles of counterpoint that each is realized.

In his Preface to the Harmonielehre, Schenker explains why he wrote a harmony book first:

---

39 The biological metaphor is common in Schenker's writings. He refers to tones having "egotism," that a tone "desires to dominate its fellow tones," that the tones "pro- create." In fact, the title of his essay collection "Der Tonwille" (1921–24) is evidence of his metaphorical pre-occupation with tone-life.


41 Heinrich Schenker, Das Meisterwerk in der Musik I (Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1925), p. 12.
I will refer several times (§84 and passim) to a work on counterpoint which is in preparation. There are three factors which might have induced me to present, first of all, a theory of voice leading and only subsequently the more abstract theory of harmony. A logical and natural disposition of the whole material mediated in favor of such an order, supported, second, by the historical priority of counterpoint over harmony and, third, by my own concept of the relation between the two as it will result in these pages. Nevertheless, I thought it preferable to begin with the harmony. Any delay, however small, in initiating the needed reforms seemed to me to be counterindicated by the very factors just enumerated. For that same reason I shall also hasten the publication of the supplement under the title, "On the Decadence of the Art of Composing Music: A Technical-critical Analysis," which should reinforce the ideas here expressed and facilitate their practical utilization. And only then shall I proceed with the publication of my Psychology of Counterpoint.42

42 Schenker, Harmony, p. xxvi (Borgese translation). [One cannot help being struck with the intended title for the book on counterpoint. The proposed title, Psychology of Counterpoint, clearly illustrates the importance that Schenker placed on perception as related to musical structure.]
KONTRAPUNKT I AND II: AN OVERVIEW

Before going into the content of both volumes of Kontrapunkt, it seems appropriate here to mention the physical dimensions of each volume. Volume I is 444 pages long, not including the twenty-eight page preface; it contains an exhaustive discussion of the cantus firmus and two-part counterpoint. Within the text proper there are in excess of 514 musical examples. Kontrapunkt II, in contrast, is 263 pages long, not counting the preface (nine pages). Within the latter volume there are over 399 musical examples. It is divided into two sections: the first is devoted to three and multiple-part composition (counterpoint) while the second section, entitled "Paths to Free Composition," is devoted to combinations of the species.

In the Introduction to Kontrapunkt I, Schenker discusses the history of theoretical teachings as they were practiced in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. According to Schenker, eighteenth-century music theory was primarily based on voice leading, with no reference or implication regarding scale-degrees. One such "voice-leading theory" that is based on the musical experiences found in vocal polyphony was codified in Fux's Gradus ad Parnassum. Although the Gradus was not necessarily a manual for musical composition,

---

\(^{43}\) J. J. Fux, Gradus ad Parnassum, sive manuductio ad . . . supremo chori praefecto (Vienna: Johan Peter von Ghelen, 1727). [See full entry in "Notes to Kontrapunkt I," (*3).]
it was an attempt to orientate the ear to the most basic movement of voices and the treatment of dissonance.

According to Schenker, another kind of voice-leading theory had its origins in thoroughbass. Based on an era that witnessed the rapid development of instrumental music, the figured bass taught a voice leading in which parts moved above a bass line. The principles according to which a figured bass was realized were presented in many treatises. However, the essay that codified the rules of thoroughbass technique was the Lehre von dem Accompaniment by C. P. E. Bach, contained in his treatise Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen.44

It was, then, counterpoint based upon vocal principles and counterpoint based upon figured bass realizations that constituted studies in voice leading. Neither discipline employed the concept of scale-degree in its instruction.

Next, Schenker turns his discussion to Rameau. Three years before Fux's Gradus was published, Rameau introduced the concept of the scale-degree in his Traité.45 In this work Rameau revealed his fundamental bass and the concept of chord inversions. Since Rameau's conception of the scale-degree was

44 C. P. E. Bach, Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen, 2d ed. (Berlin: G. Winter, 1759-62). [See the full entry in "Notes to Kontrapunkt I," (*4).]

narrow, in that he attributed structural importance to every single chord, he failed to recognize chords resulting from passing function. Thus, while his theory aimed at teaching scale-degree and the principles of voice leading at the same time, he misrepresented both through oversimplification. When Rameau's theories became even more popular and composers began writing out the upper voices in their works rather than having "lesser-gifted continuo players" improvise them from the figures given under a bass line, a conflict arose between theory and practice that typified the nineteenth century. This was Schenker's view, and in this climate he wrote his Kontrapunkt in order to "liberate" voice-leading theory from 1) the vocal method of Fux, 2) the thoroughbass method of C. P. E. Bach, and finally 3) the confused method of Rameau and his successors who mixed voice leading and scale-degree.

In the course of his presentation of counterpoint and its relationship to free composition, Schenker quotes the textbooks of Fux, Cherubini, and Albrechtsberger to illustrate the older school of counterpoint instruction and those of Riemann, Richter, and Bellermann to illustrate the newer school. Schenker considered each of these writers to have shared one common fault: each implies that there is a direct relationship between the procedures of strict counterpoint and those of free composition. That is, each implies that the

---

46 Schenker also makes passing references to Helmholtz, S. Sechter, S. Dehn, Louis & Thuille, A. B. Marx, Nottebohm, among others.
mastery of counterpoint will in some way result in a style of writing that directly relates to free composition.

Certainly there is some validity to this contention, since the vocal polyphony prior to 1600 and species voice-leading exercises seem to be very similar. But when extended diatonic forms began to emerge in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, this contention was less true. Because eighteenth-century compositional style is based, to a degree, on an awareness of scale-degrees, and every tertian sonority takes on the significance of a functional scale-degree, it follows that only those tones that do not fit into the "chord" may be of passing significance. For these reasons, Schenker contends that counterpoint is not designed to prepare the student to write in a "compositional style" or to teach "compositional procedures." Rather, he asserts that species counterpoint offers a microcosm of musical phenomena and that each species illustrates musical principles applicable to larger musical structures and forms. He writes in Kontrapunkt I:

If the content of the following example:
can be traced to a decisive two-part structure:

then the real connection between free composition and strict counterpoint can be found in similar derivations.\(^{47}\)

**Kontrapunkt I** begins with an extensive discussion of the cantus firmus. Following this, the principles of two-part composition are realized through strict counterpoint exercises using the five-species arrangement of Fux. Using the species models, Schenker illustrates how each, with its procedures and rules, is related to free composition. Along with establishing this relationship, he cites instances where the rules are seemingly "broken," but, in fact, are not. Each section concludes with model examples peculiar to the species under discussion.

**Kontrapunkt II** continues the format of the first volume using the five species with three, four, and five to eight voices. Here, however, Schenker does not relate the strict counterpoint model to free composition. Rather, he reserves a section at the end of the volume entitled "Paths

\(^{47}\) Schenker, *Kontrapunkt I*, p. 268.
to Free Composition" to illustrate the transition from strict counterpoint to free composition by means of the combination of species, first with a cantus firmus and finally without a cantus firmus. He justifies the modified procedure in this way:

As a result of this plan, I was able, in the present volume, to spare myself the extensive contrasting of strict counterpoint with free composition that was required in the first volume of Kontrapunkt. However, I found it important to retain the encyclopedic method of presentation.48

THE CANTUS FIRMUS

In Volume I, Schenker spends over one-hundred pages discussing the cantus firmus and its role in counterpoint instruction. Coupled with the common rules that govern the cantus firmus—rhythmic and harmonic balance, length, scalar basis, range, suitable beginnings, allowable intervals, treatment of skips, absence of chromaticism, absence of tone repetition, closing formulas—each rule and prohibition is recast in an example taken from free composition where a variety of conceptual extensions can be observed.

With respect to the permissible consonant intervals within a cantus firmus line, Schenker explains that each allowable interval is related to the second, third, and fifth overtone of the overtone series (octave, fifth, third) and their inversions (unison, fourth, sixth). Only the fourth

merits further discussion since it is not a direct projection from the fundamental. According to Schenker, it must be regarded as an inversion of the fifth and, as such, as a boundary interval.\(^49\) That is, if the fifth is the primary boundary interval ("born of Nature"), and the fourth is of secondary importance ("artificial inversion"), then, melodically the fourth is consonant, but, in a vertical alignment (harmonically), it is dissonant when it occurs between the lowest and any upper part.

Schenker emphasizes the importance of the melodic line being balanced and smooth—"a type of wavy line . . . that as a whole represents a living unity."\(^50\) He calls this kind of melodic line a "flowing melody."

He writes:

\(^49\) Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 112. [Schenker's discussion of the "boundary interval" concept—Kontrapunkt I, pages 111-13—rests on his contention that since the fourth is an inversion of the fifth, i.e., the fourth leads to the same tone as does the fifth:

\begin{align*}
\text{[Kpt. I, Ex. 87]} & \quad \text{[Kpt. I, Ex. 88]}
\end{align*}

the fourth, then, is a second "boundary interval" of a harmonic triad:

\begin{align*}
\text{(See Also, the discussion in first species below.)}
\end{align*}

\(^50\) Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, pp. 133-34.
If a flowing melody has been achieved, it will, of itself radiate a particular melodic beauty that, of course, remains far beneath that of the individual melody of free composition based upon unities. . . . Even in the cantus firmus, burdened with its exercise function, there is a meager melodic beauty, but nevertheless a beauty.51

To conclude his discussion of the cantus firmus, Schenker addresses the melodic cadence. As properties of a melodic cadence, he discusses the ascending leading tone and the descending leading tone—the seventh and second scale degrees respectively. According to this double leading-tone theory, the penultimate note must be one or the other leading tone. In two-part, first species counterpoint the combination of two leading tones creates a "contrapuntal cadence": $7\rightarrow 2$, as opposed to a "harmonic cadence" which is possible only in three or more parts.

**FIRST SPECIES**

In Schenker's view, first species reveals the consonances as fundamental entities. He defines the consonances as the "tonal space of Nature's triad" (as realized through the first five overtones) and its inversions. The consonances are the perfect prime and octave, the perfect fifth, and the major and minor thirds and sixths. In first species, the rules of harmonic interpretation are not complicated by the rhythmic contexts characteristic of the species that follow or of free composition. The rhythmic simplicity of exercises

---

51 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 134.
in first species guarantees that each vertical sonority can be harmonically interpreted as a single interval. By avoiding repetition, passing motion, triad outlining, etc., first species insures that the root-defining character of the perfect consonances and the inversional character of the sixth become clear. Thus, if first species is a study of pure voice leading, it is obviously not possible to extract a harmonic progression. Moreover, Schenker believes that by isolating the "laws" and "freedoms" that characterize pure voice leading independent of any harmonic considerations, first species enriches our perception of the interaction of those same dimensions in a free composition.

Two-part, first species counterpoint reveals not only the harmonic intervals permitted, but also the types of voice motion, the approach to and departure from perfect and imperfect consonances, the distance between voices, voice crossing, cross relation—in short, all matters that pertain to two-part writing. Schenker's exposition of the aforementioned matters is, for the most part, conventional, and it follows the principles expounded by Fux, Albrechtsberger, Bellerman, and, to a degree, Cherubini.

The lengthy and detailed exposition that Schenker gives in presenting two-part counterpoint is understandable, for he emphasizes that the two-part contrapuntal frame continues to function in settings of three or more parts. That is, the outer voices stand in the foreground regardless of the number of parts, and they adhere to the principles that govern two-
part counterpart. He writes: "In three-part composition, two-part composition actually continues; thus, three-part composition is merely an extended phenomenon."52 And later: "... only the two-part structure of the outer voices remains in the foreground despite all the expenditure on scale-degrees and extended laws."53 On the next page he writes: "... the outer voices are to be regarded as the primary bearers of the two-part composition that continues in three-part composition."54

It is in two-part counterpoint, first species that Schenker elaborates on the dissonant nature of the harmonic fourth and the reasons why it is not permitted harmonically. He writes:

As an inverted boundary interval, the fourth lacks from the onset the perfection of the fifth... The simultaneity of the vertical alignment is a fait accompli that makes it impossible to perceive the fifth except after the fact. It follows that, in the moment when two tones unite into the interval of the fourth, the simultaneity suddenly creates a barrier to the presentation of the perfection of the boundary interval as it is tended in the fifth,... The vertical fourth, since it is prevented from expressing the boundary of the triad perfectly, can represent a suspension or an accented passing tone with a quite dissonant character.55

53 Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 4.
54 Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 5.
55 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, pp. 155-56.
In other words, if we have a simple c-e-g triad and then replicate the root an octave higher in order to create a "boundary" (c-e-g-c\(^1\)), the secondary boundary interval, the harmonic fourth (g-c\(^1\))--which is an inversion of the fifth, the primary boundary interval (c-g)--becomes dissonance in character because we cannot immediately perceive its perfection (an inverted fifth) and hence its consonance.

In first species Schenker introduces the concepts ottava battuta and antiparallels. He defines the ottava battuta as an octave that has been approached in contrary motion by stepwise movement in the lower part while the upper part moves by skip. Antiparallels are successive perfect consonances (5-5, 8-5, 8-8, 5-1, etc.) in contrary motion between two outer parts. Both the ottava battuta and the antiparallels result in a perfect consonance being accented and therefore both are to be avoided.

In three-part counterpoint Schenker elaborates upon ideas that he first exposed in two-part counterpoint. For example, textures of three or more parts affect a change in sonority possibilities, making complete triads possible for the first time. Coupled with these added sonority possibilities is the concept of the root-propensity of the lowest note, whereby the lowest note of an octave or third, both of which are harmonically ambiguous when the interval of a fifth or sixth is not present in the sonority, is interpreted and supported as a root tone.
The presence of three or more parts in a first species context allows, for the first time, the making of a distinction between an open position and a close position. In contrast to the more commonly accepted notion in harmony instruction that open and close positions refer to the spacing between the tenor and soprano in a four-part vocal realization (SATB), Schenker describes "open" as one in which a third (i.e., tenth) is formed between the outer voices. He writes: "... I remind the reader that only the open position complies with nature since it, alone, follows the pattern of the overtone series in which the fifth appears before the third:"

![Musical notation](Spt. II, Ex. 25)

He provides examples that illustrate his interpretation of "open" and "close." Note how "open" always refers to the interval of a third between the outer parts, while "close" position involves an interval other than the third:

---

56 That is, when the majority of the intervals between the tenor and soprano lines are more than an octave apart, the term "open" is used; when the majority of the intervals are within an octave, "close" position is used.

57 Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 27.
Example 1. Examples of open and close position.

The cadence formula in first species is the result of combining the "upper leading tone" (the second scale degree) with the "lower leading tone" (the seventh scale degree), both of which were first discussed with respect to the cantus firmus. Here, in first species, the final cadence is a clausula vera: 7-8 2-1. In textures of three or more parts these two tones (2 and 7) still function as leading tones except that here, where the doubling of parts becomes necessary, the ascending leading tone cannot be doubled (parallel octaves result), whereas the descending leading tone may be doubled in the pentultimate chord since each note may resolve in contrary motion to a member of the tonic triad. For example:

\[ \text{Example 2. A three-part cadence pattern.} \]

But regardless of the number of parts in a first species context, those items that were prohibited in two-part
counterpoint remain forbidden in the outer voices, so pronounced is the outer voice construction.

SECOND SPECIES

In second species where there are two notes in the counterpoint moving against one note in the cantus firmus, various implications for free composition result. For example, the sonority of the upbeat can complement or continue the harmony of the downbeat (a), or it can change it (b):

Example 3. Second species harmonic relationships.

However, if it creates a passing dissonance, then the sonority of the upbeat prolongs and thereby strengthens the harmony of the downbeat. In other words, the dissonant interval on the upbeat constitutes an interval that, having no harmonic vertical relationship to the cantus firmus tone, creates a tension between two harmonic tones and is, therefore, passing in nature; it never functions as an independent chord. (The passing-tone configuration in strict counterpoint is the essence of "prolongation" in free composition.)

Certainly more important for Schenker than the inter-relationship of "passing" and "prolongation" in a two-part texture is the concept of passing dissonance in the lower voice. For, when a passing dissonance is in the lower voice,
he believes that it "lacks the means to audibly continue the
harmony of the downbeat," and therefore it becomes necessary
for the memory to continue the just departed harmony.

Schenker explains:

The imagination, must project, on its own, the
harmony of the downbeat, particularly when the
dissonant passing tone is in the bass. By doing
so, it fittingly prepares the way for the con-
ception of the great spiritual marvel that governs
free composition, namely, the scale degrees, which
optimally clarifies this extension of a harmony
for the duration of the passing figure. Also,
in free composition, the consonant harmony of
actual or assumed repose tones remains the
measure of all dissonant passing-tone arrange-
ments in spite of the increased possibilities
of compositional unfolding. And no matter how
obscurely, through substitution or other
abbreviation processes, the dissonant passing
tone is used, the consonance situated a second
higher or lower always stands at its cradle,
exactly as the primitive figure requires.\(^{58}\)

The far-reaching implication of Schenker's statement
may be expressed in this way: consonance on the downbeat,
being directly intelligible and having harmonic meaning,
establishes itself in the memory. And even though the dis-
sonant upbeat negates the harmony of the downbeat, the
harmony is retained in the memory through the duration of the
dissonant interval because the latter is incapable of supply-
ing a harmonic entity to displace the consonance on the down-
beat. This is precisely why second species plays such a vital
role in developing one's harmonic conception.

As for the upbeat in second species, if it is disso-
nant with the cantus firmus, regardless of the number of

\(^{58}\) Schenker, *Kontrapunkt II*, p. 60.
voices, it must be approached and left by step in the same direction. Schenker explains: "... stepwise dissonance placed on the upbeat must continue in the direction from which it came." 59 (Schenker reserves the accented passing tone for free composition.)

Schenker also discusses the passing tone in the fourth-space. His use of the term fourth-space comes from his considering a triad, for example c-e-g-c\(^1\), to have two "boundary" intervals: c-g, and g-c\(^1\). Strict counterpoint allows passing tones between the consonant points in a third-space, e.g., c-d-e, or e-f-g. Free composition, however, also allows there be a passing tone between the consonant points of the fourth-space, g-c\(^1\). He writes: "Specifically, free composition solves the problem of the passing dissonance in the space of a fourth in such a way that each of the two in-between tones are equally permitted to function as passing tones; for example:" 60

59 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 240.

60 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, pp. 248-49.
Related to the passing dissonance in second species is also the concept of the **nodal point** which plays an important role in the voice leading of free composition. Schenker writes:

As the dissonant passing tone fills in the space of a third, it gives the two consonant points the significance of beginning and end of a seemingly unified third-space. It then frees the end tone to become the beginning of a new tonal event:  

![Example notation](image-url)

The nodal point occurs in measure two on the example above. Here, the d in measure 2 is the last tone of the third progression b-c-d, as well as the first tone of the fourth-progression d-a.

**THIRD SPECIES**

In third species—four quarter notes in the counterpoint against one whole note in the cantus firmus—the passing tone can occur on the second, the third, or the fourth beat, the neighboring tone concept is further detailed, and the **nota cambiata** is introduced for the first time.

In third species, Schenker permits the passing tone on any quarter note in the measure, except beat one, as long as it is preceded and followed by consonance. An exception to this rule is:

---

Example 4. Successive dissonances.

And in referring to this example, Schenker writes:

No matter where and when they occur, the dissonant notes must appear between two consonances in step-wise motion except, perhaps in one conceivable instance where—for reasons linked to the fourth D-G in the counterpoint, and B in the cantus firmus—the diminished fifth adopts the character of a consonance so that the dissonant fourth then appears in passing motion between it and the third.62

Concerning the use of the neighboring tone in third species, two-part counterpoint, Schenker writes:

... it is desirable to have the strictest viewpoint dominate the lessons for the sake of practice, so that it is possible to learn how to solve the difficult problem of the flowing and beautiful melody without using the neighboring tone.63

Notwithstanding the previous quote, Schenker observes that the neighboring tone is best placed on the second beat where it is unaccented and returns to its consonant origin above the same cantus firmus tone. The least desirable placement is to put the neighboring tone on the fourth beat where its return coincides with a new cantus firmus tone.

---

62 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 298.
63 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 301.
In three-part counterpoint, Schenker endeavors to differentiate between the upper and lower neighbor; as he points out, he is the first person to make such a value judgment. Basically, he states that a neighboring tone that is derived from an underlying passing tone figure is more acceptable than one that is not. To illustrate this concept, Schenker writes:

Let us compare the effects of Example 120 a and b:

![Example 120a and b](image)

The reason why the effect of the lower neighbor in 120a (second measure) is better than the upper neighbor in 120b (second measure) can obviously be found in the fact that only the former reproduces an underlying passage.64

64 Schenker, *Kontrapunkt II*, p. 74.
In concluding his discussion of the neighboring tone, he points out that there are instances when a clear determination cannot be made as to which neighboring tone, the upper or lower, is the better one to use.

Also associated with the neighboring tone are the beginnings of the concept of substitution, wherein one part may be substituted for another part in the same harmony. As Schenker explains it in *Kontrapunkt II*:

If we consider, solely from the horizontal perspective, that the endpoint of a true passing tone is consonant with the starting point, that is to say, it abides with it in the same harmony, then we see in the neighboring tone figure, which is derived from the passing tone, the first seeds of a substitution that is applied so frequently in free composition, enabling us to substitute one part for another within the same harmony:

\[\text{Ex. 123}\]

Much more evident is the substitution in third species when the neighboring tone figure extends from the first to the third quarter note, for, then the preservation of the same harmony is clearly seen:

\[\text{Ex. 124}\]

With respect to the nota cambiata, even though Schenker says that the nota cambiata "actually stands in

\[\text{Ex. 124}\]

\[\text{Ex. 123}\]
contradiction to strict counterpoint" because strict counterpoint dictates an even balance throughout its content, and even though he admonishes against those who use it in strict counterpoint,66 he nevertheless discusses it and explains its origin as coming from two interlocking passing tones. He writes:

In other words, the nota cambiata represents two interwoven tones, two genuine and complete passing tones . . .:

Each passing tone shows an otherwise perfect and normal structure by having the dissonance placed in stepwise movement. However, the middle tone of the second passing figure is to be understood as the last tone of the first figure.67

It is with regard to the passing tone origin of the nota cambiata that Schenker makes a clear distinction between it and the passing tone in the space of a fourth. Because there is a fourth-space between the first and third notes in the nota cambiata, and because there are two intervening tones possible in the space of a fourth:

66 "That the older theorists have taken this compositional phenomenon of free composition and transferred it to strict counterpoint only proves how unclear their conceptions were, and how carelessly they sensed the boundary between strict and free composition." (Kontrapunkt I, p. 311.)

67 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 309.
Example 5. Passing tones in the fourth-space.

Schenker distinguishes between the two possibilities. Referring to the above example, he asserts that the passing tone in "a" is more natural than the one at "b" since the skip precedes the stepwise movement. He writes:

The psychological reason for this is that the wider, more strenuous skip of a third marks the direction more precisely and brings us closer to the goal than the stepwise movement does.  

He continues:

The intrinsic difference between such passing tones and the nota cambiata lies in the fact that passing tones within the space of a fourth, regardless of the direction, conform to the postulate of naturalness by having the skip of the third precede the movement by step; whereas, in the case of the nota cambiata, there is the demand to use the reverse succession exclusively. . . . Only in this way can it [nota cambiata] express the intended normal passing motion which begins with the step that achieves its end only on the fourth quarter note through the aid of a second passing figure.  

With respect to parallel and nonparallel direct successions in third species, from beat four to beat one both types are prohibited; from beat three to beat one parallel successions are permitted. He permits no parallel successions

---

68 Kontrapunkt I, p. 312.
69 Kontrapunkt I, p. 313.
from downbeat to downbeat. Concerning the latter prohibition Schenker writes:

Thus, the prohibition, since it manages to retain its validity even in this situation, constitutes a further advance beyond what it already acquired in second species--it has expanded beyond the first stage (the immediate succession of two tones) by managing to subjugate tones that are distant from each other.70

One final point which Schenker addresses in third species is the matter of skipping into a measure from beat four after a succession of stepwise movements. As he puts it:

... after a strong and incessant succession of seconds, even the smallest skip obviously must attract attention as being melodically too peculiar and individual. ... We must observe that the skip is not forbidden in the middle of a measure but only when it leads into the next measure. Thus, it is ultimately the measure-boundary itself which blatantly exposes the bad effect of the skip that is being censured for both melodic and rhythmic reasons.71

As the quote above attests, Schenker regards the skipping into a measure after a succession of stepwise movements undesirable.

FOURTH SPECIES

In the realm of strict counterpoint, if a consonant note on the upbeat is continued on the downbeat by means of a tie, then the phenomenon called "syncopation" results.72

With these words Schenker begins his presentation of the fourth species (tied half notes). Here for the first

70 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 304.
71 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 307.
72 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 331.
time, the downbeat may be either consonant or dissonant. In the case of the consonant syncopation, the consonance on the upbeat which follows the tie will express either the same harmony as the cantus firmus and the tied note, or it will express a harmonic change (5-6, 6-5):

Example 6. Fourth species harmonic relationships.

Schenker teaches that the nature of the dissonant syncopation—like that of the neighboring tone—is conceptually derived from the passing tone of second species. Like the passing tone, both the neighboring tone and the dissonant syncopation are situated between two consonances. He writes:

This characteristic makes these phenomena of strict counterpoint seem more alike than circumstance indicates. In the syncopation, the two consonances (with the dissonance in the middle) are placed on the upbeat, while in the passing dissonance, the consonances are placed on the downbeat. . . . In both of these phenomena the essential course is the same: consonance-dissonance-consonance. . . . In this sense, the dissonant syncopation is essentially nothing other than a type of passing dissonance, a part of the general problem of dissonance that can be understood in strict counterpoint either as a passing consonance on the weak divisions of the measure (see second and third species) or a passing dissonance on the strong beat of the measure, that is, the dissonant syncopation.73

73 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, pp. 335-36.
Since the consonance must "support" the dissonance, the dissonant syncopation, according to Schenker, results from two, distinct acts. He discusses them as follows:

In the first act of this process let us think of the following sketch:

Here the consonance \( c_1 \) that introduces the passing tone, is deleted because our instinct is able spontaneously to supply the necessary consonance on the downbeat. Thus, the passing dissonance can now move over to the vacated downbeat (see arrow) so that the passing tone, as such, seems to have disappeared. However, in the second act of this process the sacrificed consonance on the downbeat is at least replaced by a consonance on the upbeat of the previous measure. As a sign for this substitution the tie is used \( \text{——} \)—which, to be sure, assumes the pitch identity of the latter with the dissonant tone—whereby, finally, the so-called syncopation of a seventh comes into being:  

Because the dissonant syncopation is a result of "abbreviation—the first elliptical process in strict counterpoint—," a downward resolution is mandatory in dissonant suspension figures in strict counterpoint. Schenker writes:

---

74 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 342.

75 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 342.
"Because the tied dissonance is by its very nature only a passing dissonance, the basic rule of passing dissonance remains in effect, namely, that it must continue the direction from which it came."\textsuperscript{76} And following his discussion of the passing-tone origin of each of the dissonant syncopations,\textsuperscript{77} he provides this summary:

Now we have finally selected the starting intervals for the passing tones on the basis of the absolute reasons discussed above--

\begin{itemize}
  \item 8 before 7, 5 before 4, 10 before 9, and 3 before 2 in the upper counterpoint;
  \item 1 before 2, 3 before 4 and 6 before 7 in the lower counterpoint--then the direction of the passing tone is thereby determined, and as we have seen, this direction is descending.\textsuperscript{78}
\end{itemize}

In Volume II of \textit{Kontrapunkt}, Schenker shows how three-part counterpoint not only clarifies but also confirms the downward resolution of the dissonant syncopation, i.e., its passing-tone origin. And after a lengthy discussion of the syncopations $\sim 7--6$, $\sim 4--3$, $\sim 9--8$, $\sim 2--1$, $\sim 4--5$, and $\sim 7--8$ in three-part counterpoint, he writes:

\begin{quote}
  \textsuperscript{76}Schenker, \textit{Kontrapunkt I}, p. 343.
  \textsuperscript{77}Among these rules are the following: "... our instinct prefers the octave to the sixth as the starting interval for a passing seventh ... because the octave is more natural than the sixth. The sixth is the product of an inversion; in the last analysis it points to a different root-tone. ... In the case of the passing fourth ... the fifth is certainly a more suitable starting interval than the third because it defines the consonant boundary of the root-tone more clearly ... in the case of a ninth ... if we have to choose between the third [= tenth] and octave, then we should decide in favor of the third because it adds more harmony to the root-tone than the octave." (\textit{Kontrapunkt I}, pp. 343-44.
  \\
  \textsuperscript{78}Schenker, \textit{Kontrapunkt I}, p. 344.
\end{quote}
The strict adoption in three-part writing of syncopation concepts gained from two-part composition means that as long as the syncopation is in the middle or upper voice, we need to regard the relation to the bass, but not the further syncopation relationships to the third voice. In spite of three-voice texture, there is at any given point, just as in two-part composition, only one syncopation: \( \sim 7--6, \sim 4--3, \sim 9--8, \sim 2--1, \) and certainly not a second additional one against the filler intervals. This is also the case with the lower syncopations \( \sim 2--3 \) and \( \sim 4--5.\)\(^{79}\)

One interesting point that Schenker makes while discussing the \( \sim 2--1 \) and \( \sim 9--8 \) syncopations in two-part counterpoint is that he describes each as being distinct concepts and not simply one \( \sim 2--1 \) set an octave lower than the other. "The voice leading in the lesson is responsible for the distinction."\(^{80}\) As he points out, many theorists attempt to identify strict counterpoint with free composition and thereby accept an octave as a reinforcement of a unison. He continues: "But that does not give us the right to carry this feeling into strict counterpoint where voice leading alone is the deciding factor—not scale-degrees or other reinforcement tendencies."\(^{81}\)

With respect to "totally forbidden and only tolerated syncopations" in strict counterpoint, Schenker concludes that preference should be given to the \( \sim 7--6, \sim 4--3 \) in the upper counterpoint, and \( \sim 2--3 \) in the lower counterpoint. He writes:

\(^{80}\) Schenker, *Kontrapunkt I*, p. 353.
\(^{81}\) Schenker, *Kontrapunkt I*, p. 354.
The altogether positive character of the syncopations named here can be explained quite simply by the fact that the intervals of resolution are 3 and 6. . . . The \( \sim 2--3 \) syncopation has the added feature of being the inversion of the \( \sim 7--6 \), which is the original one (since it comes from the passing figure 8-7-6). Thus it shares with the \( \sim 7--6 \) its particularly high value. This is also the reason that the \( \sim 2--3 \) syncopation in the lower counterpoint seems so much more plausible than the \( \sim 2--3 \) in the upper counterpoint. 82

In Kontrapunkt II Schenker discusses the rhythmic effects of the consonant and dissonant syncopations. He notes that although dissonant syncopations require three beats—preparation (upbeat), suspension (downbeat), resolution (upbeat)—the consonant syncopation involves only two beats—downbeat, upbeat—since the consonance on the downbeat needs no resolution. In his view, the consonant syncopation brings about a kind of rhythmic separation between these two beats.

Further, within the scope of dissonant syncopations, Schenker distinguishes between two groups: 1) \( \sim 9--8 \) and \( \sim 4--3 \) in the upper counterpoint, 2) \( \sim 7--6 \) in the upper counterpoint, and \( \sim 2--3 \) and \( \sim 4--5 \) in the lower. He writes: "Due to their origins, only the first group constitutes that type of tied phenomena which, encompassing three beats, also flows (with the third beat—the upbeat) into the harmony of the downbeat. These, then are the "true" suspensions." 83

82 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 358.
83 Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 84.
It is with respect to free composition that the syncopation concept undergoes the greatest number of "prolongations" of the prototype presented in strict counterpoint. For example, in free composition, because of the function of the scale-degrees, the resolution may be ascending. Also, since the dissonant syncopation is comprised of three elements--preparation-suspension-resolution--in free composition each element of the prototype may change individually or collectively. That is, there can be a time-value change or even a harmonic change of each element. In the latter type, the preparation may assume a dissonant character, the downbeat may be consonant, or the dissonance may appear on the upbeat. If one adds to these changes chromatic movement, modulation in general, "... the number of hybrid combinations are innumerable." 84

Perhaps the most far-reaching variant of the prototype occurs when the syncopation is subjected to change by means of elision. In discussing this, Schenker writes:

84 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 365.
The preparation may be elided and the dissonance placed unprepared on the strong part of the measure. In this way, dissonant accords are formed for which, under certain circumstances, an implied preparation may be assumed during the previous harmony. In other cases, however, what seems to be a freely occurring dissonance can only be interpreted as a clearly fixed middle element of a latent passing figure. In the latter case, the harmony itself determines and supplies the consonance that initiates the passing figure. In this way we obtain the so-called free suspensions, and perhaps we can also explain most properly the ultimate origin of seventh-chords by means of the elision of a preparation or of a consonance introducing the passing figure.

When Brahms writes this in his Symphony IV, last movement:

![MIDI view of music notation](image)

we see one root after another supplied with its seventh-chord (E, F♯, G, A) for which we may assume not only an implied preparation but also a passing figure whose consonant opening interval has been elided. (To be sure, the resolutions proceed quite regularly.)

And later he discusses elision further:

The eliding of the preparation or resolution of a dissonant syncopation on the strong part of a measure or the changing of the harmonic character in each of the elements of the syncopation are possibilities that quite logically lead to reducing the prototype to a linkage of weak and strong divisions and, therefore, to a bare rhythmical form similar to that of the consonant syncopation in strict counterpoint.

---


86 Schenker, *Kontrapunkt I*, p. 368.
If there is any doubt as to the importance that Schenker places on the concept of syncopation and its relation to free composition, one need only read the following:

During the instinctive search for technical means that could enable the composer to extend the length of a composition and in the midst of a voice-leading practice, which, apart from its own laws, did not otherwise manifest any higher necessity, a most welcome means was offered the artistic sense in the obligation of the preparation and resolution of a dissonance—a means capable of stimulating, at least from harmony to harmony, a type of musical causality and necessity. Similarly, because we found in the simplest passing figure an embryo of such an obligation for progression—let us always remember the problem of extending the length when we explore the essence and history of our art—it is clear that the obligation of the dissonant syncopation must be perceived as an incomparably stronger and more powerful effect.

This same passage appears thirteen years later in Der freie Satz. In essence, Schenker is pointing out that the suspension, with its preparation-dissonance-resolution properties, has a stronger "causality" than the passing tone. That is to say, if dissonance is motion or movement, content can be expanded even more in the case of the dissonant syncopation because of its inherent passing tone nature, than with the simple passing tone, which, in itself, signifies motion.

---

87 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, pp. 376-77.

88 Schenker, Free Composition, § 180, p. 65.

(Oster translation.)
FIFTH SPECIES

Of all the species, fifth species counterpoint, or mixed counterpoint, comes closest to free composition because of the variety of note values used: whole, half, quarter, and, for the first time, the eighth note. Because of the variety of note values in fifth species, the ornamented resolution of the dissonant syncopation becomes possible. With respect to the overall intent of fifth species, Schenker observes:

It is clear that if the mixture is to preserve its character, as such, none of the species may be given undue preference over the others. Thus, a strict balance is postulated among all the species as a matter of course.

Here, he refers to the characteristic values now available in constructing the added counterpoint. Following his general description of fifth species, Schenker details how the characteristic values of each species are to be applied in two-part counterpoint. To summarize the conditions: the whole note must be reserved for the last measure only, half notes are limited to three in succession, there are to be no more than three successive measures of quarter notes, only the \( \text{and } \) syncopations are allowed, and only two eighth notes can be used in succession. And with respect to the following possible configurations of the half and quarter

---

89 Only Kontrapunkt I contains a discussion of fifth species. Kontrapunkt II contains fifth-species examples; there is, however, no accompanying text.

90 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 402.
notes: \( \text{III}, \text{III}, \text{III}, \) and \( \text{III} \)--only \( \text{III} \) is the natural one since \( \text{III} \) creates a caesura, while in \( \text{III} \), the upbeat is not rhythmically articulated.

To insure that the overall effect of a fifth-species counterpoint exercise is smooth and flowing, that is, that the lines do not contain "breaks," the upbeat and downbeats must always exhibit an articulation. When these articulations are not present, a caesura results--a "cessation" of rhythmic movement--which is to be avoided in strict counterpoint.

It is with respect to his discussion of the resolution variants (and these remain descending) of the dissonant syncopation as a result of using quarter notes that he mentions the ligatura rupta. Simply put, the ligatura rupta is either (a) the anticipation of the resolution tone, or (b) the anticipation of the resolution harmony:

\[ \text{[Kpt. I, Ex. 486]} \quad \text{[Kpt. I, Ex. 487]} \]

Example 8. The ligatura rupta.

In addition, he also permits the resolution ornamented by the neighboring tone:91

\[ \text{[Kpt. I, Ex. 491]} \]

Example 9. The ligatura rupta incorporating the neighboring tone.

91 He writes: "Indeed, viewed from the strictest standpoint, this is the first occasion that requires the introduction of the neighboring tone." (Kontrapunkt I, p. 422.)
However, he asserts that even though the second quarter note must be consonant with the cantus firmus in these resolution variants, the second quarter note may not produce a change of harmony in relation to the cantus firmus and the resolution tone. Therefore, the following are not permitted in fifth species strict counterpoint:


Following his examples of lessons in fifth species in Kontrapunkt II, Schenker makes passing references (pp. 164-68) to five, six, seven, and eight-part counterpoint. And aside from remarking that voice crossing is more frequent in textures of three or more parts, his only admonition is that the ascending leading tone must not be doubled here.

SPECIES COMBINATIONS

It is in the last section of Kontrapunkt II, entitled "Paths to Free Composition," that Schenker elaborates on the combining of the five species ("combined species"), first with a cantus firmus as a basis, and then without the cantus firmus --"Ellipsis of a Voice as a Bridge to Free Composition." In combined species counterpoint, the counterpoints obey the rules of their respective species as well as interact with other counterpoints. That is, in species combinations we encounter prototypes in voice-leading patterns that relate to
and are idiomatic in free composition. That is why species combinations, as an abstraction of voice leading, illuminate the similar phenomena found in the voice leading of a free composition.

In three and four-part composition with the cantus firmus continuing as a basis, when two (or three) counterpoints are in second species, the upbeats may both be consonant or dissonant with the cantus firmus; however, each counterpoint remains consonant with the other(s). When these counterpoints are also consonant with the cantus firmus, the downbeat harmony is either continued or changed. Here, in combined species, as opposed to simple species counterpoint, a harmonic change can, for the first time, occur on the upbeat, wherein the two harmonies are removed from one another by a fifth (example "a"); in simple counterpoint they are a third apart ("b");

Example 11. Harmonic change in second species.

In addition, the harmonic change can be affected by voice exchange. Schenker observes:

The effect of 5--6 or 6--5 can be produced, for the first time, by voice exchange:
We must not overlook the fact that such an effect usually arises automatically from the voice leading so that the voice exchange is unintentional, whereas, free composition uses this method quite consciously.  

Notwithstanding the variety of combinations of passing and neighboring tones that are possible on the upbeat in this genre of species combination, one that stands out is the skipping passing tone. Here, a dissonant passing tone (stepwise)* carries with it a tone that skips but which is consonant with the cantus firmus as well as the stepwise passing tone:

---

Example 12. The skipping passing tone in second species combination.

In other words, the dissonant passing tone is so strong that it draws the tone that skips into its domain. Since the tones in half notes are consonant with one another, and since the note that skips in the inner voice is weaker in relationship to the lowest voice, it becomes a "skipping passing tone."

About this Schenker writes:

... the dissonant nature of the passing tone eliminates the corresponding consonant effect of the skip. In this case, the victory of the dissonant passing tone can be explained by the

---

*Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 175.
fact that it causes the harmony of the down-beat to be affirmed and continued in a much stronger fashion; that is, it guarantees the harmonic unity of the measure much more emphatically than a consonant half note. Therefore, we can say that the dissonant passing tone, because of its superior influence, gathers the consonant skip into its own dissonance. That is why it seems reasonable, in such a situation, to speak of the horizontalization of a skip, that is, to speak of a skip as only a passing tone, a "skipping passing tone."\textsuperscript{93}

This combined species genre also allows there to be successive $\overline{6}$ chords, an event not possible in simple three and four-part counterpoint. Schenker writes:

There [in first species, three and four-part strict counterpoint], the progression from $\overline{6}$ to $\overline{3}$ could not occur because the whole note was used; here, it is now possible in the combinations to use the upbeat for this. This shows the particular elasticity of the $\overline{6}$ chord which can $\overline{3}$ be flowingly effective on the upbeat as well as from downbeat to downbeat. We have an inkling of how precisely the $\overline{6}$, endowed with such a property, $\overline{3}$ must extend to the core of the composition of passing tones, concerning which we can detect here the first trade.\textsuperscript{94}

And later he continues:

When three countermovements progress in half notes, we find—as if it were a three-part composition within a composition—a still more favorable occasion for $\overline{6}$ formations than was the case in the preceding combination. Thus, carried through by three voices, the intent for passing motion appears to be asserted threefold, and its effect,

\textsuperscript{93} Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 177.

\textsuperscript{94} Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 180.
therefore, is also threefold.\textsuperscript{95}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example3.png}
\caption{Example 3. Species combination incorporating second and third species}
\end{figure}

In combinations that incorporate third species, the half notes (second species) affirm themselves as the determining rhythmic subdivisions of the cantus firmus. As Schenker puts it:

It is also the half notes that decide the consonant continuation of the harmony, the change of harmony, the fourth-space, etc. . . .

In the application of dissonant passing tones, strict execution demands that the passing tones be consonant with each other if both are dissonant with the cantus firmus.\textsuperscript{96}

He points out that this particular combination also allows a dissonant clash to occur on the upbeat when the harmony of both the downbeat and the upbeat is the same (example "a"), or when the quarter notes express the fourth-space ("b"):

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example4.png}
\caption{Example 4. Species combination incorporating second and third species}
\end{figure}

With regard to example "b" above, Schenker writes:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{95} Schenker, \textit{Kontrapunkt II}, p. 185.
\item \textsuperscript{96} Schenker, \textit{Kontrapunkt II}, p. 187.
\end{itemize}
In both cases the half notes are consonant with
the cantus firmus and therefore guarantee
sufficiently the unity of the total harmony.
This harmony is also affirmed in its own way by
the fourth-space.97

When two counterpoints are in second species and one
is in third species, "the two half notes may be dissonant to
the third quarter note if they are at least consonant with
one another."98 And when the combination contains two counter-
points in third species and a cantus firmus, Schenker says:

... because of the lack of rhythmic contrast,
they must, in all circumstances, be consonant
with one another if they are dissonant with the
cantus firmus. This is the case whether both
are dissonant at the same time or only one is
dissonant (quarter notes have more occasion for
this) while the other progresses by step or by
skip in a consonant interval with the cantus
firmus.99

The following example (Kontrapunkt II, Ex. 313),
written by Schenker, illustrates this procedure:

Example 14. Schenker's model illustrating two
counterpoints in third species.

With the inclusion of fourth species in the combin-
ations, all sorts of passing tone, neighboring tone, and

97 Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 190.
98 Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 196.
99 Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 199.
cambiata motions occur in the third-species voice while the suspension in the fourth-species voice is still unresolved; for example:

a) Passing Tones [Kpt. II, Ex. 346]

b) Neighboring tones [Kpt. II, Ex. 347]

c) Cambiata [Kpt. II, Ex. 349] [Kpt. II, Ex. 350]

Example 15. Illustrations of third and fourth species in the combination.

Also, in this combined species genre, new syncopation structures appear for the first time: \( \overrightarrow{7}, \overrightarrow{6}, \overrightarrow{6}, \) and \( \overrightarrow{6}. \)

While \( \overrightarrow{7}, \overrightarrow{6}, \) and \( \overrightarrow{6} \) become feasible when the voice moving in half notes progresses on the upbeat by a consonant interval, the \( \overrightarrow{6} \) is entirely new. In the latter, the lower voice must move, otherwise fourth (six-four chords) result:

Example 16. The \( \overrightarrow{6} \) syncopation and its resolution.
While it is not necessary to reproduce each suspension resolution in this species combination as Schenker painstakingly does, a few matters do warrant additional comment. Specifically, Schenker maintains that no matter whether the \( \tilde{9}\noalign{\text{--}}8 \) or \( \tilde{4}\noalign{\text{--}}3 \) suspension resolutions (the "true" suspensions) continue (a) or change the harmony (b), the original content of each is conceptually fulfilled on the downbeat:

\[ \text{Example 17. } \tilde{9}\noalign{\text{--}}8 \text{ and } \tilde{4}\noalign{\text{--}}3 \text{ suspension resolutions in the combinations.} \]

Referring to these examples he says:

\[ \text{... where the resolving upbeat presents an interval other than the expected 8 or 3, our perception maintains, in spite of such a resolution, the original intent of } \tilde{9}\noalign{\text{--}}8 \text{ and } \tilde{4}\noalign{\text{--}}3 \text{ in full purity.} \]

These two suspensions, cast in this combined species context, where the upbeat harmony changes, exhibit a form of abbreviation—here one based upon the voice leading alone. As Schenker explains this in Kontrapunkt II:

\[ \text{The new upbeat harmony created through the progression of the second voice does not imply a conflict with the original } \tilde{9}\noalign{\text{--}}8 \text{ and } \tilde{4}\noalign{\text{--}}3 \text{ concept. It must be understood, rather, as a temporal succession, i.e., first the fulfillment of the original concept and then thereafter, a new harmony.} \]

\[100\text{ Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 207.} \]
\[101\text{ Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 208.} \]
In his detailed discussion of the $\frac{7}{5}$, $\frac{6}{2}$, $\frac{6}{3}$ and $\frac{5}{7}$ syncopations, Schenker notes that these are the seventh-chord (or its inversions) in free composition--the "embryonic seventh-chord." He writes:

However, if free composition reveals that the so-called seventh-chord is nothing other than a triad (on which the passing seventh seems superimposed by abbreviation, but which shows no diminishing independence other than progressing to another equally independent sonority), then there exists a considerable difference between the seventh-chord of free composition and the above-mentioned syncopations. Above all, bear in mind that the species combinations, which advance these structures for the first time, cannot produce them except by tying them to a preparatory consonant harmony whereby, to be precise, only the method of strict counterpoint is needed anew.\(^{102}\)

And later he clarifies the relationship between "abbreviation" and the seventh chord:

Of all the syncopation structures named in this subsection, the $\frac{5}{7}$ remains the most removed from strict counterpoint. Indeed, the tied fifth represents that real seventh which free composition has learned to incorporate and add to the chord as an abbreviation of the $8-7$ passing tone. Thus, the fifth, born as a seventh, belongs to the concept of the passing tone despite the fact that in this species combination it creates the illusion of a suspension due to the tie. Thus, from the contrast of the original concept of strict counterpoint on the one hand and the $\frac{5}{7}$ on the other, we can now recognize that chord consonance alone—in strict counterpoint circumscribed with $\frac{5}{7}$ and $\frac{3}{3}$—dominates the original concept of syncopation.

\(^{102}\) Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, pp. 209-10.
I repeat again: In the beginning was consonance! It, alone, carries the original laws of the suspension! . . . In strict counterpoint the fifth and sixth cannot be surpassed! All phenomena, no matter what traits they exhibit, come from them and flow back to them. 103

Schenker concedes that the inversion of the seventh-chord does not appear in these syncopation combinations. The reason for this is that the fourth does not represent a dissonance; rather, it is a root-tone. "Here, in this combination, it can be considered only a tied dissonance. As a tied dissonance, however, it does not tolerate the third." 104

Further detailing the combination of third and fourth species using stepwise motion, the second and fourth quarter notes can act as passing tones, neighboring tones (upper and lower), or even as parts of the nota cambiata. However, the second quarter note cannot be skipped into if it represents the same pitch as the suspended tone or the resolution tone, or if it produces a harmonic change. As Schenker explains:

As in strict counterpoint, the basic rhythm of the half notes demands that here also the preparation and use of such a dissonance take place from the upbeat to the downbeat. 105

103 Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 211.
104 Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, pp. 211-212.
105 Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 225.
And still later he adds these observations:

This construction of the species combination forces us to recognize that an increase in the types of movement, (here, the blending of the whole note, syncopation, and quarter note) always presses toward a clearer composing-out of independent harmonic concepts. Under such complicated conditions, a voice progressing in quarter notes finds no other path than that of a thorough composing-out of a chord.\footnote{106}

With respect to including fifth species in the combinations, Schenker points out that since it already uses a mixture of note values within a line, it expresses freedom and diversity within itself. Thus, there is little to be gained in including fifth species with the combinations. He concedes, however, that if fifth species is used in a combined species context, two simultaneous syncopations are possible.

It is in the section entitled "Concerning a Tying-over of the Dissonance" that Schenker introduces the "consonant fourth," that is, a six-four chord on the upbeat preparing a dissonance on the next downbeat:

\[\text{[Kpt. II, Ex. 381]}\]

Schenker outlines the conditions needed to warrant this phenomenon:

1. It requires two measures.
2. The lowest voice has to be sustained through both measures, which by itself indicates that it does not bear the cantus firmus.

\footnote{106} Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 227.
3. The cantus firmus must move in whole notes against the other voice (no matter whether above or below).

4. The required completion of \( \frac{6-1}{5-4} \frac{5}{4-3} \)

indicates once again that, because of the tying-over in connection with a cantus firmus, our case would, in a certain sense, have to be categorized in fourth (syncopation) species.\(^{107}\)

Schenker explains that the true irregularity of this figure is not found in the upper voices which progress in regular syncopation forms (\(-7-6-7-6\)), but in the sustained bass which, in the strictest sense, should not be sustained (i.e., repeated). In essence, the dissonant six-four and the dissonant six-five chords both represent just one passing tone figure. Schenker explains:

It is, ultimately, the unity of the basic voice which, by outwardly uniting the passing tones, inwardly assimilates them at the same time. . . . When it is specifically placed at the end of a lesson, we can see how our figure expresses a most gratifying cadential effect whereby the sustained bass tone is none other than the dominant:

\[ \text{[Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, pp. 248-49.]} \]
The splendid cumulative effect of a sustained dominant tone before the cadence may have also given the first stimulus to the organ point.\(^{108}\)

Although Schenker reminds us again that the consonant fourth is alien to strict counterpoint, he demonstrates, using the following example, that the consonant fourth in the preceding two examples can be reduced to an accented passing-tone figure:

\[
\text{Example 18. An accented passing-tone figure.}
\]

In "Ellipsis of a Voice as a Bridge to Free Composition," Schenker begins with combinations that incorporate syncopation species, wherein he removes the voice moving in whole notes. Using the following example by Fux:

\[
\text{Example 19. Fux's Table XXVI, Fig. 1.}
\]

he points out that it is useful to examine the same passage with the whole notes removed. He observes:

\(^{108}\) Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, p. 251.
The elision leads to the following voice-leading configurations:

Under no circumstances in a lesson on syncopation species, be it for two or more voices, could a non-syncopating voice move before the resolution has taken place. . . . According to the presentation made in that section [VI], it must be made clear that, just as in the original formulations, we have in these examples the effect of abbreviation of two different inclinations: the total fulfillment of the syncopation concept and the progression of the bass. Yet the far more important matter is the undeniable conclusion that it is possible to imagine the addition to voices set into motion according to the principles of two or more species, an additional voice that for the first time explains the voice leading and the underlying concepts, and completes, clarifies, and supports the harmonies. 109

The essential role of this "imagined" added voice

(the scale-degrees) is clarified once again by Schenker when he writes:

The same test can be made with species combinations not involving syncopation. With voice leading of this sort, it is possible (despite the omission of the abbreviation which performs such an instructive duty) to strike out the voice in whole notes (the cantus firmus), whereby we arrive at a composition for which we can then infer still further voices in whole notes without knowledge of their origin.

By recognizing that according to this test we can find for the voices moving in various rhythms a

unifying tone of greater value to interpret the movement and the voice leading, a bridge has now been established to free composition. At the same time, we have asserted that free composition, despite its variously transformed phenomena, is mysteriously tied to strict counterpoint by means of this ellipsis, as if by an umbilical chord. A composition created this way can always be supplemented with an additional voice (as if it were written) moving with the rest of the voices in this or that position, but only in longer values. In accordance with the character of free composition, it is usually led into the lower register by our musical instinct, supporting the upper voices and, most of all, giving a different meaning to the dissonance. One can guess, then, that it is the scale-degrees that complete the composition in this fashion.110

The preceding passage is, of course, one of the more important in Kontrapunkt, for in it, Schenker reveals the importance of a musical instinct that can supply the "pillars" (the scale-degrees) over which the foreground and middle-ground events progress. And, as Schenker has pointed out on several occasions in his Kontrapunkt, strict counterpoint is the training ground on which the musical instinct can be developed.

And with passing references to Fux, Albrechtsberger, and Bellermann, Schenker concludes Kontrapunkt II with the following remarks concerning ellipsis:

Nevertheless, it would be wrong for us to assume that the ellipsis might justify the "modern" way of teaching counterpoint, according to which lessons are based from the outset only upon scale-degrees, and, for example, a two-part composition is achieved by means of a

reduction of a four-part one, that is to say, two voices are obtained through elision. The theory presented in my works starts with the fundamental concept of voice leading. Only after presenting the fundamental concept do I proceed to teach how it always proves out in free composition, even in situations where the run-of-the-mill instruction speaks of "exceptions" and the like.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{111} Schenker, Kontrapunkt II, pp. 261-62.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

By his own admission, Schenker's purpose in writing the Kontrapunkt was to separate counterpoint (voice leading) from free composition (scale-degree). That is, by his assigning harmony instruction to the realm of scale-degrees and counterpoint instruction to the realm of voice leading, he attempted to show the relationship of the latter to the former. In the Preface to his Harmonielehre he writes: "First, all exercises in voice-leading, which so far have constituted the main material of textbooks, had to be banned from the teaching of harmony and relegated to that of counterpoint." And in Kontrapunkt I he says:

"... counterpoint must somehow be separated from composition if the hypothetical and practical reality of both is to be given justice. ... For, indeed, there is a relationship between counterpoint and composition even if it is far from representing a full identity. It is, therefore, a totally different relationship than the one theorists of the older as well as the new school have presumed up to now."

In examining the content of Kontrapunkt, one cannot help being impressed with the volume of explanations and musical examples taken from the literature that Schenker offers to "re-define" free composition (scale-degree) and counterpoint (voice leading)--the former necessarily connected and interrelated by means of the latter.

112 Schenker, Harmony, p. xxv.
113 Schenker, Kontrapunkt I, p. 15.
Schenker's *Kontrapunkt* is a model textbook in that not only are there species models at the end of the respective chapters, but there are also detailed explanations of each contrapuntal principle—including the rationale for each—along with the realization of the contrapuntal prototype in an example of free composition. In fact, Schenker was the first to point out the possibility of an extended application of species counterpoint in a free composition context. That is to say, by demonstrating possible extended applications to free composition of the passing tone, neighboring tone, suspension, etc.—the musical components of species counterpoint—Schenker evolved the primary structural levels of his later theory: background-middleground-foreground. In *Kontrapunkt I* he writes:

Yet, the expert sees the basic laws of counterpoint operating mysteriously in the background so that their appearances in free composition can be understood only as their extensions.\(^{114}\)

Twenty-five years later, in *Der freie Satz*, he observes:

The principles of voice-leading, organically anchored, remain the same in background, middleground, and foreground, even when they undergo transformations.\(^{115}\)

In Schenker's counterpoint instruction, not only is his own rationale presented with respect to each contrapuntal principle, but he also compares and contrasts the contrapuntal

\(^{114}\) Schenker, *Kontrapunkt I*, p. 20.

principle to the treatments offered in the counterpoint textbooks written by Fux, Albrechtsberger, Cherubini, and Beller- 
man. Utilizing this procedure, Schenker offers a history of 
counterpoint pedagogy, at least one based upon writings of 
the more influential teachers of the eighteenth and nine- 
teenth centuries.

Throughout the Kontrapunkt one cannot miss seeing the 
emphasis that Schenker places on the ear as the arbiter in 
musical structure. And what better way to sensitize the ear 
to voice leading than with the study of species counterpoint? 
According to Schenker, the primary value of studying species 
counterpoint is that the ear can be trained to hear relationships from the most simple to the complex. The pedagogical 
expedient by which this "ear training" can be best realized 
is exemplified in species counterpoint. That is, the species, 
beginning with simple harmonic relationships (first species) 
and progressing to complex relationships that have an admix- 
ture of dissonance and varied note values (fifth species), 
train the ear to perceive relationships that find their natural 
extension in larger, tonal relationships in free composition.

The importance that Schenker relegates to the ear, the 
musically trained ear, cannot be emphasized enough. His 
hypothesis that basic to all great musical structure is the 
unfolding of Nature's vertical triad horizontally—even though 
the triad is "composed out" horizontally, the original vertical 
triad remains constantly in effect—depends, in fact, on the 
ear. That is why throughout all his writings he addresses the
"musically trained ear," the "orientated ear," etc., for only with such an "ear" can his concept of the scale-degree extend beyond simple chords to "harmonic pillars" that are prolonged in time by means of the voice-leading principles in counterpoint. In fact, the many reductive analytical graphs that Schenker developed over the years are actually aids in conceptualizing the relationships that one actually hears in a musical composition.

No less important is the role that the musical memory and "instinct" play in Schenker's works. In his view, this role clearly has its origin in strict counterpoint. For example, in second species, with respect to a passing dissonance, the "memory" supplies a sound not explicitly present; in combined species, with the "skipping passing tone," the consonant intervals assume foreground status even though they are only a passing event; in species combinations, when the cantus firmus is elided, the musical context is taken over by an abstract "mentally supplied" entity, the scale-degree. With respect to the latter, he writes:

A composition created this way can always be supplemented with an additional voice (as if it were written) moving with the rest of the voices. . . . In accordance with the character of free composition, it is usually led into the lower register by our musical instinct. . . . One can guess, that it is the scale-degrees that complete the composition in this fashion. 116

A considerable amount of criticism has been leveled against Schenker because of his preoccupation with a body of musical literature from Bach to Brahms. The music written during this time span constitutes the literature from which Schenker drew his musical examples, examples he used to support his theories. To be sure, some of this criticism may be just. However, Schenker, himself, acknowledged this limitation and clearly defended the "masters of diatonic tonality." As a result of his limiting his music sources to literature from Bach to Brahms, pre-diatonic music—which lacks scale-degrees—and post-diatonic music—which he regarded as artificially contrived and lacking the test of history—are excluded in his writings.

Schenker's influence continues strong today (even though it is not always acknowledged). Among the books and monographs directly based on his theories are Materials and Structure of Music by William Christ et al.,¹¹⁷ Counterpoint in Composition by Felix Salzer and Carl Schacter,¹¹⁸ Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice by Allen Forte,¹¹⁹


Stratification of Musical Rhythm by Maury Yeston,\textsuperscript{120} Layer Analysis by Gerald Warfield,\textsuperscript{121} An Introduction to Tonal Theory by Peter Westergaard,\textsuperscript{122} and Harmony in Tonal Music by Joel Lester.\textsuperscript{123} Evidence of Schenker's influence can also be seen in several publications whose authors attempt to apply his concepts and analytical techniques to a body of literature beyond the scope that Schenker himself intended.

As a musical scholar, there can be little doubt that Schenker's study of autographs had a significant influence on the evolution of his theories. His preoccupation with manuscripts and first editions demonstrates his interest in the composer's intentions and proper interpretations by performers. This broad, comprehensive approach helped to perfect his artistic insights into tonal music. It would not be going too far to say that Schenker set the standard for current editorial practices and was, in fact, the founder of the science of autograph study.

Schenker has his critics--some of whom are as fanatical in their "faith" as are his devout defenders. Nevertheless,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{120} Maury Yeston, Stratification of Musical Rhythm (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977).
\item \textsuperscript{121} Gerald Warfield, Layer Analysis (New York: David McKay, 1976).
\item \textsuperscript{122} Peter Westergaard, An Introduction to Tonal Theory (New York: W. W. Norton, 1975).
\item \textsuperscript{123} Joel Lester, Harmony in Tonal Music, 2 vols. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982).
\end{itemize}
his writings will continue to stimulate, evoke controversy, discussion and dialogue. The English translation that follows will be another contribution to the scholarship devoted to one of the most influential theorists in the twentieth century, Heinrich Schenker.
KONTRAPUNKT

by

Heinrich Schenker

VOLUME I

CANTUS FIRMUS AND TWO-PART COMPOSITION

Universal Edition, A.G.
Vienna 1910 Leipzig
IN MEMORY OF MY FATHER
[vii] We stand before a Herculaneum and Pompeii of music! All musical culture is buried. Even the tonal material is ravaged—that foundation of music which artists, drawing from within themselves (and going beyond the scanty instruction of the overtone series), have completely reconstructed! Music—the most dream-like and "created" of the arts, the one that most of all experienced severe pangs of discovery, and therefore the one that was the latest given to us—this youngest of the arts, is lost!

To be sure, the world is still totally unaware of this dismal state of affairs; people are still enchanted by big words and grandiloquent phrases. Emphatically people discuss the "twentieth century" and "progress"; ecstatically they extol the "spirit of the time," the "modern." All around they see "geniuses" in abundance: "genius" composers, "genius" conductors, and "genius" virtuosi. They have scarcely an inkling of how inconsistent this enthusiasm is with the fact that, soon after, they likewise speak of a "sterility of the present," of a "standing still of productivity," in fact even of a weakening of all artistic potencies, etc. Heaven only knows how this world manages to bring into accord "prosperity" and "decline":

Yet, the riddle and contradiction is easily resolved, since in reality the decay is the deplorable fact, whereas positive, artistic strength is virtually nonexistent.

[viii] I have reserved for a later volume a more precise description of this decay together with its causes. However, the seriousness of the problem which I present to the reader of this volume demands that I discuss these present conditions, even if only briefly and sketchily.
Here I shall begin with the external factors that are responsible for the decay of our art. First among them is the "reproducing" performer.

No master's authority has ever been able to convince "reproducing" performers that it is not enough merely to learn the technical aspects of conducting or of playing the various instruments. Even though the masters may have criticized the mistakes in their inartistic, shallow, and untrained endeavors and often scolded them with the wrath of a prophet, they savor all the more the attentions of the world that pampers them as "artists," a world that procures money and success for them! Why should they worry themselves about the art of music when they have a wife, children, money, and position?

They pay no attention to the fact that basically the notational symbols conceal more than they reveal, and that, strictly speaking, the symbols, even today, count as little more than mere neumes behind which a special world, a genuine afterlife of the artist's soul, profoundly appears. They perform—to express this more exactly—on only one level, only planimetrically, as it were, when actually they should perform in several dimensions, that is, stereometrically. They perform as if their purpose were to become acquainted with the work whereas actually they ought to be thoroughly acquainted with the piece first in order to be able to perform it at all! But what is involved in really understanding a piece—this, of course, they know nothing about!

What damage this lack of artistic character and awareness, this total absence of a sense of responsibility on the reproducer's part, does to music can only be judged when we consider how very much—almost "organically"—music is dependent on reproduction. Let us compare the other arts. When Rembrandt created a painting, no one could exert any influence over it after its completion, and all that remains for anyone is the role of observer. If someone discusses it
unintelligently, the painting is unharmed; if someone else enjoys it with wiser understanding, it profits just as little. The painting is finished and remains the same forever. Yet, how different and more dismal it is with musical works! A Beethoven symphony, for example, has to be performed by an orchestra and its conductor, or by two or four-handed piano playing, or the like. But is what these performers play really Beethoven's symphony? Are all the different renditions good; do they all meet the demands of the work? If not, which performance is the true Beethoven symphony? Which is properly it: which provides the true form as Beethoven conceived it? But what if we had to say that none of the celebrated renditions even come close to expressing what would have been expressed. Indeed, it is so! Inferior instinct and the often complete lack of understanding on the part of today's "reproducing" performers is to be blamed for the fact that, for us, those masterworks—how horrible to admit it—have never been sounded in their true form! We simply do not yet know their content.† The rendition all-too-often sounds as though a Japanese or Chinese were trying to guess the meaning of a text by Goethe without a sufficient knowledge of German. It, therefore, is only too understandable why, nowadays, people find it [x] so urgently necessary to continuously make progress, and why again and again they must give the assurance that they have already "conquered" the classics. Indeed, if they know the works of the masters, then, as one knows, they have the right to view Richard Strauss, for example, as newer and better than Beethoven. But I say, just perform the masterworks of J. S. Bach, Haydn, Mozart, or Beethoven as they should be performed and they will easily vanquish the works of the "conquerors" of today and tomorrow!

†As I said, I will provide evidence as amply as possible in another place.
The layman must be cited as another guilty party.

Conceit and the urge to be entertained impel him toward art; therefore, he all the more stubbornly insists that this impulse is a "taste for art" which must be respectfully and gratefully credited to him: To him a serious, organic relationship with art remains forever alien; but, all the more arrogantly he demands that precisely his type of relationship with art be acknowledged as the only correct one. He simply proclaims that art is there for him--for whom else and to what purpose?--that it is precisely his "instinct" because it is still "unspoiled" which is the best appraiser of art, and that it is his "impression" because it is still "unbiased" which provides the best judgment. In short, he plays the gentleman of the occasion, most graciously patronizes a Bach, Mozart, or Beethoven, and conceitedly celebrates himself in "festivals" and "Renaissances," and the like. It is no use explaining to him that art truly does not exist for his sake, that above all, it is there for its own sake just like everything else: sun and earth, animals and flowers, etc. It is no use explaining to him that Bach, as he wrote his Well-Tempered Clavier, only thought about the character of the motives, not about the layman. Nor is there any use explaining that the lifespan of a composition, which seemingly exists in a supernatural world, very often far outlasts human generations, and that compositions, therefore, have to be regarded in a sense as living beings just as people themselves. Of this, the layman of today knows nothing!

[xi] But from where does this arrogant self-importance come? We live in an age in which, because of false and unworthy sentimentality, all values in the totality of human relations have been turned upside down. Those who should be led take the leadership: the wife takes on the role of the husband; the child is spoiled as an "individuality" and is excused from working even before he has learned to work. Workers who are merely tools in human guise think of themselves
as manufacturers—it is no wonder that the lay public has come
to know a false and entirely inverted standardization also with
respect to art! Today, not even the simplest fact is under-
stood any longer, namely, that although everything in the world
is related and necessary, this does not mean that, merely be-
cause of this necessity, everything and everyone has the same
value. Nor is it understood—notice that we are assuming the
same concept of necessity—that, nevertheless, the husband has
greater value than the wife, the manufacturer more than the
tradesman or laborer, the head more than the foot, the coachman
more than the wheel of the wagon he steers, or that the genius
has more significance than the populace which, so to speak,
represents only the humus which bears the former, etc. How,
then, should the layman grasp that he himself is of value as
the receptor for art but nothing more, and that even this repre-
sents only a stage of little relevance in and of itself:

In an era that is so intellectually and socially con-
fused, it is difficult to make the layman understand that the
unspoiled instincts of which he boasts have absolutely no value
for the art itself as long as they are not trained, elevated,
and placed on a footing parallel with the artistic instincts
of the masters in whom, alone, true artistic instincts are to
be found. He simply cannot grasp that in itself it is unimpor-
tant merely to have impressions, that before some value should
be attributed to the impression, a certain quality of impres-
[sion must be established, and that, therefore, his
individual impression cannot be the measure of the work since
he really has not yet learned to listen to it—he neither
understands nor believes any of this! The thought is foreign
to him that the true measure of culture puts forward not the
enjoyment but only the creation of a work of art! Does not a
newly created work of importance carry more weight than the
enjoyment of a whole nation? What, then, is to be said for
the endless, arrogant boasting of the layman about his "impress-
sion" and his "judgment"!
Meanwhile, what especially provokes the layman and possibly degrades his character even more is that he desires nothing more from the art: When he asserts that art is there "for him," he does so out of frivolous laziness, because in this way he dispenses with the difficulty of having to go first to the art itself. Yet, should the artist attempt to express his opinion, for example, to a banker, politician, general, or lawyer in reference to banking, politics, the army, or law, he will soon be told that he lacks every prerequisite for judgment, and for that, more than a mere layman's impression is needed. But on the other hand, he, the "layman" in the area of art, cannot presume to think that art has come to him. He has the temerity to criticize a Bach or Brahms because they wrote works that exceed the reach of his primitive enjoyment capacity. He dares to demand of artists that they make their art fit his taste and judgment, even though he does not understand anything about it—nothing! Clearly, in art, as in life, the average person dreads any kind of exertion; this is precisely the case in all intellectual and material matters basically presented only by his superiors. As he spends his wretched life with a few drams of religious, moral, and artistic statutes, he bustles about all the more ungratefully and presumptuously, imagining himself to be the final objective of all of God's creations—and the world's genius—that is exactly how the average person behaves also in regard to art! Here, too, he wants to have it so and no differently. He wants to take and to do so without exertion, and absolved, he wants this alone to represent an achievement equivalent to the creative work! But when the layman cynically transfers his natural dislike for exertion into a demand on art, he displays the most loathsome and despicable side of his nature!

So, this is the layman, the master of our contemporary art: But this endlessly talented person still fails to realize that he spends his entire life in the most lamentable fashion, destroying precisely that which he enjoys so imperfectly!
Consider the fact that he has only one way of approaching a musical work, namely, by becoming accustomed to it; he can either get accustomed to a work or not. It is no wonder that when this unreliable bridge soon collapses, the accustoming is finally neutralized and total indifference and apathy takes its place! After he has listened a few times to a Beethoven symphony, for example, and has gotten accustomed to it, he is then encouraged to assert that he already knows the work quite well, very well indeed. Now, he--the layman!--wants something else, something new--always something new! In short, he wants "to progress." To please him, then, Beethoven, whose value has been destroyed precisely because of indifference and stupefaction, is pushed aside and supposedly we advance to something newer and better. In other words, we give to the layman, as to a child, another doll which in a short time he [xiv] casts away in order to demand yet another! So wretchedly lazy, so wantonly destructive--this is how the layman (the great music-loving populace) behaves towards the redeeming force called art! Here, it is exactly the same as in all other walks of life. Even outside art, it is the tragic destiny of mankind merely to desire a redeemer, to crave for one continuously. And, even though countless redeemers may have walked the earth, in the end the masses did not know how to profit from them or to retain anything; the more they tried to destroy the works of former redeemers, the more urgently they cried for yet another--a new redeemer! Alas, what a curse there is on the average man to need to take and yet not to be able to take!

Now let us consider the remaining factors to be blamed, namely, those of music proper. Here, the composer has first priority.

Today people like to speak of an "excess of technique," an excess that must, allegedly, paralyze the composer. Now, if only they would make up their minds about the true meaning of that catch phrase. By "technique" do they mean perhaps the
fulfillment by the artist of those requirements which the lofty
subject matter imposes on him? In such a fulfillment, do they
not always suppose the technique to be true, sound, and good?
In this sense, is not the technique of a work actually compar­
able to the health of a body whose organs execute all functions
which nature demands of them? If technique is considered only
in its truer meaning, how can one logically speak of an "ex­
cess"? Does one seriously refer to an "excess of health"?
Would that mean anything more than simply "sound health"?
Similarly, what can an alleged "excess of technique" (as long as
it is assumed to be genuine) mean more than only "technique"?
[xv] Just consider this: if the possession of musical tech­
nique has not only not harmed our masters, but, on the contrary,
has suitably qualified them to give us works such as the
B-minor Mass, the St. Matthew Passion, Don Juan, and the Ninth
Symphony, why then, today, should the possession of musical
technique have such an adverse effect if it is true that what
contemporary composers possess is really technique? As we can
see, the catch phrase contains a *contradictio in adjecto*; the
two words "excess" and "technique" cannot stand together when
the latter is understood correctly. If for logical reasons we
absolutely have to associate the concept "technique" with an
inferior way of writing music, then, I ask, what use is the
catch phrase which, after all, wishes to pay a compliment to
the contemporary composer with this word? Where is the praise
when "technique" is no longer used in a truly correct sense?
There we have it: with the first word, "excess," the phrase
obviously intends to express a rebuke; with the second word,
"technique," it simultaneously intends to express praise. It
thus intends to express criticism and praise together. But if
we look closer, it can express neither criticism nor praise!
This is a true picture of the today's immature turn of mind
and consciousness: It is high time, therefore, to bid fare­
well to this nonsense, to salvage "technique" from the strangu­
lation of the work "excess," and to present it alone as a true
and valuable term. And, in this sense, I assert that there is
not, as they say, an "excess of technique." No, certainly not. Today's composers have too little technique:

In actual fact, we have absolutely no technique any-
more. Today's generation lacks the capacity simply to receive the already existing technique of the masters, which would certainly be required as the first prerequisite of any "progress." Measured by the works of our masters, the compositions of today are musically too simple, indeed, much too simple and primitive to characterize. Despite the most intense orchestration, the uproar and fuss, the "polyphony" and "cacophony," the proudest compositions of R. Strauss, for example, lag, in genuine musical spirit, inner complexity, form, articulation, and so on, far behind a Haydn quartet, in which, to be sure, the external grace obscures the inner complexity like the color and scent of a flower at first veil and disguise the great hidden miracle of its creation!

The very difficult art of synthesis—truly the only source of all musical law—has become too arduous for the delicate nerves of today's musician. Therefore, he throws off the constraint of synthesis and prefers to take refuge in the convenient surrogates of "program music," "music drama," and the like.

At problematic places in their works we see them continually in difficulty, indeed, in difficulty over the technical means that our forebears already knew so well! Might we not conclude that in this sense the compositions of today really were antedated by at least two- to three-hundred years?

Moreover, as in the vocal-contrapuntal epoch, some of today's works revel only in blank chords, consequently, in a technique that had to be entirely abandoned centuries ago because it hindered the production of content. In those days there were only blank triads, while today there are for the most part blank seventh-chords. But how important is such a [xvii] distinction in the face of the shared characteristic
of vacant chords? To be sure, the compositional unfolding [Auskomponieren] of chords requires invention, abundant ideas, and, above all, the will to achieve content. But these are exactly the virtues and talents that are lacking in today's composers: They attempt, therefore, to make up for this lack by stuffing the chords with at least the "wood-wool" of passing tones. Indeed, those passing tones are the sum and substance of the pretentious modern technique: If only composers could at least show better art in it! But here, too, the surety of instinct and reliability of ear is lacking. Most of the time they construct their passing tones wrongly, so that instead of honest clashes of several voices, there arise disorderly and unintentionally comic discords--for which we have found a term only in recent times. We call this newest of non-techniques "cacophony," a term which has become fitting for the first time in the history of our art!

This lack of technique, which has set us back artistically hundreds of years, also explains why the musicians of today produce so very little. Let us compare the life's work of our masters with that of today's writers--disregarding completely the quality, what a difference there is in the quantity! There, we have J. S. Bach, Haydn, Beethoven, Schubert, Schumann, Mendelssohn, Brahms--what wealth! Here we have Strauss, Pfitzner, Humperdink, Mahler, Reger--what poverty! How little, even in quantitative terms, these latter composers write as compared with those masters (for example, Beethoven, Brahms) who are often criticized as being "reflective": The illusion of an increased productivity nowadays is evoked only by the clamor of the newspapers that seem always able to report how Mr. A "is working on a symphony," or Mr. B "is writing an opera," and by the importunity of the overblown [xviii] accounts of performances. If we would but close our ears and consider the list of works, we would have the dismal truth!
Yes, we can go further and say that the lack in technique seems to take its revenge on the artists: If an artist of today has reached the age of forty, he is discontented, at odds with art, and at odds with life. He does not know what to undertake next; he is no longer inspired by an objective; all abilities fail him. He is wanting in organic continuity, in a straight-lined pursuit of his vital meaning. He becomes an old man; he is dead. Wherever we look today, the field is strewn with the corpses of artists! This situation exists only because the artist in his youth neglected to base his art on a solid foundation that could continually regenerate him in his later life. How different, on the other hand, are the aspects of our masters. Look how every one of them, a real artist, to take a phrase out of the Song of Songs, "rises like straight smoke," how each continually strengthens the meaning of his life and his art until the end. That is the blessing of what I would like to call the true "technique"!

After all this, does anyone expect me to express a more favorable view of the present-day condition of music theory? Certainly not. The present volume already contains enough about the miseries of this topic; later works will discuss even more.

Here, let us say a few words about the methods alone. Theory--disregarding completely the misrepresentation of content--unfortunately focuses its attention only upon the average talent and therefore addresses itself only to the teaching of a minimum. Nowhere, however, does theory aspire to take into consideration what the masters themselves deemed worthy--to speak about the noble and lofty experiences that fill their [xix] works. The sad result of this course of action is not difficult to imagine: it always multiplies the average and therefore inflicts mortal harm on the art which can never subsist on this barren and endlessly suffocating average:

And add to that the wretched sort of petitio principii--
treatment of just the most important questions. They are con-
tent to say, for example, "we have major and minor." What
should the little word "have" mean in this context, and what
should the pupil think when he reads it? Obviously nothing
more than the theorist himself has contemplated. Nevertheless,
this satisfies both of them. But, the immeasurable harm of
such a teaching method can be judged only by those who are
aware that human beings would rather accept what they merely
believe than what they ought to come to understand, and that
to them every mistake or misunderstanding is acceptable if it
is only presented in such a way that the degree of intellectual
mechanics is reduced to a minimum! Let someone venture, how-
ever, to contrast that method with another and attempt to
explain what our major and minor is, and the outcome will fre-
quently be just this: at best, the learner will allow that he
still does not completely understand the explanation and will
advance the famous reservatio mentalis that in the earlier
wording he actually was better able to "understand" the theory
of major and minor! So, I gladly acknowledge that I never
understood Richter's Harmonielehre,(*1) for example, neither
the words of the text, nor the music of the assignments. And
yet this work has been "understood" by thousands upon thousands
of students and teachers and has been "worked through" very
profitably--so they think! Of course one must never ask for
details. When one does ask they never know what to say; even
this lamentable fact does not disturb their assumption that
they have "understood" it, nevertheless, perfectly. They have
[xx] simply accomplished "understanding" what they do not
know and "knowing" what they do not understand! That is pre-
cisely it--by "understanding," the beloved world simply means
believing without exerting any effort! Since the creation of
the earth, what has it not "understood," whereas in truth it
has not at all understood, but only believed! This is the
reason for its inclination toward deception, which merely
believing requires, and for its aversion for the truth--which,
unfortunately, must be understood. This is the reason why instead of Christ it consorts with the priests, instead of Moses with the rabbis, instead of Beethoven with Bülow—we see it every day.

With such a disposition on the part of mankind, the easy position that teachers and editors of music occupy is, without further comment, quite comprehensible; whatever they say, and the way in which they say it, the public believes—pardon, "understands": Oh! what a dismal subject for discussion: teachers and editors of music! How they undermine art in their way; and the more their activities are harmful and worthy of condemnation, the less they can be acquitted of mala fides: It would be possible to write volumes of disapproval, criticism, and scorn about the harm done to students and to the art of music in the schools, conservatories, and academies because they contrive everything so that it leads away from music rather than toward it!

No less mischievous today are the support disciplines that are attached to music. I ask, which music history text has to date presented what it should, namely, an actual history of musical technique? Which work has even alluded to, let alone worked out the idea that the main development of musical technique is the composing-out of chords?

[xxi] Today, do we possess works that are a match for the monographs of Marpurg, Em. Bach, Quantz, etc. in specific musical description? Just name a single biography that, with a specific artistic view, does as much justice to the musical content of an artist's work as it does to the external aspects of his life!

What good does it do in histories of music, monographs, and biographies to highlight only external events when these can never acquaint us with the work of art? What purpose is served by the fussiness in the presentation of the so-called
"spirit of the time" if the other, more serious fussiness that should be devoted to the work of art itself is completely lacking: What purpose is served by all this idle tittle-tattle other than to cover up the indigence of the author himself whose specific musical knowledge, obviously, is not sufficient to discuss correctly and distinctly the content of the works? Let us only ask whether it is truly the "spirit of the time" or the artistic technique that brings these compositions about. If it is true, as people generally think and write, that it is the "spirit of the time" which is mostly responsible for the creation of a work, then we must assume that, given external inducement, Beethoven could have easily written the Ninth Symphony before Haydn's first symphony. Would such an assumption be correct however? The times of Alexander the Great or Hannibal, of Caesar or Luther were great; why have those times not produced a Don Juan, a German Requiem? Alas, it is high time to admit that the influences of the world around impress a composer's works only to the extent that technique in the art [xxii] is amassed, and that, therefore only the technique itself is the primary factor: It would then be correct to show concern finally for the history of the development of technique instead of chattering about the "spirit of the time"! But there you have it--therein is expressed the decline of our art. When it comes to a truly artistic understanding of music, all powers fail: One need only glance at the many, all-too-many, "guidebooks," program books, and analyses; what a terrible, almost unbelievable picture! The authors are as incapable of correctly reading the works of our great masters as are the "reproducing" performers: I shall have to carefully and accurately prove all this. However, I must make it clear at this point that the masterworks of our literature are not at all

---

+Oh, this much-discussed "spirit of the time"--with what pain and misery it has developed in our literature during the past decade!
like their portrayal in the "guidebooks." The more the authors of the analyses affirm that the structure of a certain work is "clear" to them and easy to follow, the more it is true, unfortunatly, that they understand absolutely nothing about it. For example, the analyses written by Kretzschmar, Riemann, Grove, e·tutti quante, about the Beethoven symphonies are untrue, a thousand times untrue!

This is how far we have come in our art today! Let us not deceive ourselves, the life of the art also has its agony just as a man who is not allotted the blessing of a sudden death. Thus, I can say that music, despite Schumann, Mendelssohn, and Brahms, has lain in agony for decades until finally today it has been killed by the general destructive mania!

Under such circumstances, we must first endeavor to excavate before we commence a continuing--I do not say "progressing"--labor! And thus in this spirit I invite the true friends of music to examine with me the fundamentals of voice leading. I hope they will be convinced that the latter forms an organic component of all instruction, whose value will remain as long as music exists among men:

* * *

Now we come to the subject of the present volume.

All musical technique can be traced to two basic elements: the voice leading and the degree-progression [Stufengang].

The older and more fundamental of the two elements is the voice leading.

The first instincts for voice leading may have been active in the oldest epoch of monophony; in the succession of the horizontal line, paths leading toward the fifth and third
had to be opened.$^+$

Later on, as people attempted to set more voices in apposition and opposition, the instincts developed with the objective. Indeed, the epoch of vocal polyphony brought technical advances that led to theoretical perceptions whose value for voice leading will always be fundamental.

Consonance was recognized as the first and only true prerequisite for every type of part music. In contrast to the a priori character of consonance, dissonance was established as a merely derivative phenomenon. Whether it occurs as a "passing tone" in a horizontal alignment, or as a prepared "dissonant syncopation" in a vertical alignment, the dissonance always requires the prerequisite of a consonance. Furthermore, they learned to perceive a danger in the effect of perfect inter-\[\text{xxiv}\] vals in direct motion: it was entirely bad when the composition had only two voices, but somewhat less noticeable when the composition had more parts. On the one hand, such perception led to the strict prohibition of parallel and non-parallel direct motion in two-part composition only. On the other hand, with the admission at least of nonparallel direct progressions in composition for more parts, the recognition of the mitigating power of the multi-linear texture was taken into account. The essence of a well-constructed, flowing melody was recognized in a happy balance in the up and down movement of the horizontal line, etc.

But, in the long run, the vocal technique proves to be unsuitable for increasing the content. Furthermore, the sonorities produced by the multiple parts press for an immediate resolution that concerns only them.$^{++}$

$^+$Cf. Harmonielehre, page 176 ff. (*2)

$^{++}$Cf. Harmonielehre, page 209 ff.
The vocal epoch ended. The next stage, which was at the same time the most important revolution in the area of musical technique, came when people learned how to make the sonorous clang fruitful in a new way. Now, the sonorous clang is released, so to speak, from a larger series of tones whose successive multiplicity is understood precisely through the unity of the former. The clang is "composed-out" and is thereby demonstrated also through the horizontal line. In this way, the first step is already taken toward the final goal of allowing a greater sum of clangs--each one with its specific multiplicity--to follow a principle that is new, but still proper only to the clangs.

Who knows whether the recitative, a discovery of the Italians, in which (according to common definition) a single chord supposedly "props up" a larger series of tones, was in reality perhaps given the mission, in the technical sense, of summoning to life the artistic consciousness of the relationship of this chord to a larger tone series that emanates from it.

[xxv] After all if one opposed two voices governed by the principle of compositional unfolding, the result differed completely from what was previously obtainable in two voices. Now each voice, the upper as well as the lower, had its individual passing figures which proved to be nothing more than genuine passing tones between harmonic tones of the same sonority. But, when more than two voices were set, the passing figures in the lowest voice had to exert a special influence on the voice leading. Since they could reveal their innate nature as passing figures even in multi-linear writing, they caused the dissonant seventh-chords to be granted, for the first time, the right to simple passing character and, accordingly, to a freer treatment, that is, to a liberation from the constraint of a preparation or specific resolution! If we add to this the chromatic passages in their manifold uses in simple passing figures, in the preparation of the dissonances, etc.,
the greater freedom in the movement of the voices in general, chiefly on the basis of their instrumental character (hence, in the realm of instrumental music), we have a voice leading whose technique seems quite advanced compared to that of the earlier vocal-contrapuntal epoch. This was the voice leading of the "thoroughbass."

During the vocal epoch, the fundamentals of voice leading were presented many times in treatises that were finally surpassed by a retrospective, eighteenth-century work, the celebrated Gradus ad Parnassum (1725).+ In similar fashion the voice-leading theory of the thoroughbass has repeatedly been discussed in momentous books; and it certainly received its best and most conclusive treatment in Em. Bach's Lehre von dem [xxvi] Accompagnement,++ about which Marpurg said:

Meanwhile a treatise on thoroughbass practice was published; it was so supremely comprehensive that no one sufficiently acquainted with it would dream of challenging it on this subject.+++ 

The two masterworks just mentioned present only the theory of practical voice leading. Thus, they include nothing whatever about the theory of scale-degrees, not even with regard to the question of interval doubling. After all, J. J. Fux still had no conception of it, whereas Em. Bach, who already knew the new theory of scale-degrees, apparently was guided by an auspiciously artistic instinct that prevented him from mixing two such heterogeneous disciplines.

Included in the advantage of a clear presentation of voice leading is the excellence in the method by which these

---

+See the Introduction, p. 4. (*3)

++This is from the second part of his Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen, (1762).(*4)

+++See Marpurg's Anhang über den Rameau- und Kirnberger-schen Grundbass (1776).(*5)
authors demonstrate their instruction. They recognize that in order to prove an effect of the voice leading it is not enough to persuade the pupil just with words or to merely intimate the effect with a very few tones. They attempt, instead, to present the various special circumstances of the context that can in turn find expression only in a somewhat larger complex. Therefore, with invaluable instinct they construct exercises to which they give as much expansion as needed to demonstrate the solution of the voice-leading problems that come into question. Indeed, the makeup of a flowing melody, for example, [xxvii] cannot be illustrated with three or four tones any more than the good effect of mixing various intervals or the bad effect of certain progressions can be shown and proven by a few tones. Furthermore, one must also know whether the tones are intended for the voice or for instrumental sounds, since the effect is dependent upon the instrument. In this sense, the cantus firmi* of J. J. Fux and the more or less extensive chordal successions Em. Bach uses as the basis for demonstrations cannot be too highly valued from the standpoint of methodology!

Unfortunately, in both Fux and Em. Bach, such eminent merits in the presentation of voice-leading theory are countered by mistakes which not only do harm to the method but also to the content of the instruction itself.

In his works, Fux endeavoured to oppose the spreading influence of instrumental music by placing the teaching of voice leading upon a purely vocal basis. He did this less from a conscious understanding of the value of such a method, than from the inclination to divert the new generation interested in music from the ruinous effect (so he thought) of instrumental music by converting them to the vocal technique, which he saw as the sole, redeeming technique. The present work will show

*See the Introduction for more details of this.
step-by-step the harm this inflicted on Fux's teaching. Here, let us only think of the main damage: by binding the teaching of voice leading exclusively to a vocally based theory of composition\(^+\) he forfeited the possibility of showing what is most important, namely, that in the last analysis all voice leading remains one and the same even if it takes on a new character [xxviii] in instrumental music because of the changed circumstances there:

Conversely, Bach's thoroughbass theory exhibits a fault since the problems are not shown from their inception but only in an already advanced state. The thoroughbass shows us prolongations of prototypes without, however, acquainting us with the prototypes beforehand. Indeed, the recognition of this flaw and its avoidance was impeded by the fact that the thoroughbass had to serve, above all, a practical purpose. Even though the very best musicians in those days made important stylistic distinctions between the "thoroughbass" and a truly artistic "accompaniment," the conceptual mix-up of the two was, nevertheless, a widespread error. This error had its origin in the fact that the "thoroughbass," even at an elementary level, offered at least the acquisition of accompaniment skills, and even more in the fact that the less-gifted musicians interpreted the four-part realization of the thoroughbass as the ultimate form of "accompaniment." From necessity, they imagined themselves to be already artistic at accompanying when they set the figures of the thoroughbass into a four-part texture: Thus, the dedication to the practical objective of accompaniment was as harmful in the voice-leading theory offered by thoroughbass as was the dédicación to vocally based, free composition in the vocal, voice-leading theory offered by Fux:

The result is that in both Fux and Em. Bach, the

\(^{+}\)See Introduction.
demonstration of a uniform voice-leading theory that applies equally to both vocal and instrumental composition is lacking. Fux's voice-leading theory lacks the "future" of the prolongations; Bach's voice-leading theory lacks the "past" of the prototypes.

The most fateful clouding of voice-leading theory, however, was to come from a completely different source. Almost at the same time that Fux published his work, Rameau, in France, came forward with the new theory of chord function—the theory of tonic, dominant, and subdominant as the principal chords to which all the remaining chords can be reduced. (*6) It was he, therefore, who created the theory of the functional scale-degree which, as already mentioned, forms a complement to the theory of voice leading in musical technique. When we see how Fux and Rameau presented their respective theories to the world almost simultaneously, one the theory of voice leading, the other the theory of the functional degree, we can see the nod of destiny that the two disciplines must be treated independently from each other. However, it did not happen that way. The circumstance that, in spite of everything, benefited Fux, namely, that he merely needed to draw upon the experiences of an epoch already past, was of little advantage to Rameau. Standing just at the doorway of the great instrumental epoch, Rameau did not yet even know the work of his contemporary J. S. Bach, nor could he suspect how later masters, such as Em. Bach, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, would compose. The compositions of those great figures were still completely unknown to him, those compositions in which a series of chords would be transformed into sweeping tonal successions often proceeding in polyphonic passages while the chords themselves followed each other according to certain psychological principles. Had he known these later-established technical practices, Rameau might have written his theory differently. Perhaps the sparsity of the practical materials available to him caused him to conceive too narrowly both the
concept of the functional degree and the number of functional
degrees. Only to a very small extent was his functional degree
[xxx] ("fundamental bass") at the same time a source of con-
tent to him. In addition, he did not know how to identify the
laws that actually govern the succession of these scale-
degrees. He still did not foresee that several chords of a
thoroughbass might jointly have a claim upon the meaning of a
scale-degree, and that, consequently, if one wishes to arrive
at the essence of the scale-degree, it is not enough to reduce
the individual phenomena of the thoroughbass to their funda-
mental basses and to consider the succession of the former as
a succession of the latter. He committed the same error in
the opposite direction; from a progression of the fundamental
bass he developed an upper voice, a line expressly intended to
illustrate the principles of voice leading. Thus, he brought
the scale-degree and voice leading into too close proximity,
and that hindered him from achieving clarity regarding the
character of either of them. He did not see that the paths
prescribed for scale-degrees cannot be dictated by the prin-
ciples of voice leading and that, on the other hand, the
attempt to teach voice leading through scale-degrees is about
as sensible as trying to add up feathers and breakfast rolls!
Thus he became the first one to add a third method to the two
other methods of voice leading described above. Certainly the
most defective of the three, his method combined voice leading
and fundamental bass and explained them both as one coming
from the other. As if this alone were not already a consider-
able error, the error was further compounded by the fact that
he usually constructed the model of his theory too skimpily.
Most frequently, a succession of only two chords is supposed
to prove some problem of the scale-degree or voice-leading
theory. What a compounding of errors!

Meanwhile, after the composers had begun to explain
and write down everything they wanted from the performer and
[xxxii] the "thoroughbass" had finally declined, as a result,
still another substitute had to be offered for the instruction of new generations. It happened that this substitute was presented, partly in the direction of Fux, under the title "counterpoint," and partly in the kind of teaching that drew voice leading from the scale-degrees. Thus, the theories of Rameau, as later expanded in Germany by Kirnberger and Marpurg, found a place next to "counterpoint." From then on there were two disciplines for those interested in music: in "counterpoint" voice leading was taught; in "harmony" the theory of the scale-degrees was supposedly explained. However, as we already know, the latter involves all those errors that are fundamentally linked to Rameau's theory due to the mixture with voice leading--errors that have been even more seriously compounded since then. With the triumph of such a critically disoriented method that sufficiently explains neither scale-degree nor voice leading, the malady spread endlessly. Time and again we encounter successions of only two chords that are supposed to explain scale-degree and voice-leading problems at the same time:

Consider the works of the theorists of the latter school. Whenever I observe how the zeal of the assertions about either the scale-degree or voice leading proves unavailing because of the unfortunate construction of the examples, I am instinctively reminded of the nursery and doll-play. Indeed, we know how children fantasize with dolls: to them the doll is now one friend or another, now an aunt--in short, whatever they need for the purpose of playing, the doll can represent. Now they speak to the doll and receive an answer from it--of course it is an answer that they, themselves provide. The theorists of the "harmony books" do the

---

+See Introduction.

++I call to mind the "doubling" theories, the disputes over the parallel and nonparallel direct successions, etc.
very same thing with their tone-dolls! To them the tone-doll is now one "degree-succession" or another, now a "suspension" in connection with a single scale-degree, now one voice leading or another—in short, no matter what they need or how they need it, their tone-doll says yes to everything. At the present time when Riemann has once again unnecessarily revived the teachings of Rameau and has drawn the last possible consequences from them, the "tone-doll theory" extols orgies, if I may be permitted such a designation. It simulates a new, chaotic society of "leading tones," and "doublings," about which proper voice-leading theory and scale-degree theory can know nothing!

* * *

My endeavor was to liberate voice-leading theory from all the clouding it had to suffer from those three methods. Here, the voice-leading theory must, accordingly, be presented as a basic, unified discipline that stands on its own. That is, we must show here how it always preserves its inner unity—realized at first on a purely vocal basis, then revealed in the technique of the thorough-bass, the chorale, and finally the free composition. Thus, for example, the question of doubling in strict as well as free composition will be answered purely from the standpoint of voice leading, quite independently of scale-degrees.

The theory of the scale-degree has already been presented in my Harmonielehre and, as my readers know, without any admixture of voice-leading theory. Now we can finally understand why there, instead of mere "tone-dolls," I have shown examples only in the form of quotations from the liter-

---

*I.e., the vocal method of Fux and his predecessors, the thoroughbass method of Em. Bach and his predecessors, and finally the mixed voice leading and functional degree method of Rameau and his successors.*
ature. This was not so much the vanity of merely testing my wits at the solution of difficult passages in free composition, as it was a truly organic part of my method, which starts with [xxxiii] the assumption that only a demonstration of all the forces gathered in a scale-degree will explain what it is and how it is generated. And again, it is less vanity than interest in the complete clarification of the discipline that induces me here to say that my theory is the first to point to the scale-degree as the source of content. For example, we need only compare Sechter's work[*7] with mine to see that the psychology of degree progression, as I represent it, better serves the artistic and practical purpose of achieving and increasing content—for example, in questions of chromaticism and alteration, my teaching is by far purer and more unified, etc.

The scale-degree exists in our perception only as a triad; that is to say, when we anticipate a scale-degree, we at first anticipate it merely as a triad, not as a seventh-chord. In this sense, the seventh is not at all an a priori element for our presentiment as are the fifth and third. It is, rather, an a posteriori occurrence that we can best understand from the purpose connected with it—that is, we understand it afterwards as a passing tone or a chromatic intermediary, etc. That is why in Section One of my Harmonielehre, where I set forth the basis of the systems, I discuss the scale-degrees only as triads, never as seventh-chords.† Moreover, if we consider the fact that an organ point can be placed on the root, fifth, or third, but never on the seventh of a chord, then we have even more proof that the scale-degree, a priori, is and remains a triad only! What light this sheds anew on that ancient perception of the first contrapuntal epoch which, even then, differentiated consonance and dissonance (in the

†Cf. Harmonielehre, especially § 78.
context of sonorities produced purely by means of polyphony without scale-degrees) in generally the same sense! Further-
[xxxiv] more, the degree-progression, as an abstract guidance, is so distinct from the actual bass progression that, if necessary, we may even write open octaves to a bass voice as long as it coincides completely with the path of a degree-
progression. Thus, the character of an obligatory voice is obliterated even in the bass progression if it chiefly expresses the degree-progression.

* * *

Finally, permit me to report on the consequence of my Harmonielehre. From critiques, letters, and oral remarks, I learned that the part of my work that was devoted to the refutation of the church modes found the most approval and unreserved agreement of the musicians. Since I strive for nothing more avidly than the trustworthiness of the teacher in front of the student, I am happy to have provided so many teachers with a secure hold on this very important question. In other respects, the contents were frequently characterized as full of spirit, but doubts existed as to whether my teachings could have practical value in this form. Well, I believe I may assert that it is much more practical to show a disciple of music where he must obtain his content, not to mention the basic source of inspiration, than it is to let him play with "tone-dolls," which really implies an idleness very dearly purchased! If the student has first of all learned the art of voice leading in counterpoint, he will be able to see enough in the world of scale-degrees: what they are, how they produce content, how they are related to form, how much of the degree-progression one or another thought expends, how one can economize on scale-degrees and still extend the conceptions at the same time, etc. I readily admit that I failed to do full justice to many items in the Harmonielehre, but for the time being I had to be satisfied because the road to the goal I had in mind was so long.
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INTRODUCTION


"The most common opinions, those that everyone takes for granted, often deserve to be examined most of all." G. Ch. Lichtenberg.

"The climbing of even the highest mountain begins in the valley." Japanese proverb.

Nowhere, more so than in the teaching of counterpoint does Goethe's tenet hold good:

There is nothing more repugnant than a teacher who knows no more than the students, too, ought to know. He who teaches others may often keep secret the best of what he knows, but he may not be half-knowing.

It is high time that we finally clarify what the theory of counterpoint really has to present. Above all, it is time the teacher learns to distinguish counterpoint from free composition and to give the bases for the imperatives and prohibitions he expounds. Then, perhaps, he will be able to thoroughly clarify for the student the obvious contradictions between contrapuntal theory and, for example, any Beethoven-esque voice leading. The cruel as well as narrow-minded answer with which many a teacher dismisses his questioning students must finally be silenced: "Yes, to the extent that you are a Beethoven you also may write that way." Does the teacher not suspect how poorly such an answer serves as an [2] ultimatum, and how the dressing-down he presumes to give the student is all the more dealt to himself? Unless it is a case of an honest lack of talent, which, to be sure, must endlessly enjoy a complete exemption (for it cannot be otherwise), how the teacher ought to be punished for the mischief of creating the impression that Beethoven composed poorly: No, that
is a thousandfold lie; Beethoven has never composed poorly, and
his way of composition certainly does not require the indul-
gence of some teacher who cannot even hear! In spite of such
weighty arrogance, however, some allowance must be granted
this teacher. After all, hardly any other discipline has
been so fundamentally misunderstood as counterpoint, from its
inception to the present day. The errors associated with its
development can be clearly distinguished, chronologically as
well as technically.

I

The Basic Error of the Older
Counterpoint School

When people set out to deduce the principles of voice
leading from the first compositional experiences, they over-
looked the fact that, logically speaking, these principles
cannot be unconditionally applied to composition itself.
Perhaps their modest significance for the teaching of voice
leading is comparable to grammatical rules that basically rep-
resent only the foundation for the simplest formulation of
thought elements. Only in language, however, does that path
lead from the primary principles concerning subject, predicate,
and object, etc., that is, from a simply constructed compo-
sition based on these elements to the stately, clear construc-
tion of a linguistic work of art: But in music, people have
[3] overlooked this great gap and have immediately elevated
counterpoint rules to rules of composition, that is, rules
having binding authority also for all of free composition.

In this absolute and exceptionless identification of
counterpoint with the teaching of composition, we have to
recognize the fundamental error that has, unfortunately, been
handed down to the present time.
To be sure, the genesis of this error was due to an understandable and excusable illusion, and this illusion was based on the fact that in the early days of vocal counterpoint, the compositions exhibited a character quite like that found in the assignments given in modern textbooks. In those days there were no independent harmonies; no one could know about effective length, functional degrees, or modulation; and likewise, the manifold phenomena of the subsequent organization and synthesis were still unthinkable. Equipped with only a few technical means for production, as for example, the characteristic entering and coupling technique, canon, and other imitations, people always wandered with the text from place to place, from cadence to cadence—without having the kind of composition which distinguishes itself as an actual free composition rather than a movement developed merely from the voice leading. Today it is difficult, if not impossible, to specify how much free composition is composed according to false theory, since the reciprocal influence of practice and theory is always observed whether the theory is correct or not. Thus, in the early days, counterpoint and composition teaching were united in an undifferentiated mass. This was not too different from that kind of old, theological scholarship in which all disciplines of knowledge and art sprouted up as if under the patronage of a divinity.

[4] It would be going too far here to lay out the evidence of the just-mentioned error of the theorists, especially since I will have occasion to refer to it in quotes from older works during the course of this work. Anyone wishing to convince himself may read, for example, the preface to J. J. Fux's Gradus ad Parnassum (German translation by Mitzler, Leipzig, 1742)—which, by the way, is one of the most important works on counterpoint—or, the introduction to Cherubini's Théorie des Kontrapuncts und der Fuge (Leipzig, Kistner)([*8]) Let me here, for my part, only quote what Albrechtsberger said in the sixth chapter of his Gründlichen Anweisung zur Composition. . . . (Leipzig, Breitkopf & Härtel, 1790)([*9]).

+See my Harmonielehre, pages 209-219.
By strict composition I mean that which is written only for voices without instrumental accompaniment. It is bound by more rules than free composition. This is because the singer cannot find tones as easily as an instrumentalist. Strict composition is used mostly in churches and chapels (therefore it is called a cappella style) where it is accompanied with the organ; sometimes violins and oboes accompany the treble in unison; sometimes a few trombones also appear. . . .(*10) When the instruments are omitted, as is customary in royal chapels during Passion Week, no dissonant skips (excepting diminished fourths and fifths when they are resolved properly) are allowed. It is also forbidden to skip to or from a dissonance. In two-part writing, hidden fifths, octaves, and unisons are forbidden in the five species of strict exercises where a voice is added above or below a given melody (hymn, or cantus firmus). In three-part settings some are allowed, and in four-part several, etc.+(*11) In first species no dissonance is permitted. . . .(*12) In second and third species, dissonances are permitted only as regular passing tones. . . .(*13) and certain changing tones. . . .(*14) Also, notae objectae . . .(*15) are not permitted in strict style. (*16) Furthermore, in the strict style all tied dissonances, which are first found in fourth species, must be prepared by a consonance and resolved downward, not upward, to the next tone or semitone. Finally, the chromatic— and the enharmonic—passages are forbidden here.++ To the strict style, thus,+++ belong the five species as they are presented here and in Fux's work. . . .(*17)

The strict style encompasses the church-style imitations, the valiant and serious counterpoints with or

+It should be noted how abruptly and carelessly he speaks in the last sentence about "exercises" and "species," when just before that he describes the strict style as exclusive only to a cappella works!

++As one can clearly see, all these remarks by Albrechtsberger refer only to "exercises" in the five species. Strangely enough, he takes no pains, even with a single word, to separate "exercises" from the first-mentioned a cappella style. He certainly did not consider the "exercises" to be complete works of art!

+++"Thus"?--let us reread the first sentence of the quote where there is talk of totally different matters and fit together the contradiction, if we can:

[5]
without a hymn, then the simple and double fugues, and finally the canon. In short, all a cappella contrapuntal settings for voices belong to strict style, especially those without accompaniment of instruments.*

In none of the five species of strict composition are two notes of the same pitch (e.g., C C or D D) permitted to follow each other immediately in a measure. However, this rule has two exceptions; the first is in fifth species [with the ligatura rupta]. The second exception is in reference to vocal pieces where, because of many short syllables, you can make two notes out of one. . . .(*18)**

Free style is the type in which, according to all five species, one may use an unprepared dissonant chord in any part of the measure in imitations, contrapuntal passages, and fugues. However, these dissonances must be resolved in a proper and natural way. . . .(*19) In free composition one is rarely constrained to one of the five species,+++ but uses all sorts of notes for the melody as well as for the accompanying voices. . . .(*20) Free composition is used in three styles: church, chamber, and theatre; for instance, in Masses, Graduals, Offertories, psalms, hymns, etc., accompanied by the organ; also in fugues where one uses unprepared dissonance, even tied dissonances that resolve upwards as retardations. . . .(*21) In our time one hears and finds a thousand examples of free composition for every twenty of strict. . . .(*22)++++ Since one cannot get to the necessary purity in either style without the principles of counterpoint, it is advisable to start by learning two-part strict style.

---

*Has Albrechtsberger forgotten the "exercises" of which he wrote so diligently earlier?

**Please take note that this "exception" is in connection with the tone-repetition problem to which I will return later.

+++"Rarely"? Never, not even in a cappella music!

++++Naturally--because by definition every composition is free and never strict!
In this complete chaos of conceptions, perhaps one must consider the last sentence above all others as clear insight, even though, in the last analysis the proper explanation is lacking. Yet, the absence of the explanation of contrapuntal laws and prohibitions remains a negative characteristic throughout almost the whole teaching of the older theorists. Perhaps one could designate J. J. Fux, the founder of the discipline, as the teacher who took the most pains to clarify the problems. Considering the mistaken identifying of counterpoint with composition teaching, how could one expect to find convincing explanations of the teachings at all? Was it simply an impossibility since it was not known whether the latter had to be regarded as exercises or as composition?

Later, in yet another respect, the first error of the theorists was destined to prove critical. That happened at the time when instrumental music came into prominence and when the problem of length (chiefly with regard to monothematic principles) was solved for the first time in the closed form of the fugue. For, due to the false belief that the teaching of counterpoint is the same as the teaching of composition, the older theorists added fugue to counterpoint so that the character of the fugue, as an independent form of composition, suffered by being included with the teaching of voice leading. Since that time, counterpoint and fugue have remained inseparably linked in textbooks. The confusion this eventually led to is hardly believable. As people became accustomed to regarding fugue alone as the highest, perhaps only goal of contrapuntal instruction, they then imagined that only the fugue totally "contained" counterpoint within it. Thus, only those who wrote fugues could be considered "a master [7] of counterpoint" and to be sure, only if they wrote them. Far from realizing that, in truth, the fugue is as individual and independent a form as any other, such as a rondo, or a three or four-part form, etc., and that each musical piece--

+Elsewhere, therefore, e.g., in a sonata or symphony, they could not speak of counterpoint, especially if the setting did not sound fugal.
a waltz, a march, as well as a sonata, or an intermezzo—necessarily involves counterpoint in a relationship of at least two voices, they went so far as to consider counterpoint and fugue identical.† Falling more and more into this error, people finally reached the point of declaring all fugal compositions genuine fugues regardless of whether or not the composition was a complete organism in itself.

When, for example, Mozart in the last movement of the G-major String Quartet, or Beethoven in the last movement of his String Quartet, Op. 59, No. 3, used the fugue form only as the main idea in an otherwise cyclic (sonata) form—similar at least to the openings used by J. S. Bach in the preludes and gigues of his suites—ignorance permits some to convert the cyclic form of those movements into "fugues." To this day, silly as it is, do they not speak of the "Jupiter Symphony with a closing fugue" when in reality the fugal technique is used in the modulations (†) that connect the first group with the second and consequently emerges quite dependently without impeding the completion of the ideas as a true sonata form: Do we not deny ourselves the enjoyment of Mozart's genius if we discount the clever inclusion of fugal technique in a larger form as simply a fugue? If we consider the sonata form to be open to possibilities like the one manifested in the final movement of the just-cited symphony, is it not easy, then, to believe that all sonatas are similar, and no less, all fugues? Or let us think of Beethoven's Piano Sonata Op. 110. In reality, what an ingenious formal combining of a third movement (an Adagio) and a fourth movement (a true fugue) this is. The first half of the Adagio is followed by the first part of the fugue, and the second half of the Adagio is followed by the modulation and closing section of the fugue. And yet, what it has become in the minds of the theorists and virtuosos: They see only the fugue because their own artistic sense is inadequate for any further penetration into the realm of Beethoven's imagination! However, since our masters have not let faulty explanations of their works prevent them from applying fugal techniques in new ways, such as these examples illustrate, we see, in contrast, how lesser talents take advantage of the narrow-mindedness of the musical audience, strutting about with their fugal technique in order to gain the audience's admiration, knowing

†In the mind of A. B. Marx, who was more aesthetically than musically inclined, counterpoint could become so consolidated with "polyphony," that in his textbooks he used the word polyphony instead of counterpoint!(*23)
full well that only a few people are capable of judging whether the fugal technique is good or bad. They write only a few fugal measures, or even a whole fugue, and then are awarded the honorable title "master of counterpoint," for only the fugue is considered counterpoint by the music audience: Do I need to name names? Is it not true that recently someone gave a childish piano paraphrase of Johann Strauss' waltz themes, which surely has nothing to do with art, the proudly boastful title of "Contrapuntal Paraphrase"?

II

Intensification of the Same Error by the Modern School of Counterpoint

In the long run, the weight of the first error had to prove unbearable when the creations of our classicists stormed in--with their new developments of content, degree-progressions, plans for modulations and forms: a new boundless universe that stepped out of the void! When the works [9] of Schubert, Schumann, Wagner, Brahms, etc. were also added, then, like it or not, people were faced with the unavoidable need to resolve once and for all the contradiction between the manner in which those masters composed according to the new psychological forces and the prevailing theory (especially that of counterpoint) which caused the discrepancy between the worlds of practice and theory to become too great.

However, in this increasing peril there was no possibility of finding a more proper path since theorists preferred to continue on the old erroneous path. Often they were quite oblivious to the problem because, to them, their path seemed to be totally new and proper. With the newer theorists

---

*Even the military bandmasters set two, three, or even four well-known tunes over one another by one dozen.*
as well as the older ones, the approach stayed the same, that is, counterpoint was supposed to be, as always, the theory of composition. Moreover, wherein should (or could) the difference be found? For, if Fux extracted his principles only from the vocal compositions of older times (as he thought he must) in order to make them applicable for composition in the "strict style," the new theorists, in contrast, preferred to draw their contrapuntal principles from the instrumental compositions of the classical and postclassical composers, that is, from modern harmonic and formal structures. They thought they had to do this in order to make these principles useful for that kind of modern composition. I ask now whether the circumstance that the one has a vocal basis and the other an instrumental basis constitutes such a significant difference in the face of the important fact that in both cases all that matters is composition (to be sure, only living composition), which is the true point of departure, that is to say, the source of the principles and at the same time their ultimate goal.

[10] Thus, the fact that younger theorists of the newer composition have reformed the prevailing cantus firmus technique into another type of exercise, carries very little relevance over against the disastrous point of view assumed then as well as now that, after all, the first voice-leading exercises are to be directly combined only with free composition (formerly vocal, and now instrumental).

This newer, more modern false identification of counterpoint and composition is expressed in E. F. Richter's counterpoint textbook. We read in Chapter I:(*24)

If, in contrast to earlier methods, we begin with four-part texture instead of two-part, it is because we attribute a greater significance to harmonic progression as the foundation of our music. Thus,

+And therein lies the total sameness of the older and the modern schools:
harmonic progression is no longer an accident of the mechanical application of counterpoint, but appears as the factor giving direction to the melodic succession. How the harmonic progression or direction proves of greater significance to the counterpoint than in former times can be shown in a short example by J. S. Bach.† Despite all the contrapuntal independence of the voices in this well-known piece, only the following simple harmonic progression is present.++ If we compare this rich, metrically and rhythmically composed succession of harmonies with any setting from an earlier epoch . . .(*27) its precision cannot be denied, whereas in the other one, the progression is only the accidental result of the voice leading. Herein, we see the real basis for the distinction between the modern and old music, and therewith the difference in the counterpoint and its treatment. Thus, for the sake of the learning process, we must to some extent take care to keep our beginning simple.

In a very concise and clear manner, the last [two] sentence[s] contains all of his erroneous conclusions and other errors. Because classical music has logic in its harmonies, must counterpoint, for that reason alone,+++ also comply (in his lessons)? On the other hand, what moves him to make the "beginning" nevertheless "simple," if, as he believes, counterpoint and modern composition should proceed side by side? According to this theory, the pupil would have to "choose the harmonies carefully so that they can be taken as a fixed and secure basis" for four-part writing in [11] order to arrive at two-part writing as a distillation --all that to provide the student, even in counterpoint lessons, the logic and sequence of harmonies appertaining to modern composition.++++ In other words, all that to pave the way in the lessons for the newer music. He is completely unaware of the fact that, from the outset, he strives for an illogical goal—a goal that will remain illogical and unattainable forever.

†Example follows.(*25)
++The illustration follows.(*26)
++++"Therewith," the author says simply:
+++++By the way, we note that the same author has included contrapuntal voice leading in harmony lessons. Cf. Harmonielehre, §§ 90-92.
Riemann almost goes further astray, if that is possible, when he discloses in the first chapter of his book on counterpoint: (*28)

Nothing can be more perverse than to require a student to construct the greatest possible number of individual contrapuntal settings to a given cantus firmus all of which are to be harmonically different; rather, the endeavors of the student must be guided through repeated refinements to a kind of contrapuntal setting that he regards as proper and natural. Instead of many of equal value—which are, in fact, of little value—he must ultimately elevate one good contrapuntal setting from the level of the merely natural and correct to one of art and beauty.

And still more obviously:

When there is a given voice (even a cantus firmus), the task cannot be one of finding a melody that appears insignificant and without content in comparison to it. Rather, the efforts must be directed in such a way that the cantus firmus becomes more significant due to the counterpoint. The counterpoint should interpret the cantus firmus. For example, let us examine J. S. Bach's fugues with regard to this point. We will find that not even in the modulatory sections does the theme receive through the counterpoint any meaning other than that given it by the first countersubject. A theme that would be interpreted in one way and then another must seem characterless. Soon enough we shall see how the essence of the composition becomes special through detail—and yet, the core, the skeleton, must stand steadfast.

In light of this, Riemann himself feels no compunction about composing the following melody as an exercise:

---

*In a note he remarks: "... unquestionably, the first concern of a budding composer is to learn to understand his own melodic ideas and to treat them effectively in many voices in order to develop them, according to their individuality, to their fullest."
Stronger words can hardly be found to express the notion that counterpoint is already composition in its own right, and that in the most delicate sense of the word it must be cultivated. The student, here, is supposed to learn to express the trivial melody in the finest, most artistic manner. Yet, I ask, how could the theorist overlook the fact that in reality the melody composed as an assignment is much too brief and limited to fulfill artistic demands, and merely serves as an approximation? Is it not the case that the expression one gives to a melody in a real composition depends also on circumstances other than the few notes from which it is created? Is it really a matter of little importance whether the melody appears, for example, in a sonata form, in the first or in the second group, in a modulation or a closing, or whether the melody appears for the first, second, or third time, etc.? Consider someone encountering the theme of Beethoven's String Quartet, Op. 59, No. 1 for the first time. Who, after experiencing so many contrapuntal settings during the course of the movement, anticipates yet a final one in the coda that can be described so particularly as a Russian contrapuntal setting—I mean precisely such a contrapuntal setting? But are we aware that there are a thousand special circumstances which force the composer to imbue his melodies with this or that expression—to search for a special expression that has no similar circumstance or condition and therefore remains beyond any mood? I observe from the fact that even the greatest of the great have trouble expressing their exact thoughts, as Lichtenberg said so beautifully:

The thought has still too much room to play in the expression; I have pointed to it with the head of a cane when I should have used the point of a needle.

That we can hardly expect beginners, of all people, to find the best expression when such expression cannot be reached because of the lack of adequate experience. Must we not consider such an unnatural requirement of the beginner analogous to expecting as specific an expression to be conveyed in elementary sentences typically found in French or English grammar books as would otherwise only be conveyed by serious [13] actors in sentences from Faust? For example, what can
sentences such as these mean to an actor: "This room has three windows" or, "Several books, a pencil, and a notebook lie on the table." Which expression would he have to choose for that kind of sentence? And, similarly, which expression should the student put into the above-mentioned melody assignment as precisely the only and best one? Is it not quite obvious in Riemann's glaring theory that a disparity exists between the "exercise" and the real composition and that this disparity is permanent and irreconcilable?

At this point we must also mention W. Dehn's more grotesque dictum. He refuses to give his students precise directions regarding the construction of a basic melody by saying: "We are melody makers by God's grace." Do we not over-estimate the role of the cantus firmus if the grace of God is to be considered the last court of appeal? How great was Dehn's misunderstanding of what actually constitutes the task of counterpoint instruction if he could arrive at that overestimation: "Help yourself, and God will also help you" is probably the last thing that ought to be said. For nothing is simpler or more useful than to instruct anyone in the making of a cantus firmus, and we can do something as trifling as that without the help of God!

Bellermann also misunderstands the true task of counterpoint since he explains:

Likewise, anyone wanting to devote his energies in the freest manner to the theatre or concert hall will succeed if he has gained skill in voice leading. For example, consider an opera composer who wishes to compose an aria that will be accompanied obligato by some instrument or take advantage of violins in smooth-running passages. How easy will such things become when he has already conditioned himself in his studies not to string chords together but to write obligato voices instead. With what sureness such an ensemble piece and finale will be put together if he has learned to write a fugue with ease.

[14] Can counterpoint, in and of itself, actually grant such advantages to the student? No, that is a utopia since, as I said above, too great a chasm gapes between contrapuntal exercises and the demands of free composition.

+Lehre vom Kontrapunkt, W. Dehn. (*29)

++See the Introduction in his Lehrbuch des Kontrapunkts, Berlin: Springer. (*30)
Shall I discuss here the copious details of how the newer theorists of counterpoint must find it as difficult to explain their stated principles as the older theorists, since both groups suffer from the basic error of confusing counterpoint and composition? That goes without saying: From the modern theorists we also receive principles, therefore, that are unfounded or, at best, only vaguely explained. And with them the misconception of fugue as the alleged proper domain of counterpoint persists--incidentally perceived--in much the same manner as I have represented it above.

It is much more important to state that through the forced encroachment of counterpoint exercises on free composition, as the modern school propagates it to the degree mentioned above, the situation of contrapuntal theory has become decidedly worse instead of better than in earlier times. This simply results from the fact that, on the one hand, the exercises of modern theorists are, in reality, no longer true exercises and that, on the other hand, the explanation of free works of art through the principles of contrapuntal theory is, as before, still wanting. Thus, the intended approximation has produced precisely the wrong result: counterpoint and free composition stand further apart today than they did in the past! The true nature of the matter cannot be taken lightly--that which does not, by nature, strictly belong together cannot and will not become one through some artifici-ality:

[15]

III

How I Eliminate the Abuse

From the previous presentation the reader may have already deduced the only path that can lead us out of this accursed error: counterpoint must somehow be separated from composition if the hypothetical and practical reality of both
is to be given justice. In light of this, it will be A) my first item of business to separate pure voice-leading theory from free composition. However, such a clean separation of the "exercise" from the free work of art also demands, even more urgently, the fulfillment of B), the second item of business: namely, to reveal the connection between counterpoint (as the first exercises in musical grammar) and the real work of art, and to show what this relationship is and upon what it is founded. For, indeed, there is a relationship between counterpoint and composition even if it is far from representing a full identity. It is, therefore, a totally different relationship than the one theorists of the older as well as the newer school have presumed up to now.

A) In regard to the first item of business, that is, the total separation of counterpoint from the teaching of composition, I must discuss the following points here:

1. In teaching counterpoint it is less important to teach a particular style of composition than to introduce the ear of the music student, for the first time, to the infinite world of basic musical problems.

At some time and place the pupil's ear must be alerted, for example, to the particular psychology that applies to musical intervals whereby the second is distinguished from the fifth or sixth, etc., or to how situations must be understood and solved in which two, three, or four voices cooperate --or better, counteract one another. The musical instinct must be alerted to the effect associated with each of the three possible voice motions. Therefore, the main purpose of the study of counterpoint may be viewed as the investigation of the possible situations of the voices and their solutions. These situations and their solutions must be made understandable to the ear with great care and not just presented as gradations from the simplest and most natural to the more remote and complex.
That such schooling of the ear for artistic purposes is indispensable—no matter whether for artistic-creative purposes or merely artistic-reproductive purposes—is self-evident. Even Mozart's ear or Beethoven's ear needed such training—this is evident from the mistakes that can be found in their earliest exercise books. This postulate comes, by the way, from the nature of the subject itself because counterpoint is an empirical art based upon the most strenuous and, at the same time, sublimate perceptions of composers and teachers of the many centuries since the discovery of polyphonic composition. Consequently, how should one be able to recapitulate the experiences of so many generations without falling into the same errors that our predecessors learned to avoid by some fortunate knack? Thus, we see that passing through an embryonic stage is unavoidable—a fact well known in organic nature!

2. According to this conception, counterpoint must limit itself to demonstrating the nature of the problems and their solutions on the level of a modest, naturally simple exercise—a small training stage, as it were—such as the cantus firmus represents. Counterpoint should not be regarded as anything more than an elementary preparation for actual composing. In no case should such an exercise and its manipulation be regarded as a full-fledged compositional event.

The use of the cantus firmus instead of a genuine melody as a foundation for contrapuntal experiences is quite comparable to using plaster casts, plaster ornaments and stylized forms instead of living models in the teaching of drawing. When starting out, the beginner in the art of drawing must avoid the complexities and unforeseen occurrences of a natural casting.

3. The statement of the problems as well as their solutions must be based exclusively upon the vocal principle and not upon an instrumental-mechanical technique. At the beginning of the contrapuntal period, it was the human voice (and it alone) that taught us to distinguish the true and natural from the false and unnatural. Because the voice, due to its limited range (on the average hardly more than one and one-half octaves) and the needed involvement of the mind for the production of intervals, is able to reveal, in the clearest manner, the true magnitude of the tensions, it qualifies—
as it did centuries ago and still does—as the best leader and judge in all questions of voice leading.

How relatively easy it is to play, for example, a sixth on the piano or any other mechanical instrument, and how soon the ear becomes disoriented by the fact that the hand and the instrument can produce larger spans as readily as smaller ones: But regarding what the sixth is, in reality, we must ask only the human voice. Or, let us consider what reasons the church may have had when in the early period of vocal counterpoint it generally forbade certain intervals, permitting some only ascending and others only descending. Obviously, the church, with proper instinct, understood from its first experiences that the human voice (permit me the adaptation of a principle taken from a political-economic concept) is effected by the law of a psychological inflation, i.e., that which is so dear and so difficult to acquire, like the intervals of the human singing voice, must be regarded as a treasure. As a limited instrument, the voice does not permit its few precious intervals to be misused like the keys of a piano. In simple speech we can already hear what organic-mechanical relationship the intervals hold in relation to the content, and it is all the more so in the stylized art song: Far be it for me to designate the old composition rules of the church as meaningless, inconsequential decisions. Rather, I advocate that they be regarded as a welcome contribution to the history of the understanding of voice leading and the nature of the voice. Finally, because of the unchangeability of the larynx, it is certainly correct and important, even today, to make the distinctions that the church believed it had to make in drawing the resultant, as it were, from the postulate of a dispassionate sort of devotion and from the singer's voice. At that time, the church rules were, of course, also composition rules, but, as I said at the beginning of this section, now that composition is to be distinguished from the elementary preparation represented by strict counterpoint, we must still use them as the proper core for strict counterpoint even if we can no longer regard them as valid for composition.

4. Counterpoint instruction animates the problems of voice leading by presenting them in the form of laws and prohibitions. That is to say, we learn about one problem of tone-life [Tonleben] because counterpoint prohibits this or that, and about another because inversely it demands something. But at this point we should also bear this in mind:

+Cf. Bellermann, Chapter VIII.

++This will subsequently be seen much more clearly.
we must not allow ourselves to be misled by the great number of prohibitions, for in spite of the many prohibitions that counterpoint instruction is capable of creating, there are--even in the operation of the world of lessons--still more things that are permitted; there is much more freedom than lack of it:†

Nevertheless, all contrapuntal precepts must at last receive their founding at this point. Certainly, this is most difficult to do, and the difficulty alone clarifies why the [19] theoretical foundation of counterpoint has for the most part eluded us to this day. Has it not been the experience of religion that men have asked for the "why"; and is it, therefore, not comprehensible that the teaching of counterpoint, which has long been perceived as a musical religion, has finally shared in the same destiny? If we had only begun earlier with this task--I already said the constant mixing of counterpoint and composition has seriously hindered this--many of the dismal aspects of the present-day situation could have been avoided:

B) In reference to the second item of business, the method of its realization will be best explained during the course of the work. At this point I will only refer to the previously-cited analog with the art of language. I believe that it is also possible, with respect to free composition, to proceed as we do when we want to explain why the sentence construction in Faust, for example, takes this freer form:

Now, alas, I have thoroughly studied Philosophy, Law, Medicine, and--unfortunately--also Theology--with passionate fervor!

†In real life, as well, there is generally more freedom than lack of it, and only our own stupidity is to blame if we stare and goggle at the restrictions and fall victim to the illusion of a quite opposite condition!
instead of the one we must usually adopt to teach a beginner to construct the same thoughts. Are the reasons why Goethe had to arrive at the above construction not the following: the poetry (prosody, rhyme), Faust's discontent (which psychologically compels him to revolutionize the normal order of the sentence elements and to rearrange them freely), and also his seriousness, which makes that discontent truly believable? If we simply disregard these psychological forces, we will immediately realize that lacking them it would be foolish, even impossible, to use the same construction. In this respect, the first essays and exercises of a student distinguish themselves from the real, literary work; there, the psychical necessity to create freer organizations must, unavoidably, be lacking! I ask, therefore, does the quotation from Goethe offend German grammar rules? Who can overlook the fact that Goethe, in spite of all his rearrangements, basically only produced extensions of the most normal laws of grammar? Similarly, the new forces in free composition bring about a seemingly new ordering principle. Yet, the expert sees the basic laws of counterpoint operating mysteriously in the background so that their appearances in free composition can be understood only as their extensions.

When I finally summarize these results, it turns out that this newly based counterpoint instruction appears to be naturally closer to the older theorists than to the younger ones; this, to be sure, fills me with pride! What links me to the older teachers is that here and there, the exercises have the same character. What separates me from them is one essential difference: I consider counterpoint and its tasks only as voice-leading exercises, whereas they usually mixed the experiences from the compositions with those in the exercises* and, by so doing, eventually had to render the prin-

*At first this mixing conformed to the nature of their compositions; later, it even opposed their nature—therein, they already caught a glimpse of real composition.
principles unusable for both counterpoint and composition. The younger theorists, by turning away from the cantus firmus (in an attempt to move closer to the character of modern music), forfeited the natural foundation of the simple, first lessons without, on the other side, being able to attain the freedom of a genuine melody. And this was due to the lack of the needed dimension and the thousandfold prerequisites in the small structures they now set in the place of the cantus firmus. On the one hand, their exercise structures are too complex for exercises designed merely to introduce the basic problems of voice leading; on the other hand, they are, after all, inadequate for a true study of composition. Being essentially devoid of character, such exercises lack the potential to give clear and certain direction to the student.

Let us remember, for example, that in many respects the opinions which Em. Bach set down in his theoretical works can never become outmoded. And, to cite from the area of painting, A. Dürer's theories will also have lasting value according to the testimony of important painters.

IV

The Nature and Advantage of Counterpoint
Instruction According to the Present Method

Counterpoint instruction, taken solely as a doctrine of voice leading, indicates tonal laws and effects from an absolute perspective. It alone can do that, and it alone should do it—that is its highest value and, at the same time, its significance for the future.

Counterpoint teaches the inherent effect of the tones, one is tempted to say their spontaneous movement, and frees the disciple of art from the delusion that tones must imply objective, extrinsic effects in addition to their absolute effect.
Here, the future artist will convince himself that, whether he intends it or not, tones placed in a certain way produce a specific effect and no other. This is predictable and must come about: Thus, the tones cannot simply produce an arbitrary effect desired by the person who sets them, for no one has power over the tones in the sense that he can demand an effect from them that does not conform to their prerequisites. The tones, themselves, do as they must; they [22] have no choice! This knowledge can only be gained in counterpoint instruction. It constitutes the greatest benefit that an artist can gain.

The artist learns to be satisfied to bow before the absolute nature of tone-life and to define and structure his objectives only in accordance to the absolutes in music. He knows the effects that the tones must yield under various circumstances and he can, in modesty--the true sign of every great man--and in freedom, either choose them or not. Conversely, he is thereby spared the misfortune of aiming for a certain effect and having the tones, quite unexpectedly, yield a totally different effect because they, being always independent of the composer's whim, can produce their effects only in conformity to the prerequisites actually imparted to them in the particular instance. Here, in counterpoint instruction, the student can acquire the foundation for the first insight and conviction that there actually is a relationship between the artist's intention for tones and their effect. It is an amazing relationship about which the lay-public has no idea, and in the best cases+ intent (that is, the prediction of the effect) and effect are totally identical. However, in most cases the tones, acting, as it were, on their own account and behind the back of the composer, produce a totally different effect than the one intended.

+The latter are precisely the geniuses, and they alone!
If we wish to characterize the main fault of "modern" music in the most objective manner, we can define it from the standpoint of what has just been said, i.e., the composers of today have lost all command over the mysteries of the tones. Unfortunately, it happens (as it had to, considering the prerequisites of the tones), when composers certainly intend to do much better: With R. Strauss, Pfitzner, Mahler, and even Reger, with Tschaikowsky, Elgar, and the other names I could mention, it is always the same story; none of them understand which effects they are supposed to seek, are able to seek, or are even allowed to seek. Still less do they understand what is actually required to attain the desired effects. Everything is chance: good luck—or bad luck:

[23] The absolute character of tone-life, as it is demonstrated for the first time in counterpoint, brings with it the emancipation of tone-life from any external object—be it the text, the stage, or the anecdotal aspect of a program. This latent quality of the tones urges upon the composer the obligation to accommodate himself to the inner-directed life of the tones and to assign a secondary role to any goal that might be associated with the music. In other words, the shaping of the secondary aim must never become such a primary consideration that, because of the (quite unintentional) poor effects, the tones, themselves, would have to protest!+

Finally, counterpoint instruction is quite able to put a stop to false ideas about the nature of music, such as those held by the philosophers, poets, etc. Being only slightly familiar with the absolutes of tone-life (even E. T. A. Hoffmann is by no means an exception), they must present questionable positions in their ideas and definitions—such as we find in this statement by Schopenhauer: "The composer reveals the innermost essence of the world and expresses the deepest knowledge in a language that his intellect does not understand...." If we insert into all such vague expressions

+Moreover, in mistakes of this kind—and as we know, they are commonplace today—the expert finds (inversely, also in the poor absolute effects that occur) his most effective weapon against the false statements and beliefs of the composers and their defenders.
simply the organic and absolute inner direction of tone-life, there will indeed be no less marvel and mystery! Then we will know, all the better, why music--secure in its inherent tone-effects and removed from care in its innate ideal association of motives, yet, like the other arts, having to communicate with the outer world--even reveals the character that is so carefully scrutinized by the philosophers and aestheticians, but so poorly understood. We will know why it seems to be disassociated from the world or, as Schopenhauer puts it, why it shows "an inherent universality exclusive to itself, along with strictest certainty." The "strictest certainty" he admired here is nothing more than the inherent effect of tones, the latent motives about which he had no knowledge. And, looking at it from a different angle, the result is the same: the inner-directed life of the tones is also "its inherent universality." Thus, Schopenhauer's conclusion that music offers the "innermost core of any configuration, or the heart of the thing," is unfortunately in contradiction to music. We recognize how (despite frequently correct misgivings) the confusion of the philosopher ultimately led him into a trap; music is not "the heart of the thing." No, music does not want to have anything to do with "things" at all (at least not much), for the tones are, as it were, living beings with inherent social laws.

How easy it would be for the philosopher if at the start, he could grasp and assimilate from counterpoint only the absolute of music. Then, from there he might also be able to understand more clearly the ultimate mystery of the world, its absolute existence, and the vision of the creator of the world as a similarly absolute eventuality!
A More Detailed Plan of the Present Work

In light of the explanation given above, I offer in my counterpoint instruction only that which pertains, in the strictest sense of the word, to voice leading.

At the outset I exclude fugue instruction, together with all particulars aimed at this form (therefore, canon, double counterpoint, etc.), which may be dealt with more effectively in the teaching of form.

It will suffice, therefore, to present the theory of the cantus firmus, composition in two, three, four, and more parts using the familiar five species, and finally, as newly added material, the transition to free composition.

Within this material each law and prohibition receives its rationale along with the presentation of its relative importance also to free composition. I believe I can thereby contribute most effectively to the removal of the accursed confusion of counterpoint and composition and its unfortunate consequences.
SECTION ONE

CANTUS FIRMUS AS THE BASIS FOR THE STUDY
OF COUNTERPOINT

CHAPTER 1

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS
OF THE CANTUS FIRMUS

§ 1. How the Construction of the Cantus Firmus Results from Its Purpose.

Because the theory of counterpoint involves an inter-relationship of at least two voices, it is necessary (before going into the actual theory of correct relationships) to speak, first, of the foundation itself, that is, of the principal voice as the given prerequisite of a second voice.

For the design of the principal voice, certain observations and artistic rules must be considered as they are logically abstracted by the consciousness of the ultimate purpose. If this purpose persists in revealing only voice-leading problems, by necessity, everything that would turn the cantus firmus into an individual type, that is, into a true melody in the sense of free composition, must be avoided.

First of all, groups of notes must be prevented from combining into unified figures, rhythmically or harmonically, because, if this should happen, the actual life-element of free melody would be created. In other words, as a contrast to the predominance of individually, free segments character-[27]ized by complex rhythm and common harmony, we must strive for an equal balance of the tones.
§ 2. Concerning Rhythmic Balance in the Cantus Firmus.

The rhythm in the cantus firmus must be devoid of complexity and make its contribution to the demand for equilibrium in such a way that it is totally neutralized, as it were, allowing the notes to appear only in equal values. Thus it is irrelevant whether we use the breve (\(\text{\textendash}\)) throughout, or the semibreve (our whole-note).\(^*\) I prefer to use just the whole note in the discussion that follows and, rarely, the triple meter.

With regard to rhythm, no note can claim a particular importance or preference over another—this explains the unchangeable and rigid rhythmical aspect of the cantus firmus.\(^{++}\)

As we explained in the introduction, this purely mechanical rhythmical phenomenon required only by pedagogical technique, led to the illusion that we were dealing with a special and yet allegedly genuine type of composition, namely, "strict composition."

This misunderstanding must be the reason why Fux, Albrechtsberger, Cherubini, Dehn, etc., treated the cantus firmus and hymn as synonymous in their theoretical works, and why they put them in their lessons, under this or that \([28]\) heading, without taking the trouble to consider value or to give the pupil the slightest instruction concerning the cantus firmus itself. In reality, even in their own exercises there exists a considerable difference between a genuinely artistic hymn and the cantus firmus, as the following discussion will show. I have therefore found it necessary to point out these peculiarities because they have subsequently led to more regrettable consequences. Quite frequently, these teachers were guided too much by emotion in the midst of presenting a voice-leading problem. As a result, they did not teach actual composition.

As far as I know, of the authors writing about counterpoint, Bellermann is the only one who, in a special

\(^*\) or the \(\text{\textendash}\) in triple meter.

\(^{++}\) Regarding the historical reason for the rhythmical neutrality see Harmonielehre, p. 198 f., especially the note on p. 209.
chapter well-worth reading, + speaks out about the cantus firmus--after having discussed four-part strict counterpoint--in spite of the fact that in his own stance he hardly deviates from Fux's great model. Regardless of how meritorious Bellermann's treatment of "melody" is, it is regrettable that he does not take this opportunity to cast a clear light upon the emerging problem of rhythm in contrapuntal lessons. Without clear awareness or better understanding, he remarks (p. 99):

For our purpose it is first of all important to invent melodies that appear graceful in their cadences, i.e., in their harmonic relationships. These relationships should be closely respected and carefully practised. Therefore, for the time being we disregard the words to be sung and limit ourselves to the rhythm in its simplest relationship--melodies which move from note to note in whole notes (or in lengths of two beats).

That is all he says; as we can see, it is too superficial to provide a full explanation.

§ 3. Balance also in the Harmonic Relations of the Tones.

To prevent any harmonically based unities [Einheits-bildungen] from appearing in the cantus firmus, we must avoid successions of tones which would appear as an arpeggio or configuration, no matter whether it is consonant or dissonant.

The same prohibition applies also to other unities as they are created, for instance, through the circumscription of a single tone by a neighboring tone, or the like.

[29] However, considering the indefinable abundance of possible dangers, counterpoint instruction does enough--or as much as it should--if it alerts the student's ear to them and leaves it to him to avoid the dangers of unities.++

Thus it would be bad to write unities such as these:

+"Concerning melody," which treats the real choral composition as a four-voice composition. See p. 268 ff., and p. 418.

++Cf. below, Chapter 2, §§6 and 19.
Example 2.

Bellermann observes (p. 99):

Furthermore, the composer must beware lest he unify two, three, and four individual measures (whole notes) into a larger group whereby certain tones of the melody become outstanding by their position and emphasis—something which happens quite easily and often without intent. This must be avoided at all costs because rhythmical arrangements frequently help to alleviate certain harmonic harshnesses and blemishes that become quite apparent when all melody-tones are of equal value.

§ 4. Restrictions also on the Length.

Naturally related to rhythmic limitation is the limitation of the length. Why should we persist with such a rhythmical equilibrium; in a sense, why should we aesthetically burden a substandard melody when we deal only with an exercise? And, if for no other reason than to explore the complex problems, are we not, thereby, more urgently motivated to reach for a second or a third way, or depending on their different arrangements, for still other voice-leading experiences offered by the occasion? This alone is the reason why, through proper instinct, the cantus firmus has never been expanded beyond 15 to 16 measures.

In spite of the similarity of the results attained by other writers, I point out the distinction at the outset be-

[30] cause I believe it is urgently necessary to clearly understand that the cantus firmus desires nothing more than to be
a lesson, a fact that must be presented in the proper light in the methodology of contrapuntal instruction.

Another reason for the limitation of length is given in Béllermann, page 99. As a consequence of his view that the cantus firmus is a real melody (even a compositional event and therefore more than a voice-leading exercise) he remarks:

We only need to see to it that the melody is a musical thought complete in itself and that it is not too long to be comfortably comprehended by ear without tiring or forgetting its opening. Such a thought, or melody, will then consist of approximately 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, or at the most 14 or 15 whole notes (or measures) as these two examples illustrate.+

§ 5. Concerning the Question of Scales.

With regard to scales [Tonarten], I consider it inadmissible to wear down the student of counterpoint with the writing of cantus firmus lessons in the old modes. We will, therefore, consider here only the major and minor.

The old church modes can easily be discarded if we agree with what I said in my Harmonielehre.++ There, I explained them as hardly more than well-meaning but, in their results, unsuccessful theoretical attempts to interpret musical phenomena. They are nothing more than modest attempts to categorize only horizontally conceived melodies. Even if they were prompted by external purely mnemonic motives, they nevertheless had the power to affect unfavorably the practice of composition. That is to say, as experiments, they were once necessary for the evolutionary development of the artistic and theoretical perception of major and minor; now they are superfluous.

More than ever before, this question needs explanation because, on the one hand, there are theorists who use contra-

+Two examples follow. (*31)

++Cf. pp. 70 f. and 118 f.
puntal exercises in the church modes with abiding trust; and, on the other hand, there are those who try to incorporate into our music the "systems" of exotic peoples in order to create, in boastful terms, a new "epoch of exotic romanticism" in Germany—a type of "world music," which, allegedly, corresponds so well to the German character. Although these things seem too far removed from one another, the error seems to be one and the same, since neither the church modes nor exotic scales presume to be a real system. Let us, therefore, take a close, critical look that will refute the efforts previously described.

Whoever wishes to create for himself a clearer, more graphic view of the essence of the oldest Gregorian music and the old church modes should (excluding the music of the West and Occident of course) use for comparison the present-day music of the Japanese, Arabs, and Chinese, and the music of the synagogue—the types of music we discuss, at least in part, under the collective title "exotic music." In those sources we still find, often enough, just as we do in our oldest music, a certain degree of involuntary irrationality of melodic design and a similar scarcity of orienting harmonic junctions of the fifth and third. In the music of those peoples, the horizontal line has not matured, simply because the feeling for the fifth and third has not ripened, and the [32] rhythm is only confused and disconnected. Obviously, there is, for the same reason, a lack of vertical direction, that is, a total lack of polyphony. Thus, the parallel condition exists: the peoples of the Orient just as our forefathers—quod erat demonstrandum!—adhered to the childish

\[\text{Cf. what is said below.}\]

\[\text{Cf. Harmonielehre, p. 177f, --with the exception of pure "heterophony," little insight is to be gained from this music.}\]
illusion of having their own "scale system," which they put on paper by simply following the horizontal direction of their melodies. For example, they employ a five-note (pentatonic) system:

\[
\begin{align*}
C & \quad D & \quad E & \quad G & \quad A & \quad C \\
C & \quad D & \quad E & \quad G & \quad A & \quad C
\end{align*}
\]

or a seven-note (heptatonic) system:

\[
\begin{align*}
F & \quad G & \quad A & \quad B & \quad C & \quad D & \quad E & \quad F & \quad (Chinese) \\
D & \quad E & \quad F & \quad G & \quad A & \quad B & \quad C & \quad (Japanese) \\
C & \quad D & \quad E & \quad F & \quad G & \quad A & \quad B & \quad C & \quad (Gypsy) \\
F & \quad G & \quad A & \quad B & \quad C & \quad D & \quad F & \quad (Chinese whole-tone) \\
C & \quad D & \quad E & \quad F & \quad G & \quad A & \quad B & \quad C & \quad (Indian)
\end{align*}
\]

In addition, one can, as with our old church modes, begin all the presumed systems on any of their notes. Thus the number of the systems becomes monstrous. Countless systems are believed possible when actually a "system," in the true sense of the word, is impossible simply because it lacks a precise differentiation of the very modest tone materials. These so-called systems, therefore--just as in our oldest period--may be given, at best, a mechanical and descriptive value that obviously may be attributed only to the horizontal line.

Perhaps our own attempt at polyphony--a totally thought-out process--has, for example, lead the Japanese of today to the same experience of harmonic principles that west-
[33] erners underwent hundreds of years ago. To clarify music without such an attempt, I find completely unthinkable. First, there is the friction of the horizontal and vertical direction that helps the human ear discover the natural principle of the fifth and third. Following that, one could begin, so to speak, the process of ordering both melodies and harmonies. Thus, in music, today's westerner, compared with orientals of the present and westerners of the past, has an advantage of harmonic consciousness with all its beneficial consequences, precisely an advantage of several centuries
How inconceivable it is, then, that artists, and theorists, in our sphere (e.g., Saint-Saëns, Busoni, Beller-mann, Capellen, A. J. Polak, H. Riemann) could hail the old church modes or the exotic scales as a widening of our musical horizon. Yet, this fact is one of the most ironic and shameful aspects of the present disorder and general lacking of instinct.

Was it not misfortune enough that the Middle Ages, from a lack of understanding, believed it had to accept without question the alleged systems of Antiquity, especially of the Greeks? Must we refuse to learn anything from such a bitter experience, the source of so many artistic and theoretical evils for so many centuries? What a lack of understanding of the later development that so logically surpassed the previous one! What a lack of gratitude for the destiny that has explicitly given western man the beautiful miracle of music and the ability to enquire into the natural laws of music! What a lack of understanding of those heroes of composition who, by their efforts, have led us to the realization of what a system actually can do! Alas, why have our great masters lived and worked if nowadays one may supposedly regard their works, built on functional systems, as regres-sive in comparison to short Chinese, Japanese, Arabic melodies and "scales?" After all, they were the ones who, long ago, centuries ago, elevated us above the Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic levels and beyond the church modes by recog-nizing the necessity of a compromise between the horizontal and vertical harmony. By so doing, they created for us, out of the primordial chaos, the diatonicism [Diatonie] that is totally lacking in the music of exotic peoples [the lack of]

^For, what else can we call it if exotic scales are propagated under the title "progress"!
which is, therefore, precisely the cause of the irrationality of their music.

To be sure, who would want to be purposely guilty of misunderstanding the works of genius and the evolution of development! Quite the contrary, even if it leaves a bitter taste, it is fairer to say that all those who prefer the old church modes or the scales of exotic peoples are only guilty of a certain insufficiency of artistic instinct perpetrated by the artists and theorists who propagate this kind of music. Obviously, the latter, at any level, are as yet unable to appreciate the still higher instinct of the former artists who indicated to music its paths to the ultimate basis of creative work. These people do not comprehend that in the works of our greatest masters their instincts push directly to the primitive essence. They do not understand the paths they followed with true divination: (1) how, in accord with nature (i.e., having learned on the basis of the harmonic series to expose the major harmony also motivically) they adopted in an analogous—but artistic—way the minor triad; (2) how they further recognized the motivating principle of all music for all times merely in the reiteration of one tone-series and then knew how to gain from it alone irrefutably valid and definitive forms in the greatest number of possible variations; (3) how, from the combination of all these postulates (i.e., the major and minor triads, the creation of a tone-series reflecting these sonorities, the reiteration of a single given tone-series, the application of harmonic principles to the horizontal and vertical line in precise relationships, etc.) they acquired for themselves and transmitted to us the consciousness of purely diatonically related tones as harmonic scale-degrees (i.e., as producers and bearers of content).

Where artistic instinct fails, understanding also fails; without a strong artistic instinct there can be no
true theory in art! What is the consequence, if in theory textbooks—I take, as an example, one of the latest ones, namely the one by Rudolf Louis and Ludwig Thuille—the essence of the major system is defined in the following vague way:++

The major key is formed in such a way that both of the dominants of a major tonic oppose it in generic equality as major triads also.

Example 3.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
C: IV \quad I \quad V
\end{array}
\]

The key is perfectly and completely determined by the three triads, tonic, dominant, and subdominant. If, starting with the tonic, we arrange in stepwise fashion the tones provided by these triads, we obtain the major diatonic scale.+++

Example 4.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
C: I \quad V^5 \quad I^3 \quad IV \quad v \quad IV^3 \quad v^3 \quad I
\end{array}
\]

Should we not be excused if, equally deserted by instinct and

++Stuttgart, Grüninger. (*32)

+++See p. 3 ff.

Compare to that the arrangement of the minor system, (*33) on p. 20 ff.
theory, we looked in desperation for other "systems" that could never be systems, or if we asked at every street corner with an apparently superior (in reality only sarcastic) empty contemplation whether there can be for now and evermore only major and minor keys? And why, then, can we not have something new which happens to strike our fancy, for example: C D♭ E♭ F♯ G♯ B C, or: C D E F G A♭ B♭ C, or systems supposedly provided by the old church modes or the scales of exotic peoples? Do we not clearly see the lack of explanation in this definition for the reason why in the major system exactly one major chord is opposed by two other major chords; why there is "generic equality"; why the scale is obtained simply through the unrolling (?) of those three triads; or why, on the other hand, the independence of the other four tones (besides C, E, and G) is negated; etc.?

Must not all these points be confirmed, and does not such an assertion put forward a real petitio principii?

And how do we intend otherwise to understand the "system" if it robs individual scale-degrees, with the exception of I, IV, and V, of their independence and at the same time robs them of the attractiveness of their multiple functions? Without having an inkling of how much closer to the true meaning of composition the III-degree, for example, conforms in its various functions (i.e., how it sometimes appears as the fourth upper-fifth of the tonic, or as a harbinger of the I⁺⁺--or of the V) or, indeed, of whether or not development or inversion is in the making at a particular point, we have recently learned that the II, III, VI, and VII are not real in themselves but are merged in the I, IV, and V.

---

^According to the fifth-principle, Harmonielehre, §§ 14-19.

++According to the third-principle, Harmonielehre, § 126.
They therefore have to make way for them when it is just this ambiguity of the scale-degree which is at the root of practice; but, then, to be sure, this presupposes their independence!

Conversely, how much closer do we approach the instinct of the creator when we find in the very independence of the II, III, VI, and VII degrees the psychological source of all chromatics and alterations, instead of assuming everywhere the apparent functions of the IV, V, and I scale-degrees rather than one apparent function and, for this reason, doing away with every independence for the sake of only the I, V, and IV scale-degrees when the latter scale-degrees have been assured a dominating position in the system as foreground steps?

If Schubert, in No. 3 of his German Dances, Op. 33++ succession: VI-III-V-I, does this then invalidate the totally different fact that at another time Brahms in his "Der Tod das ist die kühle Nacht"+++ continues a succession as follows: III\textsuperscript{b5}-VI\#3-II\textsuperscript{b5}-V\textsuperscript{7}-I? In the latter, does the diatonic fifth-movement proceeding from the III have so little purpose in its own right that we do not need to regard it—since we are in a position of being able to explain it better through the assumption of sequences or reiterations of other scale-steps— or does it have a self-purpose? If the answer is yes, how can we explain it in any other way than by recognizing the independence of the individual scale-degrees, that is, also of the III, which, indeed, was in question here?

Or, if a composer reaches back from the IV to the II,++++ in order to complete the so-called final cadence—

++++Op. 96, No. 1.
+++++Cf. the quotation from Chopin in Harmonielehre, Ex. 157.
namely II-V-I—is it not precisely the II that can be recognized, after all, as an individual and independent scale-degree with an individual effect connected to the fifth descent II-V? Why, then, would the composer, if the II were less itself than a replacement for IV, choose first the long path that leads him beyond the II? What would prompt him, in addition (as we find in the Chopin example), to lower the II, that is, to make it into a Phrygian?+

If it were not a question of releasing the specific strength of the descending fifth from II to V, what else could have motivated Brahms, in the Fourth Symphony, first movement,++ to lead the bass precisely in this way, that is, IV-II-V:

Fifth-descent

Example 5.

And, would it not be just as wrong to deny the independence of the II-degree in the following example—which is given, to be sure, only in sketch form:

+Cf. Harmonielehre, § 50.
++See p. 14, meas. 4 to p. 15, meas. 4.
Example 6. R. Wagner, Faust Overture, meas. 10-12.

a) 

\[ \text{Winds} \]

\[ \text{Str.} \]

\[ \text{D-min.} \]

(Same as V-IV-V in A minor)


[39]

(Same as V-IV-V in D minor)

+Cf. Harmonielehre, § 139.
When the E in Example 6a expresses itself so strongly as a bearer of all content, and when the descending fifth E-A (=II-V$^{5}_{3}$ in D minor) has so much more individual foreground effect, why should we push its real effect into the background and ignore it for the sake of a certain speculative theory? Why, instead, should we accept the root of the IV-degree, G, as its replacement—in reality, the only possible root?

Should I mention that the necessity of recognizing the VI—just to say something about this harmonic scale-degree also—results solely from the psychology of the deceptive cadence and that it must be evident to everyone? Which meaning could we attach to V-VI (in order to carry out in most cases VI-(II)-V-I or the like), if the VI-degree were not itself but perhaps a I, or else a IV? Is V-VI really no more than V-I or V-IV? Can that be? Further, is II-I simply the same in its effect as IV-I?

We stray too far from art and become lost in speculation if we believe composers use similar descending fifths, as, for example, II-V, mostly in empty sequences and reiter-

+The content can be reduced to:

Example 7.

\[ \text{Example 7.} \]

so that what could be interpreted in the middle as a #IV-degree should be conceived more correctly as a neighboring harmony (cf. later, Section II, Chapter 2).

++Cf. Harmonielehre, § 121.
ations. Often enough, the descending fifths in total either present the key+ (instead of a presumable sequence) or they produce smaller, but nevertheless well-graduated fragments and closing passages of a key, appearing simply through ellipsis or coupled together by means of chromatic modulation.++ We can be certain that there is more than a simple sequence in the following example:


\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Bass:} & \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{G-min. II - V} & \text{G-min. II - V} \\
\text{etc.} & \text{etc.}
\end{array} \\
\text{i.e.:} & \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{A-min. II - V} & \text{A-min. II - V} \\
\text{etc.} & \text{etc.}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly, in the C-minor Etude,++ Chopin knows how to obtain from an initially perceived diatonic passage (with a hidden background):

++See the most instructive example in reference to this problem in Bach's French Suite No. 1, Minuet II, measures 1-8—where, without sequence or modulation tendencies, the scale-degrees define only D minor: I-IV-VII-III-VI-II-V-I.

++E.g., Op. 10, No. 12, meas. 55 ff., fragments which, unfortunately, one cannot hear too well.
Example 9.

by means of the following ideally connected process of [41] tonicalization:

Example 10.

the final formulation of this structure:

Example 11.

\[ + \text{Cf. Harmonielehre, § 136 ff.} \]
But do not all these exemptions from the presumed sequential character necessarily presuppose the recognition of the scale-degrees other than I, IV, and V, as equally independent degrees?

To be sure, it is easier to say: "The major scale is formed in such a way that . . . etc." when we refer later in the definition simply to the system as a completed structure and describe it in superficial terms. Such terms not only deceive the author himself, they do even greater damage to the reader. The latter reads the words and believes he understands them along with everything else that might be implied. As a result he never comes close to knowing how far, in reality, he is from truly understanding the most important compositional problems. These attempts unavoidably reveal the true, sad state of affairs. How is it possible to describe the major or minor systems as they are described; [42] how is it possible to carelessly define a "system" as a utopian series without diatonicism [and], chord value (i.e., without any artistic value); how can we grant to major and minor the character of "systems"—if we understand that from compositional necessity the major system is the only true and natural one, the one that has been proven in the most glorious works of art today?

In the inconsistencies we easily recognize how little the feeling of the general public is in accord with the artistic instinct that characterized our great creative masters. But these inconsistencies even effect practice and theory; the vague longing for church modes and exotic systems, the vague definitions in teaching, etc.

The total lack of any technique in composition today, by dint of misunderstanding or the inability to aspire to previous advances, must necessarily lead to an epoch of irrationality in our art. Having descended upon us just now—to be sure differently than in the initial stages of
music—it naturally conforms only to the desire for the musically primitive irrationality of foreign peoples. It is the decline of our art that induces the involuntary references to the immature art of exotic peoples!

But even if we should disregard all the inadequacies of the instincts and perceptions, and the similarities common to involuntary irrationality, what naive expectation there is in the propaganda for other "systems."

Let us imagine that there are among modern painters some who might recommend the primitive drawing of the Eskimo as true art for imitation and for enriching our own art, or, that among the poets there are some who might propose, in all seriousness, to conquer a new future for the art of language by going back to the prattle of a three or four-year-old child. How costly is the process of maturation of language, and how indispensable is the artificial art of language if the communication between people is to be preserved? Now, because of an unfortunate momentary depression of the German people—a hundred years after Goethe and Schiller—are we supposed to reach again to the immature linguistic tools of a child for the purpose of presumably enriching the spirit of our present-day art? And similarly, confronted with the fruits of an already developed art such as music, do we dare to advise looking for an allegedly new system from musically immature races and nations that have none?

Do not misunderstand me, however. The prattle of a child, and his first crude sentence—this has its own charm that captivates us; likewise, we enjoy Arabic, Japanese, Chinese, and Turkish songs, etc. But, in the one case, our enjoyment has its source in the child itself; we take delight in the charming miracle of the growing human being. In the other case, it is the foreign nation with its unique heritage which arouses our curiosity.
Meanwhile, however, stronger artists have fortunately narrowed the problem of using exotic music in practice and have even conceived of trying to familiarize us with the original melodies of foreign nations through all the refinements of our dual key system. They express the exotic in our major and minor system—what superiority of our art and what elasticity of our system! And never has this tendency gone so far as to supersede the transposition. Let us think of Haydn's and Beethoven's Scottish Songs, Schubert's incomparable Hungarian Divertimento, Brahms's Hungarian Dances, [44] Dvorak's Slavonic Dances, Grieg's Norwegian Dances, Rimsky-Korsakov's Sheherazade, etc. In all these cases, the task was not to loosen up our system to absorb a foreign one, but just the opposite: to enhance our major and minor system in order to express the foreign. This, in a certain sense, honors music in its original state, but only after an adjustment to a more mature art. And if it cannot be denied that for reasons of mood, a procedure such as Berlioz's is justified, as for example when he, in the last movement of his Symphonie fantastique, inserts the genuine Aeolian melody of the Dies irae, presumably in the "old system," that is, without essentially adjusting it to our system, then the skillful procedure used by the masters mentioned earlier is even more artistic and logical. For example, how should we understand Helmholtz when he says in his Lehre von den Tonempfindungen: (*34)

Just as we presently know that we may not adorn a Greek temple with Gothic ornaments, we must also understand that we may not harmonize the music of other times and of peoples who have tone-values other than major and minor according to major and minor harmonies.

---

*In many cases because of its incompleteness and awkwardness.

**Cf. in contrast, Saint-Saëns' treatment of the same melody in his Danse macabre.
Helmholtz has inadequately understood that, in the structure of our own system, pure, artistic necessities also played their part. Melodies that were never systems and, therefore, never capable of bearing larger tone-structures can be compared neither to our systems, which have already proven their capacities, nor to the architectonic system of the Greek temple that passed the test of a similar capacity in the large structures of "temples." What a great difference there is between the imagined Doric system in music and the real Doric in Greek architecture!

[45] In this connection, permit me to refer here to Brahms's adaptations of German folksongs. Without a doubt, German folksongs originally seem to have been influenced by harmonic considerations and, as such, stand infinitely above the exotic melodies. Nevertheless, I would like to count Brahms's adaptations among the attempts to test our system on those melodies that stem from an earlier time, melodies that are the property of the people to whom the "system" is basically unknown or only instinctive. I know from his own words that by this means he wanted, among other things, to protest against the many widespread editions of German folksongs and the inartistic treatment they received in these editions. He had, to this end, written a special polemic indicating that his adaptations should be seen as nothing more than demonstrations of his contrary views. Later—as he told me—he became convinced of the uselessness of written words; he destroyed the polemic manuscript and deemed it better to publish independently only the supplement to the familiar books.

We conclude, therefore, that if folk songs should be incorporated into the realm of art, the art has to do its

+Seven books. (*35)
best in treating them, even if they should be as well developed as those of the German nation. Fully developed art must see to it that it uses its proven means—those characteristic to it alone—to unveil, freely, the spirit of the song; that the most hidden, but still undeveloped character of the song, becomes evident, and that the emotion still flowing in the people is preserved in a firm, artistic style. By this I do not mean that, in the name of art, affectation in the setting of the song must now be acceptable. No! But let us look at the differences in the adaptations of a Brahms and those of others and it becomes clear, immediately, what the only problem of real art, in reference to folk song, ought to be. The minute the song advances from the ethnographical realm into the artistic and becomes the property of art, it is no longer permissible to contemplate giving the song back to the people in its artistic form. The principle of art alone becomes effective, without regard for the people. The people, once and for all, propose a song to art and now art brings this proposal into its own realm. With its own means, to be sure, so as not to transgress the proposal too harshly, it artistically fulfills the song. The German people—I mean the general masses of the German people—will never wish to sing Brahms’s settings of its folk songs, just as, for example, gypsies will never accept Brahms’s genial adaptations of their own songs and dances. May we reproach the artist and art for that? Whoever makes that reproach should remember that the artist does not descend from heaven but is merely part of his nation, albeit the best part; what he receives, he repays a thousandfold, and he deserves the deepest thanks of his nation and of mankind. If the artist were to remain where the people must always remain, how could we have enjoyed the blossoms that we now enjoy? If art had never progressed beyond the folk song, if it had never progressed beyond Gregorian Chant, how then could we have gained polyphony, motets, sonatas, and symphonies? Let us, therefore, not
create an opposition between people and art where it does not exist. Let us understand, finally, that where art begins, the people must stop for reasons other than that of opposition, because musical art cannot really go on forever with only sixteen measures!

[47] Should we reproach Goethe for having elevated the "Faust" of the people to the "Faust" of art? Growth is the destiny of man, even if in the process— he perishes!

When it comes to deciding what is complimentary and meaningful for the progress and the creativity of the human race, what, then, are the hundreds of folk songs for the lute of the past which have recently become the fashion in concerts, or all the Balalaika performances coming from Russia compared to a fugue by Bach or a symphonic movement by Beethoven, or even compared to Rimsky-Korsakov's Sheherazade?

And now, taking leave of this topic, I want to urge the artists and theorists who thirst so for other systems to save their energy for more rewarding matters. What awaits them at the end of all such efforts in word and tone? Irreversibly, it is the disappointment of being confronted again with the result that was achieved long ago and a thousand-times better. Either they can realize how necessary it is to learn to derive a melody from the harmonies and thereby honor the triad, and in the process, by necessity, to bring together several triads in an orderly relationship to one another (thus, coming again to the diatonicism of major and minor), or they can continue to have the experience of simply harmonizing exotic melodies. In the West we have long recognized the value of the triad as one belonging to diatonicism even if, so far as the harmonization of melodies is concerned, for Capellen, Polak, Dittrich, and even Saint-Saëns and Busoni, etc., the masters previously discussed remain unattainable models since these masters were much more instinctively at home in our systems than they are. Must we then, because it
is preconceived and absolutely willed, create a "universal music"? Will the inorganically grown caprices really accom-
modate the organic laws? And if there could not be a "German Empire of the Holy Roman Nation," must there be a
"German Music of the Japanese or Indian Nation"?

Of the most important writers, Fux is obviously the one who is firmly grounded on the old scales (p. 53):

Since the disparity between the tone and the semitone has been established, the three Greek genera have fallen into disuse, as I said above. It is now worth remembering that necessity has introduced another system to replace the Greek and has reduced those three genera to two, the diatonic and chromatic. But since man has an insatiable appetite for something new and different and has not yet been satisfied by these two genera, composers have mixed the two in their compositions and have introduced them everywhere. I find this quite acceptable since we must adapt with the times. But composers must be reminded that they should not use these genera in a cappella style without the organ. Otherwise, they can be assured that they will never achieve the desired purpose, because in this style, nothing but the diatonic may be used. This important remembrance, which is based on my manifold experiences, I want to commend strongly to everyone.

Fux's correct instinct for the fact that we must use only the diatonic genus, in lessons with a cantus firmus, causes him, as we see, to overshoot his mark. With regrettable misunderstanding of the fundamental distinctions between the cantus firmus lesson and the work in free composition, he would like to connect also the latter, thoroughly, to the diatonic genus. From a glance, for example, at J. S. Bach's choral settings or motets, we learn how untenable Fux's limitation, beyond the contrapuntal lessons themselves, must be. Up to a point, however, Fux is fully aware of the greater freedom in composition; therefore, in a narrower sense, his error is that he draws upon free, a cappella compositions and confuses them with lessons on a cantus firmus. In this respect, only one thing is correct, that in all circumstances a vocal setting—and that is a cappella—must observe a more modest chromati-

†See Table I, Fig. 10. (*36)
Albrechtsberger treats this question naively when he states (p. 33):

I have already shown in the fourth chapter that the Greeks and our old masters acknowledged twelve variable keys. Their key of E, which they called the Phrygian mode, appears to be nothing but a hybrid. Fux's habit of beginning his examples in this mode with a minor third and ending them with a major third as in the remaining minor keys, is very strange. But his honor still endures because he has served many hundreds of people as teacher and model. How can he be blamed for the fact that so much has changed in our time? The other five authentic modes would be acceptable if they exhibited the necessary flats and sharps that would beautify their melody. I want to retain the twenty-four keys of the modern composers (stipulated in the same chapter) throughout all five species.

We can see in these sentences a suggestion that somehow the authentic modes must have been derived entirely from major and minor if one is only permitted to add the appropriate and necessary accidentals. For us, however, the result is more important: Albrechtsberger sticks strictly with major and minor in his exercises. The same goes for Cherubini.

The more striking, therefore, is the regression of Bellermann, who uses the old church modes for his exercises. This happens with him less because of his devotion to Fux than from a true, deep conviction. It is doubly regrettable, therefore, that this fault is due entirely to mistakes. Starting with a slightly incorrect assumption, he arrives, through a correct instinct, at the main principle, namely: "The study of music must begin with the song." This is totally acceptable, but now we read what he derives from that statement [p. vi]:

The simplest and most natural relations of art must first of all be studied thoroughly and examined from all sides. We want to pay particular attention to the field of harmony, and this can be done through the study of the diatonic scales which display their

---

*See Foreword, p. vii: "In the arrangement of this course of teaching [as in the first edition,] I have followed Joseph Fux." (*37)*
abundant forms not only in our major and minor but also in the various octave-species.\textsuperscript{+} In those days, when music moved within the strict laws of the pure diatonic system, the studies always had to be tied to harmonic relationships, if, from the very beginning, wrong and confusing opinions and conceptions were not to become established in the student.

[50] And on page xv he says:

All other exercises presented in the previously mentioned works rely only on major and minor.\textsuperscript{++} This procedure has a number of disadvantages: we can never learn to appreciate old masterworks or understand the course of music history without a thorough study of the old modes. Furthermore, if we want to write strictly diatonically, it is most important for a correct modulation to know how to arrange a cadence on each step of the diatonic ladder. I believe the correctness of this statement can only be comprehended when one has thoroughly undertaken, for himself, the course of study as it is prescribed here.

Now this is totally wrong in conception and judgment; does the teaching of counterpoint have to busy itself, per-chance, with music history, and ex officio, with introducing the old masterworks instead of occupying itself with the valid, basic principles of voice leading? Why, then, should we want to write in the old modes which were strictly diatonic when we ought to--and are allowed to--write chromatically? And does not the major mode have a diatonicism equally as pure as all the other old church modes? Therefore, even with the strictest observation of vocal principles, cannot the voice-leading rules be demonstrated just as well in major as in the diatonicism of the church modes? Why must the major, which, of course, can be used in counterpoint, mislead the student in regard to the course of music history?

I have already shown in the introduction what makes Bellermann tick! What has led him to these errors is simply his wrong conception of the problem of teaching counterpoint combined with an erroneous belief in the church modes whose refutation has just now been presented here.

\textsuperscript{+}Church modes and what relates to them.

\textsuperscript{++}He means the works of Albrechtsberger and Cherubini.
CHAPTER 2

CONCERNING THE STRUCTURE OF THE CANTUS
FIRMUS IN PARTICULAR

§ 1. Construction of the Beginning.

Already in the construction of the beginning, the cantus firmus reveals its nature as an exercise. Conforming to the most basic condition of melody, it should be given the simplest and most primitive type of all possible beginnings; [51] it should begin with the tonic of the key. How could a more individual start justify the brevity and the neutral rhythm of the cantus firmus? That alone is the significance of the old rule to be applied here: the cantus firmus must always begin with the tonic of the key.

This solution of the problem of the beginning is, as we see (and unfortunately may easily misconstrue), arrived at exclusively from the limited situation and the pedagogical purpose of the cantus firmus. The solution is valid only for the cantus firmus itself. It otherwise makes no demand for recognition as a general law of composition, that is, as a rule for all true artworks of free composition regarding which an "exception" or, at best, a special act of a "strong talent"+ must be indicated if a musical composition should begin on a degree other than the tonic.

+The teachers who are too lazy to think have, at best, a tendency to forgive it with a static and grotesque condescension, without wanting to recommend it to their students for imitation.
A true work of art is permitted, therefore, to have a different beginning depending upon its own individual mood and intention without giving us the right to speak of an infraction against an alleged "law of strict counterpoint." Different situations demand different solutions--and the cantus firmus is just such a special situation! How can the solution of the one be designated as contradictory to the solution of the other? Each, in its own way, is justified without prejudice to the fact that in free composition, as always in compositional reality, artistic "morality" demands for "a simple situation once again a simple beginning," that is, that it be given the tonic instead of contradicting it through complication.

What happens when we regard the above rule of pure lesson structure as a binding authority beyond the cantus firmus, this chorale, as free composition, shows us:

Example 12.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ge-lo-bet seist du Je-su Christ, dass du Mensch ge-} \\
\text{bo-ren bist von einer Jung frau, das ist wahr, dass freu-et} \\
\text{sich der Engel Schar Ky-ri-e-leis.}
\end{align*}
\]

together with the following three settings:
Example 13.  

J. S. Bach

a)

---

J. S. Bach

As we can see, these three settings stand on the foundation of G major, if not actually on that of the "Mixolydian" system.

If we free ourselves totally of any prejudice of older theory and take as the strongest aid the unencumbered action of the ear thereby attending, in the horizontal direction of the melody, *merely to the fifths (which help to construct and at the same time express the content in such a beautiful way), **what, then, will we hear?

*See Example 12, above.

**Cf. Harmonielehre, § 76.
The first verse is dominated by the fourth G-C (i.e., the fifth C-G in inversion), from which the instinct, due to the tonic impetus of the fifth,† unfailingly gains at first the impression of C major. That precisely this first impression is, at the same time, also the correct one, is affirmed just by the succession which still reveals a contradiction and therefore could have led to a correction.++

In the second verse, the ear automatically relates B to D and these both finally to G, whereby the triad-sum G-B-D results. How natural, thus, is the development of the original C major toward the fifth, the key of G major!

The third verse returns immediately to the key of C major with the initial fourth G-C (=C-G) but is able to attain, nevertheless, the effect of a half cadence (I-V) with D-G-D (=G-D) clearly understood in C major. Let us not forget, therefore, that while the second verse ends the modulation to G major with the inversion D-G, the third verse, conversely, develops the fifth upward, G-D.

And now in the fourth and fifth verses we have the clearest closing toward the tonic again, and from this tonic reached at the word "Engel" the final G still has the effect of only the fifth of the tonic. According to this natural and fifth-directed course of the ear, the four-voice setting of the above chorale must be fashioned altogether differently. Since I wish to use only triads in root position for the realization of the setting,+++ I give here an illustration that is designed simply to convey the

---

†Cf. Harmonielehre, § 133.

++Cf. the last-cited paragraphs.

+++By avoiding inversions, passing motions, and other manipulations. Cf. Harmonielehre, Example 57.
intention to the expression:

Example 14.

[56] Wherein, then, can the difference be found? While I hear the chorale in major (here C major) for reasons supplied by the fifths of the melody, the composers of the first three settings believed they must hear it in Mixolydian. So, we read in Bellermann (p. 120):

The complete melody is Mixolydian; the first verse makes an Ionian cadence (on C), the second a Mixolydian (on G), the third a Dorian (on D), the fourth an Aeolian (on A), and finally the fifth ends with G Mixolydian.

+To be sure, a cadence on D could be made at the third fermata, just as the previously quoted settings indicate.
The supposition of the Mixolydian system rests on the fact
that the first and last notes of the chorale are G. Furthermore, it obviously rests on the rule established by the
Teaching of counterpoint that the first note of a melody must
be the first note of a system—thus here it is Mixolydian.
The internal fifth relationships are silenced, therefore, by
this superficial feature alone. We see that when one has the
responsibility of saving an imaginary system there are few
questions concerning the inner truth and meaning of the mel-
odic line. *Pereat cantus, vivat modus!* was obviously the
solution of the earlier theorists. Thus, even Bach and
Bellerman force the chorale to begin, as well as end, with
[57] the G chord—merely to justify the theory! And if, under
certain circumstances, one might account for such constructions
on the basis of artistic mood and privilege—even from the
standpoint of a free composition (and not, therefore, by theory
alone)—if that were possible, there would still be an over-
supply of unnatural coercion in those adaptations exercised
by the Mixolydian system upon the, otherwise, normal major
melody. This coercion is not lessened even by the fact that
J. S. Bach has aided this false system with ingenious voice-
leading and elemental, tonal beauty. I need only refer to,
for example, the initial fourth G–C, which, understandably has
to signify in the Mixolydian sense, the under-fifth of the
key—right at the beginning of the melody!—whereas the same
fourth reverses itself immediately, in the most natural,
harmonic way, as soon as the melody is perceived in major
where it exactly circumscribes the tonic triad.

Furthermore, how unnatural is the assumed "Aeolian"
in the fourth verse. In an effort to check and discover what
would actually be well suited to Aeolian without being theo-
retical,* let us substitute, in our melody, in place of the

---

*Cf. Harmonielehre, § 27.
present Aeolian scale-tone, G, a raised G#. Because it is essentially unnatural, this will convince us that such an alteration thoroughly contradicts the melody and totally corrupts this place. Actually, both Bach and Bellermann ignore the Aeolian that was, in theory, horizontally affirmed—and indeed, in Bach's case, even though the freedom of his adaptation would have permitted it. Despite rather weighty concessions to theory at the beginning and ending of the chorale settings, both of them let instinct be victorious over theory at this place, so unnatural was its demand! While the melody of the chorale, perceived in Mixolydian, appears only forced and unnatural (that is, unnatural in-between the normal beginning and ending on the tonic as demanded by theory), it appears completely natural in major and, due to a small nuance, more individual than many other melodies in major; it exhibits the peculiarity (regarded from the standpoint of the others) of beginning and ending with the fifth instead of the tonic. Is this, I ask, not a gain when a system, as here the major, gives back to the melody its natural scale and at the same time permits it to appear to be far more individual than some other melody belonging to the same system? Is it not more appropriate to add this richness to the major system than, without richness, to presume the unnaturalness represented by the use of Mixolydian in this chorale?

One can infer from this example why I have rejected the church modes in my Harmonielehre as well as here. We can best recognize here how a well-constructed melody can suffer under the pressure of an old church mode as our understanding is brought closer. The only description of the old

---

+Cf., by the way, Harmonielehre, page 180, Example 141!

++See the previous paragraphs.
modes—or, as I designated it above, the only mnemonic technique—is clearly displayed here: through them, theoretically only the beginning and end of the given melody as well as the other relationships in the rising and falling of the horizontal line are to be apprehended. In former times, one had to distinguish (especially for the purpose of making similar descriptions) all scales, including even those in the authentic and plagal, or the so-called tonus perfectus, imperfectus, mixtus, etc., in order first of all to understand and categorize the different melodic phenomena. However meritorious [59] such an epoch of collecting and describing remains for the development of art—since it, beyond doubt, presupposes the best intentions and finest, truest observations—it, nevertheless, reveals an even greater advance in the attaining of our two main systems. These, in contrast to the old scale systems, are finally constructed on two dimensions—horizontal and vertical. No longer needing to restrict themselves to presenting a detailed horizontal description, they (as a result of their greater depth) are capable of revealing the true essence of the melody all the more clearly through the application of harmony.†

By means of the chorale cited above, we learn that in contrast to the cantus firmus of our exercises the chorale melody already presents a melody, a real composition, while the cantus firmus merely fulfills the purpose of a lesson, which generally speaking does not need to exceed a minimal beauty.++

†We encounter, unfortunately, a descriptive wealth and verbosity in the theories of H. Riemann, Capellan, etc., that results from the lack of a unified and simple, deep perception. In both epochs, the past as well as the present, the lack of artistic instinct and cognition expresses itself in the same way—in both there is an overabundance of concepts, terminologies, etc.:†

†Cf. Harmonielehre, § 76.

++Cf. below, § 20.
And, to this day, how many errors and distortions in teaching and writing the theorists could have spared themselves if only they had known how to distinguish between a real chorale and the cantus firmus which should have been used only as a lesson!

If we are aware of the difference between the two phenomena, then we can really understand the meaning of the rule mentioned here concerning the beginning of the cantus firmus, recognizing that the cantus firmus alone demands the tonic at the beginning, but not the chorale or a larger, freer work. For, if the chorale has shown us that as a free composition it can begin with a tone other than tonic, then this is even more easily understood in reference to larger compositions, in which the scale-degrees effect a more clearly defined justification than in the chorale.† However, as I stated, none of these beginnings is simply an exception since the contrapuntal rule given above was designated to solve the problems of the beginning of the cantus firmus. To be sure, a certain perspective of the overall problem of the exercise was gained thereby. To offer precisely such perspectives, proceeding from very simple situations, is an essential task of contrapuntal instruction.

We can go further and assert that free composition not only can use a beginning other than the tonic—or the harmony of the I-degree—but that under certain circumstances it must vigorously demand such a beginning. Thus, for example, the fact that in Bruckner's symphonies most themes begin with the tonic (I-degree) can undoubtedly be criticized as a serious error. It will be shown in another place how this ordinary technique totally contradicts the cyclical form and, therefore, must exert the stodgiest effects on the order.

†Cf. the examples given in Harmonielehre, p. 47 ff.
The reader will now understand why, in my remarks on page 27, I had to criticise fundamentally the confusion of the designations chorale and cantus firmus occurring in Fux, Albrechtsberger, etc. If the confusion of which most teachers are guilty has disadvantages to be mentioned later, then I wish to state here that Fux, Albrechtsberger, Cherubini, and Bellermann, fortunately, use only genuine cantus firmi and not chorale melodies for use in lessons. So, at least in this respect, no harm stems from the interchange of the chorale and the cantus firmus in their contrapuntal theory.

[61] E contrario, it is understandable why I must disavow, for example, the method of Dehn, who proposes at once a genuine chorale melody for "larger exercises" (p. ?):

Example 15.

\[
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one that bears such very different and more complicated prerequisites and presuppositions that it cannot be assigned, reasonably, to elementary instruction. Think only of an opening that begins with the dominant pitch; of the individual cadences that are typical of the chorale melody; of the repetition of notes, etc., elements which bring with them their very own, independently recognized restrictions.

MIDDLE

§ 2. The Range of the Tenth.

The cantus firmus will have to move about within the range of a tenth. This is necessary on the one hand, because of the limited range of the voice and, on the other, because of the modest size of the exercise itself in which a greater operating range for the melody would seem unnatural.
Indirectly, Fux himself acknowledges this strict viewpoint—to be sure, only in reference to three-part composition—by emphasizing (p. 93): [Aloys]. "Moreover, in this compositional type one may not transcend the limit of the staff unless it is absolutely necessary." We must remember that in his lessons Fux uses, in addition to the F-clef for the bass, only the old C-clef (\(g^1\)) for the soprano, alto, and tenor. Because of this procedure and vocal considerations in the exercises, he recommends not exceeding the boundaries of the five lines in order to maintain also the boundaries of the individual voices.

[62] Through this, we find Fux's insight into the significance of the C-clef emphasized most emphatically. Indeed, at one time the C-clefs, which endeavored to encompass the range of each voice-part as accurately as possible within the scope of the five lines, actually represented genuine clefs.

In order to establish our own understanding of this matter, let us compare the makeup of the four main voice-parts represented on the following clefs:

Example 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>C-clef</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Written today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soprano</td>
<td>(c'-g₂)</td>
<td>a₂</td>
<td>(c'-g₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto</td>
<td>(f-c₂)</td>
<td>d₂</td>
<td>(f-c₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenor</td>
<td>(c-g₁)</td>
<td>a₁</td>
<td>(c-g₁)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[3c\] instead:

\[3d\] or: \(\uparrow\) \(\rightarrow\) \(\downarrow\)
Unfortunately, we increasingly ignore the C-clefs, nowadays preferring to use instead the G-clef even for the alto and tenor. We do this in spite of the fact that both need more ledger lines and that the more the ledger lines are used, the more the staff lines are not.\(^1\) We strive for a standardization of everything in notation even in a case where nature itself has ordered the clear differentiation of the fundamental phenomena. In this process the feeling for the voice-parts disappears and in its place—certainly [63] to the detriment of the art—appears an all-too-expressionless, colorless, monotony of images. This is strong proof of the alienation that has taken place in many circles, one that threatens to spread even more with regard to understanding the true task of the clefs and their two fold relationship, one to the voice-part, the other to the five-line system. The publisher is now advised to adapt the old scores to a standardized clef! What a horrid waste of money that could be spent better—and all this for the dear "layman" whom we want to consider nowadays the highest authority, the ultimate goal of our art! The undesirable, topsy-turvy outcome of this particular accommodation on the musician's part to the laziness of the public is made clear by the fact that—to show a harmless example—the public regards the registers of the tenor and soprano as being identical—just because, for example, in piano reductions of operas, the violin clef is used for these two voices. The public fails to understand that according to an agreement by musicians, the notated range of the tenor is to be understood, in reality, as sounding an octave lower.

Bellermann explains emphatically (p. 115 ff.):

The widest range of a melody should be represented by the tenth which we reach in the authentic modes by either surpassing the octave by the third above, or by extending it a third below the final [Grundton], or by transcending the octave by only one step above and touching the step below the final. In plagal melodies, we can proceed in the same manner although we will rarely want to go beyond the lower dominant.

§ 3. The Prohibition of Tone Repetition.

In the cantus firmus one may not use the same note

\(^1\) Illogically, the abundance of the ledger lines (e.g., in Example 16, 3c and 3d) has led to the elevation of the tenor notes by an octave—see 3b!
successively. First of all, this repetition of a tone inevitably results in the unity of the two measures and this unity, according to Section I, Chapter 1, § 3, must contradict the postulate of balance in the cantus firmus.

Besides—and this is the second reason—a strange effect makes itself felt if we repeat tones; we automatically [64] associate this with the idea of a song text or, specifically, with a two-syllable or polysyllabic word. It is easy to understand that such an association must destroy the balance in the cantus firmus.

Later, in discussing fifth species, § 11, I will speak of the only exception to the above-mentioned prohibition in reference to the ligatura rupta, that is, the resolving of a syncopation with the help of the anticipation of the resolution note.

The repetition of a tone that the teaching of counterpoint forbids, only negatively, so to speak, is e contrario, therefore, only a phenomena of free composition. Free composition, for its part, has certainly reason enough at times to foster the repetition of a tone in order to enhance its genuine harmonic and rhythmic significance. It may fulfill the requirements of a polysyllabic word in vocal music or through association an imitative requirement in instrumental music. In the latter case, the performer must try to lend a proper rhetorical expression to the, as it were, latent words and syllables in the tone repetition through a sort of declamation of the repeated tones. Nothing is so tasteless—keyboard players sin the most in this regard—as when such a repetition in absolute music is monotonously played without betraying, thereby, an instinct for the secret of the "hidden words."
As an example of tone repetition in vocal composition we have seen the previously cited chorale in Section I, Chapter 2, § 1. There I remarked that tone repetition, in addition to many other characteristics, constitutes one attribute by which the chorale distinguishes itself, as a free composition, from the cantus firmus that is used as mere lesson material.

Here are some examples taken from instrumental music:

Example 17. J. S. Bach, English Suite in D minor.

Example 18. J. Haydn, Divertimento in F minor.

Example 19. Mozart, Symphony in E-flat major, "Finale."+

+This is from the "Finale" at the end of the development. With what heavenly expression the reprise is introduced!

Tone repetition penetrates with similar rhetorical intention and effect the ornaments of the appoggiatura, suspension, anticipation, etc., as the following examples show us:

Example 21. J. S. Bach, English Suite in A major, "Courante I."

Fux and Cherubini follow the prohibition of tone repetition in the cantus firmus in the strictest sense but do not clarify it. This is all the more regrettable for both theorists since this prohibition could have easily pointed
out the difference between the cantus firmus and a chorale (i.e., a genuine composition) and by so doing could have pointed out the true task of counterpoint.

In contrast to them, Albrechtsberger—to be sure only in the fifth species of two-part composition—approaches the present problem in the following way. Following his method of teaching, he purposefully constructs a mistake (p. 67):

Example 23.

\[ \text{Example 23.} \]

\[ \text{Example 23.} \]

in order to make this remark:

The [fourth] mistake is that two identical tones have been set, one after the other, in a single measure [i.e., A A in the seventh measure]. (438) In vocal writing, this is not a mistake if the two short notes have been made from a long one due to a two or three-syllable word; for example:

Example 24.

\[ \text{Example 24.} \]

\[ \text{Example 24.} \]

From Albrechtsberger's own entry "just like," with which he indicates that both series of tones are one and the same, we understand that he has surmised the real reason that led to the prohibition of repeated tones in the cantus firmus as well as in the contrapuntal exercises based upon the cantus firmus—except that his awareness lacked maturity. First, he does not know why the prohibition must be directed against the cantus firmus itself; second, he is
unsure for just this reason—he does not know whether the permissible repetition in vocal writing represents a kind of "license," an "exception," or something more serious, that is, something permissible or required. Already we can see here how he has to pay for the fact that he is not able to distinguish clearly between "vocal writing" and the problem of counterpoint. The lack of a precise distinction causes him to remain unclear why two tones, due to their own characteristics, must be forbidden without exception in the cantus firmus, and why they must be demanded in "vocal writing" because the situation there is totally different. In reference to "strict composition" he holds to his prohibition and only once uses tone repetition, designating it, however, as a "license" (p. 152):

Example 25.

\[
\text{\textit{license}}
\]

\[\text{\textit{etc.}}\]

Whether he wanted to allow freedom of repetition in fugue lessons cannot be inferred with complete clarity.

Cherubini gives an example of tone repetition in the cantus firmus and makes the following statement regarding it (p. 10): "These examples totally conform to the rules of strict two-part counterpoint... (*39) and the melody always moves diatonically in an easy, elegant manner." This shows that Cherubini had not the slightest inkling of the danger of tone repetition. Nevertheless, a hidden instinct prevented him from making the same mistake a second time. However, it should have been Cherubini's task to explain this instinct.

\[+\text{Let us look at his casual remark: "In vocal writing this is not a mistake..." etc., and let us remember the quote in the Introduction on page 5 where he speaks of an "exception."}++\]

\[++\text{Cf. Nottebohm's Beethovens Studien, 1873, Rieter-Biedermann, p. 70 f. (*40).}\]
Bellermann, however, says (p. 99):

In such melodies avoid the repetition of the same tone twice or more, since a repetition brings the regular tone succession to a standstill, and besides, a tone repeated more than once becomes rhythmically predominant over the other melodic tones.

[68] We can recognize even more clearly the terrible pedagogical mistake Dehn commits in his textbook when he uses, in addition to the cantus firmi, a real chorale melody, which of course has repeated tones. It must confuse the student when he is confronted by a succession of examples of cantus firmi without tone repetition and a chorale with tone repetition, both offered as lessons supposedly of equal value without a word of explanation about the principal differences in their mechanics, or without even mentioning the problem of tone repetition.

§ 4. The Prohibition of Chromatic Movement.

A chromatic movement is forbidden in the cantus firmus. We must not set, for example:

Example 26.

This prohibition is based, first of all, upon the fact that the chromatic movement is a kind of tone repetition, which, as mentioned above in § 3, is totally forbidden in the cantus firmus.2 Similarly, since the chromatically raised or lowered tone through this raising and lowering has the effect

2 By the way, in free composition the same view of tone repetition suggests that the suspended tone may be counted among the so-called prepared notes, even if the tone in question has been modified by a similar chromaticism. Cf. Harmonielehre, pp. 408-409 and Example 352, loc. cit.
of a differentiated tone and otherwise looks like a passing tone, this effect binds all three tones into a unity and, therefore, must lead to the prohibition of chromatic movement in the cantus firmus.

In addition, chromatic movement may cause, under certain circumstances, a "mixture" of keys. Such an effect, however, cannot be used in the cantus firmus because, without a doubt, it is a drastic and forced mixture (shown, most flagrantly, by chromatic movement) that can never maintain a good, normal relationship to the narrow space of a cantus firmus. Therefore, in the cantus firmus itself, chromatic movement is forbidden even for cadential purposes since it would create, due to the direct succession, a succession of both ascending seventh scale degrees, as for example:

Example 27.

---

+See Example 26 where G# passes between G and A, and Gb between G and F.

++In the above example A major; cf. Harmonielehre, § 38 f.

+++We must mention that in the absence of scale-degrees, various contrasts, and other richer differentiations—cf. Harmonielehre, p. 209 F.—the two possible keys that are being mixed through chromaticism cannot be reproduced as clearly and encompassingly here as in free composition; and this is partly the reason why such a drastic mixture, in terms of force and precision of the effect, must be avoided in the cantus firmus.

++++Cf. below, § 23.
Because the indiscriminate additions of all possible involvements of a pure, harmonic nature must be denied the cantus firmus, all mixtures can only belong to free composition.

So much for the prohibition of chromatic movement in the cantus firmus itself.

From this discussion we could conclude that chromatic movement might be permissible in counterpoint of two or more parts where, due to the expansion in harmony, the effect of a mixture or, perhaps, even of a tonalization process might be suitable and desirable. However, in such a case, as I later want to prove in detail by means of three-part counterpoint, the harmonies lack the necessary power of conviction that they possess in free composition where they are structured by the scale-degrees. One must not, therefore, use chromatic movement in multi-linear writing, as for example:

Example 28.

The total result is this: chromatic movement must be removed from all counterpoint exercises since it disturbs the desirable balance in the melody through tone repetition and passing tones. In addition, because of the totally inappropriate characteristics of the musical material itself (the cantus firmus as well as the harmonies built upon it), chromatic movement could only point up a mixture of keys or a tonalization process without being able to develop them as fully as possible in free composition.

\[\text{Cf. Harmonielehre, § 136 f.}\]
From this, then, we obtain the perspective within free composition that chromatic movement may be used for the most diverse purposes. So, for example,

a) Passing tones:

Example 29. Mozart, Rondo in A minor.


+Cf. also Harmonielehre, Example 101, meas. 8-10, G-G♭-F.
Example 31. J. S. Bach, English Suite in F major, "Sarabande."

b) Mixture:

See Harmonielehre, Example 87, in Violin I the progression B-b_G-A in G major : I 7 3 - bVI-II-b5-V#3-Ib3;

Example 90, meas. 5 (B-b_G); Example 93, meas. 5-8
(A-b_A-G-b_G) in : I-V-I-#IV-IV-I#3-I #3, etc.

[72] Concerning a mistake that he purposely provided as a warning about a chromatic progression:
Albrechtsberger remarks without further explanation (pp. 30, 32):*

The [fifth] mistake is the chromatic movement (or the chromatic genus) from G down to E. Half-step progressions are not permitted ascending or descending in this species without instrumental accompaniment.

In contrast to that, compare a similar chromatic movement under the designation "license" (on page 147 of his book) which I will discuss, in detail, in three-part composition.

Bellermann explains (p. 103):

All intervals created by the raising or lowering of a scale degree, which result in augmented or diminished intervals, are excluded, as for example, the small semitone from B♭ to B and vice versa, or from F to F♯, and vice versa.

As we can see, just as little explanation of the prohibition can be found in Bellermann as in Albrechtsberger. Then he continues: [103]

By the way, I wish to remark here that we occasionally find an exception in multi-linear music written by good composers (even if only rarely). Claude Goudimel, for example, uses a chromatic inflection G-G♯ in the cited motet "O crux benedicta."

Thus, we can hardly find here a true explanation. For him the "exception" is entirely intentional, as if, in spite of some exterior similarities, the motet were essentially something different from a contrapuntal exercise that is not a free composition capable of creating "exceptions" even if it uses chromatic movement occasionally for individual reasons!

*In two-part, first species counterpoint.
It gets worse, however, because when, on page 122, he forbids chromatic movement even at cadences, as for example:

Example 34.

[73] he dares to add the following thought:

Beginners who have not understood the essence of the diatonic modes sometimes try to use such false cadences. Nowadays, in a time when the genera (diatonic, chromatic, and enharmonic) are often used interchangeably without rules, this is not surprising. Therefore, we must impress upon the student again and again that our rules are first of all derived from the masters of the sixteenth century—when they did not purposely create chromatic compositions. A few, rare exceptions can be found such as the application of the small semitone in "O crux benedicta" by Claude Goudimel. Cadences, however, like those mentioned above, are totally impossible and even in free composition are unpleasant.

How much more useful it would have been for students if BELLERMAN had understood that the teaching of counterpoint is only preparation for free composition and that in this or that effect the ear must at first, with no concern for the rest, attend to its proper precepts and prohibitions (thus without exposure to further modifications for the, as yet, foreign situations of free composition). If the practice of the sixteenth-century masters as the sole basis for the prohibition of a chromatic movement may be accorded little validity for the practice of the cantus firmus, even less so may the same prohibition—which, by the way, BELLERMAN did not confirm for the cantus firmus—be regarded as applicable in free composition. Circulus vitiosus! Rather, we find that chromatic movement gains its justification for existence in free composition by the same measure that it could not achieve it in the cantus firmus.

*Although not improperly for lessons in strict counterpoint.
How wonderful is the effect in Beethoven's Op. 59, No. 3—to use only one example to refute Bellermann—at the conclusion of the first theme of the first group:


What an unprecedented effect the first violin produces here with the chromatic progression A-D-B-\text{C}: Let us now explain why this succession is not only not "unpleasant," but is, contrary to Bellermann's teaching, very pleasing.

If, in the course of the same idea, the particular section had opened with the same motive, it would have been self explanatory, and we would have an explanation for the subsequent parallelism:

Example 36.
Now, however, in the following example instead of progressing similarly, to the last note C, Beethoven writes the following:

Example 37.

	\[ \text{Example 37.} \]

and, in order to yield to a strong demand for the closing, he immediately abbreviates all the expected details so that this chromatic movement is produced:

Example 38.

\[ \text{Example 38.} \]

Considering the special, motivic circumstances here, who can deny that Beethoven had the right to use chromatic movement, in fact, that he was obligated to use it? And, how Beethoven is able to show the motivic connection, which in itself cannot be misunderstood and, moreover, is even a necessity of the harmonization! Let us look at the following harmonic succession: \( \text{C}\flat\text{V} - \text{G}\text{V}\text{V} - \text{C} \). What nonsense seemingly appears in the abrupt connection of \( \text{C}\flat\text{V} \) as a \( \text{V}\text{V} \) in F major and \( \text{G}\text{V} \) as a \( \text{V}\text{V} \) in C major, and how logically, at the same time, this progression exclusively serves the motivic connection! Then, considering the harmonic construction of the earlier components—compare a) and b), and b) and c)—must there not be, between c) and d), etc., a similarly emphatic completion of the key of F major? Indeed, the \( \text{D}\flat\text{V}\text{V} \) as \( \text{VI-V}\text{V}\text{V} \) in F major points to the

+Cf. above, Example 37c, 37d, and 37e.
ellipsis of the I chord in F major, which, however, has to be interpreted as a IV (just before V?) of C major in order to move as quickly as possible to the key of C major.

But why—and this is the thrust of these deliberations—should an internally required chromatic movement be considered nothing more than an "exception" or an "unpleasantness" extorted from theory, regardless of its position in the composition and its cadential character, just because there is no need for such a chromatic movement in the cantus firmus? It is better to understand that every necessity carries its own rules within itself, a fact that must not prevent us from pointing out to the student the specific necessities of the cantus firmus. Then, starting from these primitive necessities, the student will be able to understand all changes and extensions of the problem in free composition, also.

And how much is gained if the teaching of counterpoint alludes to a problem only with a prohibition (instead of a law)? For that answer we only need to become aware of the bases that lie in the cantus firmus itself in order to understand the full depth and breadth of the problem even beyond the cantus firmus. Never, however, will the teaching of counterpoint have given the last word when it prohibits this or that within the framework of the cantus firmus.

§ 5. Only Diatonic Intervals Are Allowed.

By excluding chromatic movements, only diatonic intervals remain in use in the cantus firmus. But just because every interval in the cantus firmus must have a diatonic character, we should not conclude that, vice versa, every diatonic interval eo ipso may be used in the cantus firmus.

Without distinguishing between major and minor, the diatonic intervals are:

+According to §§ 58 and 60 in Harmonielehre.
Bellermann states (p. 103): "In the melody, only diatonic intervals may occur." We have learned enough about the subsequent unhappy explanations regarding chromatic movement in §4 above.

§ 6. Some Diatonic Intervals Must Be Excluded.

The following diatonic intervals are not used in the cantus firmus in spite of the fact that they are diatonic: the augmented fourth (tritone), its inversion, the diminished fifth, and both sevenths. Thus, the melody of the cantus firmus may be built only from seconds, thirds, the perfect fourth and fifth, the two sixths, and the perfect octave.

The reason for this prohibition is not solely the dissonant quality of these intervals and their succession with regard to expression, but also the difficulty of intonation connected with them. The notion of the latter has been deduced from the singing voice alone. For, in contrast to all other instruments, which surely have no difficulties producing a seventh, an augmented fourth, or a diminished fifth, only the human voice, because of its particular difficulty in producing these intervals—-inversions as well—is incapable of revealing their true psychological content. We can deal with this only in the teaching of counterpoint which must train the ear of the student to recognize the distinctions among the individual intervals.

Let us not reply by saying that by its very nature difficulties of intonation may be an entirely relative concept, since, with better ability and more industry the difficulty, as such, must cease to exist. On the one hand, it does seem reasonable to take into account only the average musical talent, as well as to consider the fact that with the help of a piano or orchestra, or by using a second voice or several voices, intonation difficulties can be eliminated.

*See Introduction.*
On the other hand, we can designate an eternal absolute character to these difficulties by venturing to say that there will never be a time when the human voice can sing as true a seventh as it can a second. In other words, by natural necessity, the experience of the singing voice always shows that the seventh is a more complicated interval than the second. Thus, more than any other instrument, the human voice reveals that in the seventh, along with the dissonance it shares with the second, there is, in addition, the difficulty of the larger skip. Thus it is specifically the latter that is the reason for forbidding the seventh in the cantus firmus while its inversion, the second is permitted. The second, to be sure, contains the same dissonance, but it incorporates the least tension.

In the case of the augmented fourth and the diminished fifth, besides their dissonant character which already portends a particular difficulty in production, there is the fact that they both excessively alter the natural expression of the perfect fourth and perfect fifth into a less natural one so that this change of the expression must be considered a new difficulty for the intonation. Hence, we have the prohibition of these intervals for the cantus firmus.

But, there is an additional, more surprising aspect to these intervals in the cantus firmus. Let us think of a series of tones, as for example:

[78] Example 39.
and ask our ear what the effect is. The ear will immediately rebel against the "sums" of the seventh, diminished fifth, and the augmented fourth.

Obviously, in the latter cases we cannot speak of intonation difficulty on the basis mentioned above because the intervals are not produced as genuinely and directly as the former intervals. Rather, a new aspect appears here, namely, that of a "sum of intervals," indeed, in our example, a sum of dissonant intervals, which must—and this is the main thing—be forbidden in that form, just as, in conformity with the rule advanced earlier, they must be forbidden to occur one after the other.

In its construction, the human ear is endowed with the assignment to seek out and understand harmonic relationships even in the progression of tones. It searches, as it must, for fifths and thirds among the many tones heard in these sequences in order to relate them and thereby put them in order. In this desire and ability of the ear is found the first lever for artistic development by means of which method may be finally brought to the irrationality and dissonant chaos of tones. How the strengthened harmonic sense was exemplified later in the spontaneously discovered vertical direction (polyphony), and how this sense had to gain from the relationship of both directions, as a consequence, the scale-degrees in free composition, I have already mentioned in § 76 of my Harmonielehre. It was only to draw a close to the melodic formulation in question, that I recently confirmed, in this context, that the ear has the propensity to hear intervals not only in their direct sequence but also in combined sums.

---

+ Cf. Harmonielehre, § 76.

3 This ability of the ear is what is lacking at this time among exotic peoples. (See above, Section I, Chapter 1, § 5.)
Let us not forget, however, that sums of sometimes more and sometimes fewer tones must intrude upon the ear forcefully; where several tones follow one another they cannot—and must not—be missing. Thus, in venerable Fux's beautifully constructed cantus firmus * (which has made its way into almost all the textbooks on counterpoint), the ear inadvertently and unavoidably follows, first of all, the third, \( F \), then adds the fifth, \( A \) in order to gain the impression of a disentangled triad \( D-F-A \).

Example 40.

```
\begin{tabular}{c|c|c|c}
& Tonic & third & fifth & tonic \\
\hline
\scriptsize{\text{\textbf{Tonic third}}} & & & & \\
\text{\textbf{fifth}} & & & & \\
\text{\textbf{tonic}} & & & & \\
\end{tabular}
```

But this and similarly unavoidable sums neither must nor should fall under a prohibition. Rather, in regard to this problem we must deal with smaller, more limited sums that, because of their unified character, are prohibited wherever they, due to various other circumstances, must be disharmonious, as unities, with the remaining balance.**

[80] However, the circumstances—this should be said clearly—under which such a dangerously dissonant unity may appear cannot be precisely defined. One whose ear is alerted occasionally to an error will be able, on his own, to judge correctly whether in a particular case the unity of a

*Presumably in Dorian; in reality, it could also be in D minor.

**With these remarks about the forbidden sums in the cantus firmus—be they consonant or dissonant—that could only be discussed in context here, I have treated fully that which I briefly mentioned in Section I, Chapter 1, \% 3.
dissonant sum really too sharply, too squarely tears into the "flesh" of the cantus firmus, or whether the tones proceed so successfully that the sum of the dissonance does not "scream out."

If, through the nature of the singing voice, we could explain the problem of forbidden intervals and grasp their true character, we would easily understand why those intervals must adjust, in one way, to the changed conditions and circumstances of free composition or at the same time, in another way, to the environment of a different instrument.

 Permit me here to show by means of some examples the method by which we can not only retain the augmented fourths, diminished fifths, and the sevenths in accordance with the special circumstances of the actual situation, but also demonstrate and thus eliminate the presumed (and feared) contradiction that exists between the teaching of counterpoint and free composition, without distorting either the former or the latter in any way, or, better expressed, without causing either counterpoint or free composition to lose something of their essence (i.e., of their strictness or freedom).

Example 41. J. S. Bach, B-minor Mass, No. 1, "Kyrie."

```
ky-ri-e- le i-son, Ky-ri-e.
```

(B-min. 1 --- --- --- #3 IV-#11 --- #VII(-V)- I)
In this example the bracketed augmented fourth (tritone) is, first of all, justified sufficiently because the song is accompanied; free composition offers to the singer's ear all-around harmonies whose logic strikes an accord in his consciousness. From that they have the power to orient him easily to all necessary intervals, including dissonant ones. Furthermore, along with this familiar succession of harmonies, its particular melody is, to no lesser extent, also forcefully active. While it runs about and composes-out the harmonies, it also, in keeping with the nature of free composition, makes use of diverse, small unities [Einheitsbildungen]. Thus, considered separately, the melody in the example above traverses the path from the tonic $\text{B}^{++}$ to the subdominant $\text{F}$ in order to get from there—perhaps over an independently assumed $\text{GII}$ (Phrygian) $\text{G}$—to $\text{A}$, which has the relationship of $\text{V}$ as well as $\text{VII}$.

Disregarding the support granted the singer by the harmonies, another, almost independent circumstance decrees the permissibility of the tritone here. It is the fact that, in relation to the large unity-formation developed out of the I-degree, the eighth-note $\text{G}$ between $\text{C}$ and $\text{F}$ expresses, in reality, the effect of a mere "passing tone" (in the broadest sense) rather than a tritone.++ Since a passing tone appears even as the interval of a tritone, one sees from this the power typical of free composition, which is based on scale-degrees and aims, as with so many aids, to insure the individuality of the melody.

---

+Cf. Harmonielehre, § 76.

++Even over a raised third, $\text{D}$, which is both passing and chromatic in character.

+++Cf. Second Species, § 5.
If we require training and practice for the choir member (or even the soloist), then many circumstances, as all of those mentioned above, can act in a positive way to ensure that the interval will be sung with precision.

If a tritone, to cite a further example, under given circumstances represents the succession of scale-degrees I-#IV, as for example in a cadence:

Example 42.

\[ \begin{align*}
E^\flat & \quad I \quad IV \quad V \\
\end{align*} \]

then the singer or the instrumentalist is led by instinct to the scale-degree and, at the same time, to the tritone. Everyone perceives that here we deal, basically, less with an original tritone than with a raised IV, A, and that therefore we will take the chromatic inflection of the IV-degree in stride, even if unconsciously. What objection could the counterpoint or the cantus firmus have, since neither of them is capable, in its own realm, of producing a feeling for scale-degrees?

Several relationships that can be offered by free composition justify the tritone in a different way, as for example:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Example,} \quad \text{Harmonielehre,} \quad \S \ 162. \]
The "staring" glance—how marvelously it is portrayed here by the tritone! And does this tritone not, in addition, awaken in us the feeling of the II in B-flat minor, C-E\textsuperscript{b}-G\textsuperscript{b}, which need not be rejected here before the V, even if, with the avoidance of an independent interpretation of the tritone, the note C could be connected immediately to F in the sense of the V, whereby certainly the G\textsuperscript{b} would be assigned a different role, namely, that of a passing or neighboring tone? All the more effectively do the diverse effects surround the tones; not only do they avoid thwarting a primary effect, they further it!

And just as we were able to demonstrate the necessity of the augmented fourth as a direct succession of two tones in the example cited above, we can probably also demonstrate, on various grounds, the necessity of the tritone sums resulting from several tones in free composition. And again, more for the sake of methodology which is so important here, than for the sake of the examples themselves, I offer a few instances of tritone sums.

Chopin, for example, writes— to cite a rather curious case:

In order to understand the poetic basis of the tritone bracketed above and thereby understand its necessity, we must bring to mind the plan of the entire first part.

[84] This is set in three-part song form, A\textsuperscript{1} B A\textsuperscript{2}, and is in C major overall. In its detail the disposition of the keys exhibits a certain anomaly that, in addition, is equally emphasized in every part by a strange consequence: while A\textsuperscript{1} and A\textsuperscript{2}, the framing parts, are set in C major, they intentionally derive their key contrast from the related key, A minor—but instead of a true A minor, curiously enough only in the form of the allegedly genuine "Aeolian" system, so that even in the cadences the leading-tone, G#, is totally avoided. Similarly, the middle part of the song form, B, shows the unusual characteristic of contrasting the A\textsuperscript{1} and A\textsuperscript{2} sections with a presumably genuine "Lydian" system instead of F major. That is the reason why the composer avoids the B\textsuperscript{b} in measure three of our example, the B\textsuperscript{b} which could have made F major clear to us—particularly since it follows the chromatically altered II-degree.

However, it is abundantly clear that Chopin by no
means harks back to older systems, considering them to be of equal value and independent. On the contrary, with the finest artistic tact in the introduction as well as through the harmonization in the remainder of the composition, he seeks to create in the listener the conviction of hearing only C major and F major. Thus, here we deal only with some traits of a thoroughly artistic archaizing, an affectation that a man like Chopin could adopt in the middle of his fantastic music making. It is an obvious quote, a curious vignette from the good times past that he believed in, a Lydian system, which, for example, is often played irresponsibly in "national hymns" just because, in truth, one does not know how to hear or play them better.

In contrast to that, compare the following crass tritone:

\[\text{Example 45. R. Wagner, Götterdämmerung, Act II, (p. 86).}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example45.png}}
\end{array}
\]

and similarly also:

\[\text{Example 46. Brahms, Trio, Op. 87, "Finale."}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example46.png}}
\end{array}
\]

*Compare with that also the superb and convincing conclusion of this Mazurka!
These cannot be put in the category of an alleged Lydian mode despite the strong similar effects. Actually, both cases produce the effect of only a #IV in the composing-out situation [im auskomponiertem Zustande] which is shown by the succession of scale-degrees. In the Wagner example in C major, the succession is: #IV(F#)-V(G)-bII(Db)-IV#3(D), etc.; in Brahms, over an organ point on C, the succession is: I-#IV-(I-#IV)V (meas. 4).

The following example illustrates that other conditions, e.g., a modulation, can lead to a tritone whose necessity is shown to be inherent:

Example 47. Mozart, Symphony in E-flat major, "Andante."

That we speak of the tritone here at all comes from the fact that the violin passage is unaccompanied up to the point of the V-degree, and because it appears without harmony, its effect is even more striking than if it were accompanied.

[86] The augmented fourth in the following example is explained by the nature of the keyboard setting itself:

___

+Especially in the Wagner example.

+++I will take this up later.

It is especially the case in the older keyboard setting that, the less it uses a continually dense texture,† the more eagerly the allegedly missing harmonies run through the configurations and sundry adornments and thereby produce the polyphony. Why should it need harmony in complete chords if it only needs to give an impression? In the above example we can clearly see how the figures unify several voices in the most artistic fashion. The following example illustrates this procedure:

Example 49.

It follows, however, that the augmented fourth in the Handel example is only seemingly a tritone since, in reality, according to Example 49, the note A does not go to $F^b$ but to $E^b$ and, furthermore, since at the same time a second line goes to $G$ and $F$, the two intervals merely represent movements by step.

†Such as the kind we use so frequently nowadays.
In so far as the augmented fourth is a part of the harmony of the V-degree, it is motivated, eo ipso, by the absolute necessity of the latter.

[87] On the other hand, the following highly interesting examples show, nevertheless, that free composition is sensitive to the tritone under certain circumstances and prefers to avoid it:

Example 50: Ph. Em. Bach, Sonata in F major, First Movement.


The first example, Ph. Em. Bach's composition, seems to be the more daring and, at the same time, the one composed with the tenderer artistic conviction. In both examples, let us try to apply the augmented fourth in order to convince ourselves of the delicacy achieved by its avoidance.

Compare to that the equally impressive example of the
final cadence in Ph. Em. Bach's *Rondo II* in B major,\(^{+}\) or, measures 9 and 12 before the cadence in Haydn's *String Quartet* in E-flat major, Op. 76, No. 6\(^{++}\) where the tritone is avoided so ostentatiously and is replaced by the perfect fourth.

Having shown above how free composition can manifest \([88]\) its necessities, I leave it to the learner himself, in reference to other forbidden diatonic intervals, to seek out similar ways to employ the diminished fifth, as well as the seventh. Meanwhile, let me make some remarks of greater importance.

I want to remind the reader that the diminished fifth is an integral part of the V-degree and, by its necessity, is adequately protected in free composition.

I have shown in my *Harmonielehre*, \(\&\ 50\), how, on the other hand, the avoidance of a diminished fifth often leads to the appearance of the Phrygian II.

In the following example, the bracketed succession of tones shows that the diminished fifth is not, in reality, an interval at all;\(^{+++}\) it must be explained as a meeting of the harmonic tone \(C^b\) (in \(D-F-A^b-C^b\)) with the chromatic passing tone \(F^#\).\(^{++++}\) The two are heard simultaneously in such a way that our succession of tones is understood and justified accordingly:

\[\text{From the fourth collection of the *Sonaten für Kenner und Liebhaber*.}\]

\[\text{**The "Fantasia," Payne No. 191.}\]

\[\text{+++Cf. *Harmonielehre*, \(\&\ 50\).}\]

\[\text{++++Between \(F\), on the first beat of the second measure, and \(G\), on the second beat of the third measure of our example.}\]
Example 52. Bruckner, Symphony No. 1.

Finally, as far as the seventh in free composition is concerned, the necessary freedom for its application is primarily connected with the necessary phenomenon of the seventh-chord about which contrapuntal theory knows, as yet, absolutely nothing.

[89] Therefore, in free composition the seventh may, for example, appear under the very complicated circumstances of an all-too-pensive declamation, as shown in the following example:

Example 53. J. S. Bach, St. Matthew Passion, Soprano Aria (p. 37).

But, instances of the use of the seventh, like the following:

+ Note the impressive pause after the seventh!
Example 54. J. S. Bach, English Suite in E minor.

or:


or:

Example 56. Handel, Variations in B-flat major.

are related to the nature of free composition, which in its structure unites and presents simultaneously two or more voices at the same time. Thus, in the Bach example we must consider the tone $e^1$ (or $b$ respectively) as being independent and continuous and contrastingly juxtaposed

---

*Cf. above, Example 48.

**Example 54.
to a second voice, which, also independent, carries out a chromatic passing motion, falling from $e^2$ to $b^1$, or, ascending from $b$ to $e$. The unification of the two voices allows skips of the seventh to appear natural; hence, we are really not dealing with skips of the seventh but rather with movement by seconds.

With regard to the Schubert example, we have to imagine that $e^1$ (left hand) and $g^2$ (right hand) are equally independent and continuous so that the apparent skips of the seventh are in reality only movements by seconds:

Example 57.

The Handel example lends itself to the following three-voice sketch:

Example 58.

The significance of this example is that here, too, the skips of the seventh clearly originate from the transformation of a multi-linear texture into the succession of one horizontal line and from the character of the movement, by seconds, so that one could take them for real dissonant sevenths. Instead of getting lost in sevenths, the performer only
needs to follow the lower bracket [see Example 56] to restore the true meaning.

A very peculiar use of the seventh can be found in Handel's B-flat major organ concerto (Example 59). It suggests that Handel, obviously in a humorous mood, is willing to change the harmony on the second eighth note of the second measure (without fear of paying the extreme consequence from what precedes) so that the main accent of the measure, in this case the first eighth note, remains, as it were, only a delayed I-degree. Immediately after that, however, he presses the second eighth note, suddenly and surprisingly, into the service of the new harmony, i.e., the V-degree.

Example 59. Handel, Organ Concerto in B-flat major.

\[\text{Example 59. Handel, Organ Concerto in B-flat major.}\]

However, it is even more important to mention a peculiarity of the seventh in free composition where it quite frequently stands for its inversion, that is, the second, so that it totally loses its proper content as a real seventh.

Certainly, that may be said of this vocal line:


\[\text{Example 60. J. S. Bach, B minor Mass, No. 13.}\]
The reason for this possibility of substitution is so interesting, particularly in free instrumental composition, that I cannot resist citing some examples here:


At the turn of measure 1, the bracketed seventh moving in the bass part appears to reflect the facility offered by the keyboard, which greatly reduces the mechanical difficulty of a seventh. In reality, however, the occasion has been used to gain, as a starting point for the next series of tones, the lower octave $f$ instead of $f^1$, so that the seventh $e^1-f$ basically represents here only the second $e^1-f^1$. Finally, however, there rests on the $f$, in the name of degree-progression the established relationship to $c$ (the second quarter note of the first measure), that is, the relationship of a fourth, $c-f$, or a fifth, $c-F$ (= V-I in F minor).

Therefore, in this example we see that an original second is changed into a seventh and this act not only creates greater instrumental suitability, but also affords the favorable degree-progression. Without a doubt, the true dis-

+As is always the case in free composition.
sonant character of the genuine seventh is strongly diluted by effects such as the second and fourth which, on many grounds (i.e., on melodic grounds and the scale-degrees), flow together in it. For that very reason, their use in this composition is both justified and indeed necessary, and can not be subject to the veto of a contrapuntal theory.

Example 62. J. S. Bach, English Suite in D minor.

In the example above, the bracketed sevenths in the bass are justified not only by the fact that they can be interpreted equally well as seconds, but also because the d in the first measure has found, in the manner of an independent voice, its continuation in the descending stepwise movement (d-g-Bb). And finally, a point certainly not to be overlooked is that they are justified by the clear logic of the scale-degrees D-G-C-F-Bb, which on their part allow us to anticipate the tones c and Bb at the beginning of the second and third measures, regardless of their octave.

In addition to the obvious purpose of continuing the content in a lower octave (as in the two previous examples), the seventh in the example below, bracketed in measures 3 and 4, manages to achieve its own strong effect—as a seventh—simply because it occurs in the more prominent soprano part:

+See the previous example.
Example 63. J. S. Bach, Three-Part Inventions, No. 11.

[94] It almost seems to have a secret longing to produce a singer's or violinist's portamento—such as the exquisite intimacy created here by the turn of the seventh. The same may also be said about the "Adagio" of Mendelssohn's Scottish Symphony.

Example 64.

Frequently, the range limitation of this or that instrument causes one to change an originally planned second into the skip of a seventh. Thus, for example, the viola, cello, contrabass, etc., change the second into a seventh by virtue of the limits of their respective ranges. This is an all-too-common event with instruments since the ear does not have the slightest difficulty understanding the true fact. No further word would be required about this if it had not been for men like Liszt and Wagner. They tried to "explain"

†Or else, glissando.

‡The exception of range extension of the cello in Schumann's Piano Quartet, Op. 47, is well known.
a true seventh of the finest motivic value--at a much interpreted place in Beethoven's Ninth Symphony-- as being a fake seventh born, so to speak, from a second and therefore to be regarded as a presumably unintentional mistake by Beethoven. They even "corrected" it into a second! Permit me to give a detailed refutation of Wagner in the appendix. (*41)

Recently, it has been R. Strauss who has almost developed a mannerism of changing the second into a seventh within the melody in order to achieve exotic effects. In some cases we might find this interesting if we were not all-too-frequently upset by the composer's intent; for example:


One sees that the bracketed seventh in the second and third measures, from \(e_1\) to \(b_1\), surely originated from a second:

\[\text{Meas. 138 ff.}\]
Thus, $\text{c}_1$ is a neighboring tone between the two b-flats in the chord $\text{E}_b-\text{G}-\text{E}_b$; after that, in measures 5-6 and 7-8, the bracketed sevenths, $\text{d}_1-\text{c}_2$ and $\text{e}_{b1}-\text{d}_2$, are used instead of the seconds, $\text{d}_1-\text{c}_1$ and $\text{e}_{b2}-\text{d}_2$. In contrast to that, the unbracketed seventh-sum in measures 3-4 ($\text{f}_1-\text{g}$)--this should be noted here for purposes of discrimination--is a genuine one created by the fact that the last two sixteenth notes, $\text{f}_1$ and $\text{c}_1$, are really passing tones that have transcended the strict rule only to heighten, all the more, our expectation of the overdue harmonic tones, $\text{e}_{b1}$ and $\text{b}_{b1}$, which promptly appear in the fourth beat of the next measure:

Example 67.

The same composer purposely avoids having the neighboring tone, $\text{f}_1$, "follow its main note, $\text{e}_1$, in the piano reduction of *Salome*" (p. 35):

+See Example 68a, meas. 1.
However, in order to heighten the tension there, he inserts three other tones: in measure 2 the chord tone, \( c' \); in the same measure, as a neighboring tone to the fifth, \( a^1 \); and finally in measure 3 the neighboring tone, \( d^#1 \).+

Finally, a seventh-sum receives its justification from other circumstances in free composition apart from the necessity of the seventh-chord. The following especially sentimental example illustrates this:

Example 69. J. S. Bach, B-minor Mass, "Agnus dei".++

See Example 68b.

Cf. Harmonielehre, § 40.
How impressively the seventh-sum ($b^1-a^1$) extends over the change of harmony, I-IV$^b_3$ in G minor; it is, however, just the latter that motivates the former.


With regard to the minor system specifically, we must remember that it must be viewed basically as an artificial system that chiefly serves motivic aims. Because of this artificiality, the minor system quite often borrows from the major system, especially for the purpose of cadencing. Also, in the cantus firmus, thus in melodic matters, we must borrow from major for cadence purposes when the mode is minor. How this mixture takes shape will be shown in § 23, which deals with cadences. I must interject here that, in spite of the permitted mixture, the following mixture intervals are, nevertheless, forbidden:++

Augmented second  
Diminished fourth  
Augmented fifth  
Diminished seventh

The reasons for the prohibition of these intervals in the cantus firmus are the same as those for the seventh, augmented fourth, and diminished fifth: the intonation difficulties caused by the dissonance resulting from the change in the expression of the underlying intervals.

+ Cf. Harmonielehre, § 40.
++ Cf. Harmonielehre, p. 160, Table VI.
It goes without saying that, in contrast, free composition accepts these intervals. Here are some examples:

Example 70. Schubert, "Meeresstille".

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(In A minor)} & \\
\text{und bekümmert sieht der Schiffer} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

The augmented second here assists the modulation from E major/minor to A major/minor.+

[98] In the following example, the progression from $b\text{II}$ to $\#\text{IV}$ is responsible for the diminished fourth ($a^{b1}e^1$) in the second violin part:

Example 71. Mozart, Quintet in G minor, "Minuett".

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(Cf. Harmonielehre, § 68.} & \\
\end{align*}
\]
There is a reason for the cruelly beautiful and depressing diminished fourths in Mozart's G-minor Symphony:

\[ \text{Example 72. Mozart, Symphony in G minor.} \]

While Mozart has previously used the motive in the simple guise of a triad or seventh-chord:

Example 73.

![Example 73](image)

he now inflects it, for the first time, in the very same measure according to two different harmonies. Thus, he violently breaks apart the original unity with tremendous power so that the respective counterpoint is forced to follow two different harmonies and thereby make a diminished fourth.\(^4\)

[100] In the next example, the bracketed diminished fourths in measures 9 and 11 can be explained simply by the clash of the suspension (syncopation) of the seventh, \(\text{c}^3\) with the accompanying \(\text{g}^2\) from the harmony \(G^#-B-D-F\). What power is generated by the friction of these two tones?

\(^4\)When I recently heard Richard Strauss conduct this symphony, to my horror it became clear to me that he was totally unaware of this event of the main motive. He took the diminished fourth as the purest fifth or third! What, then, should the diminished fourth of a "classic composer" mean? A "modern composer" thinks of himself as having blood, pain, dissonance, temperament, and, therefore, takes his own diminished fourth seriously. Did not the classical composer remain always in the "equilibrium of man and artist"? Anyone who thinks that true humanism and passion within art began only with the modern composer thinks banally. Need I mention that still other conductors fail to give a proper interpretation of this section of Mozart's composition?

\(^5\)Note also the augmented fifth by the basses.
Example 74. Beethoven, Symphony No. 9, meas. 241 ff.

The augmented fifth in:

Example 75. R. Wagner, Walküre, Act II (piano score p. 23).

finds its justification in the harmonic progression:
G♯5 - E♯3 (F-) C - - F♯ || G♯5 - C - - F♯ - B .  
B min: VI♯5 - IV♯5 - ♩II (Phryg) V || VI - ♩II (Phrygian) V - I .

[101] As one can see, this example may be reckoned in B minor, and in this key one can even put together a well-rounded little section in spite of the fact that the progression of the first two chords, VI♯5-IV♯3, has, in addition, a secondary effect of III♯5-I♯3 in E major/minor.+

In contrast, the augmented fifth is only an apparent one. In reality, it is another interval created by the polyphony; ++ it is elucidated in Example 76b:

Example 76. J. S. Bach, English Suite in D minor.

---

+Cf. Harmonielehre, § 141.

++Compare the above example to Examples 48 and 56 along with the respective remarks.
8. The Prohibition of the Diminished Third and Augmented Sixth.

The reasons for the prohibition in the cantus firmus of those intervals that were cited in the two previous paragraphs also apply to the two remaining intervals: the diminished third and the augmented sixth.+

It is obvious, then, that free composition can, with proper reasons, use these intervals in the most diverse manner:

Example 77. J. S. Bach, B-minor Mass, No. 3.

[102] Without further ado, the ear understands that—if we are dealing only with the horizontal line—the diminished third represents nothing more than two neighboring tones to F♯, which frame the main tone instead of, as is usual, appearing to be separate from one another; both tones are inserted one after the other between the main tone and its return. In addition, we must deal with the harmonization of the step, which (carried out according to the dictates of the continuo) now also offers a strong support and, at the same time, the final necessity that, in truth, the diminished third is only apparent.

+Cf., Harmonielehre, § 147 and 148.
In the following example, the power and logic of the degree-progression sufficiently justifies the bracketed succession of two tones (meas. 3), which in the same way again, only seemingly present a diminished third; that is to say, the two tones have turned up in the melodic realm only through the confrontation and scaling off of two degrees (bII-V). Therefore, neither intends to express the proper harmonic effect of a true diminished third:

Example 78. Beethoven, Symphony No. 9, First Movement, meas. 463 ff.

The following augmented sixth is perhaps less an altered interval than an interval originating through passing motion and is, despite its exotic nature, rather pleasing to the ear.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
   \text{Example 79. Beethoven, Trio, Op. 97, 1st Movement, meas. 21 ff.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
   \text{Example 79. Beethoven, Trio, Op. 97, 1st Movement, meas. 21 ff.}
\end{array}
\]

§ 9. Conclusions about the Forbidden Intervals.

With the exception of the two seconds, all dissonant progressions are forbidden in the cantus firmus, no matter whether they are of purely diatonic origin or whether they stem from some other source, for example, mixture [of the modes].

In Fux we find the remark (with regard to three-part counterpoint) on page 93: \textit{[Aloys.]} "What, then, would you say about the skip of the seventh? Remember, one must consider the natural ease of singing." That is all he says.

Albrechtsberger explains in his ninth rule (p. 23):

All augmented and most diminished skips, and the three sevenths are forbidden ascending as well as descending.++

Because we are not permitted to write a skip larger than the perfect octave in each of the four voice parts in choruses, only the following are permissible.+++

---

+Cf. also page 40.

++Now follow examples of the diminished third, augmented second, augmented fourth, augmented fifth, augmented sixth, diminished seventh, minor seventh, major seventh, diminished octave, and, finally, the ninths and tenths. (*42)

+++Examples of the minor third, major third, diminished fourth, perfect fourth, diminished fifth, perfect fifth, major sixth, minor sixth, and the perfect octave follow. (*43)
And finally he says (p. 24): "The following are only permitted in free composition or with instrumental accompaniment."+

Without giving a reason for it, we see that Albrechtsberger retains for use in lessons the diminished fourth and diminished fifth. Therefore, he gives the following example (p. 32):

Example 80.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Diminished fourth}
\end{array} \]

[104] It is highly regrettable that he did not think of supplying a logical reason for the prohibition of all dissonant intervals, particularly the diminished fourth and diminished fifth, when, at the elimination of intervals that surpassing the octave (ninth and tenth), he had to cite, anyway, the nature of choral composition (thus, of the vocal parts) as a reason for the prohibitions. With that he was already touching the center of the problem.

Logically speaking, the reasons for differentiating choral composition, instrumental accompaniment, and free composition would have been sufficient to prohibit also the diminished fourth and the diminished fifth. But—one sees the half-truth—Albrechtsberger himself felt the reason for the prohibition was too shallow to impose it within the problem of the first separation of lessons from free composition. Suddenly injected into his counterpoint teaching is a component part of free composition, which must be confusing to the student. We ask: why should the augmented fourth be forbidden, and yet, in contrast, the diminished fourth be permitted? Why, similarly, is the augmented fifth forbidden and the diminished fifth permitted? I suspect that he has been led simply by a desire for the minor mode—to be sure, minor in the usual wrong conception—and this has led him to these irregularities to which he surrendered because he, as I said, had not sufficiently thought the problem through. He obviously believed that in the minor, where the necessary raising of the leading tone leads to the diminished fourth, one

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Examples of the sevenths follow. (*44)}
\end{array} \]
is not permitted to borrow this interval because it is, presumably, already purely diatonic!

Cherubini teaches in his sixth rule (p. 7):

With regard to melody, all progressions shall be diatonic or natural. In strict style a flowing melody is always better than a disjunct one. Accordingly, the progressions of the major and minor second, the major and minor third, the perfect fourth and fifth, the minor sixth, and the perfect octave, are permitted both ascending and descending. [It is better to avoid the minor sixth descending.] The augmented fourth (tritone), the diminished fifth, the major and minor seventh, in contrast, are totally forbidden ascending as well as descending.+

The contrast to Albrechtsberger is very obvious; i.e., the diminished fourth and fifth are forbidden. What, however, has happened with the major sixth, which—mysteriously enough—has not been encountered in the above rule as either to be permitted or forbidden?

His explanation for the rule is expressed in the following remarks [p. 7]:

[105] This rule is very wise and the old masters had all the more reason to stick to it because they wrote for singing voices alone without any accompaniment. In this way, they obtained pure and simple melodies in which the forbidden intervals would make intonation very difficult. By the way, we have very often strayed from this rule in recent years.

How many seemingly accurate remarks are found in these sentences and yet, at the same time, how many dangerous errors! Although intonation difficulty is correctly cited here as the reason for the prohibition, it is not considered by itself as it should have been, but, exclusively within the framework of the compositional practice of the old masters where it cannot demand the right of unalterable validity. To be sure, it is historically correct that the earliest composers++ were not far removed from the creations that even today we consider related to the task of a

---

+ See also p. 2.
++ See also p. 3.
cantus firmus. We must not, however, make the mistake of considering it a praiseworthy part of composition when they were compelled to regard the intonation difficulties to such an extent. Admittedly there was no other way—considering the primitive level of contrapuntal technique and the state of vocal composition—but without a doubt, it was progress when composition, relying on its many special elements, gradually laid claim to all intervals according to the limitations of the instrument, the tuning, and the expression. Ultimately, the more composition demanded the conquering of these difficulties in a free work of art without regard to intonation, the more the difficult interval was founded on good, inner reasons. Therefore, what a crass error exists in the last part of the remark, namely, the insult to free composition! Should this rule of counterpoint (i.e., the prohibition of this or that interval) still be valid for free composition, or is it not, rather, the task of the counterpoint teaching to simply expose the problem first? Should everything composed since the oldest times really be based only upon "exceptions" and "mistakes" contrary to a supposedly unchangeable "compositional rule"—one, therefore basically written badly? How unjust it is to let the student experience this sort of thing in opposition to all truth and all feeling of true art! Thus, we see how bad it is if we cannot formulate the task of counterpoint in a better way.

If the unjust rebuke of free composition has been casually mentioned by Cherubini, it seems to be much more detailed and therefore that much more unjust in Béllermann's case. We read (p. 101 ff.):

In regard to our music of today, great freedom reigns. I do not speak of an inferior, decadent, and unrefined, modern music, but rather of the music of the eighteenth century, thus of men like Bach, Handel, Graun, Haydn, and Mozart, who are justifiably called classical composers. We find that in their melodic application of the intervals, they did not adhere to imposed prescriptions but rather followed their taste and their subtle musical feeling, using all intervals of the diatonic scale not only in solo music written for virtuoso singers but also in choral compositions. In the latter as well as the former, they frequently went beyond the limitations of the diatonic scale reaching for chromatically altered intervals. As examples of this I give some themes by Handel and Graun:
Example 81. Handel, Israel in Egypt.

It cannot be denied that profound effects and great power of expression are often produced by such free use of intervals. And the newer music, having had instruments added for support since the seventeenth century, can also do such things without harm when composers use the intervals consciously and when, secure through strict studies, they have taste and are capable of mature judgment concerning what is practical for the human voice.

Following that there is a discussion—by the way, a very readable one—concerning the history of intervals (pp. 112-13):
I have inserted these historical notes in order to show that the use of the intervals by the older composers was not something accidental, but that here a boundary was drawn with awareness and consideration, which became highly important for polyphonic, a cappella music. It was not the practical musicians who sought to extend these boundaries. Strangely enough, it was the theorists who were often too inadequate as practical musicians to realize the importance this teaching had for the practicability and beauty of the songs, and who were encumbered by all sorts of frivolities in the presentation of their theories. . . .

(*45) With the onset of the seventeenth century, composers began to write more freely about the application of intervals as components of melody. However, the school adhered to the stricter rules for the benefit of art. These strict rules maintained a secure foundation in voice leading for the younger generation. Only since the middle of the last century, with the destructive proliferation of instrumental music, was the school left behind. Unrestrained despotism and total lack of judgment are the consequences.

Unfortunately, the student is very little served by these unjustified reproaches. First of all, instead of praising the "taste" and "subtle musical feeling" of our great masters, in order to vaguely hint, in spite of praise, that the masters supposedly ignored some "imposed prescriptions," and further, instead of adjusting to new music in a similar, determined way,† he rails against the "destructive proliferation of instrumental music" merely for the sake of praising the "school" only as the repository of the stricter rules! Instead of such contradictory vacillations, there was only one way Bellermann could choose regarding this question, namely, to learn to distinguish the cantus firmus from free composition, then, to discover the reasons why these dissonant intervals are to be prohibited in the cantus firmus and finally--and this is the most important point--to express in clear language those reasons that permit, even demand, dissonant intervals in free composition. From this point of view alone it is clear that the application of dissonant intervals in the melodies of our masters, credited by Bellermann only to "their taste and subtle musical feeling," corresponds to rather than contradicts the "prescriptions," which they understood much more correctly! To be sure, we must not join Bellermann by thinking that the "prescriptions" simply pertain to the cantus firmus.

†"Newer music can also do such things without harm."
The most precise result, however, attained by Béllermann is this (pp. 104-105, Sub 2):

All the diatonic intervals up to the magnitude of the perfect fifth are to be used in the melody ascending and descending without limitation except for the tritone and diminished fifth. These intervals are the following six: the major semitone, the whole tone, the minor and major thirds, the perfect fourth and perfect fifth.

And next (Sub 3):

The tritone and the diminished fifth are totally excluded from the melody, and the tritone must not be approached by step if the voice does not move beyond the interval in the same direction, be it ascending or descending.

Example 84.

For the older composers, the tritone was the "most forbidden" interval; therefore, we must treat it in our exercises with particular care. In fact, it would be best to avoid it altogether. The diminished fifth, whose stepwise attainment does not have the tense harshness of the augmented fourth, is less dangerous. We cannot reprove the following application of the diminished fifth:
Example 85.

\[ \text{diminished fifth} \quad \text{diminished fifth} \]

And (Sub 4):

The use of all those intervals that are larger than the perfect fifth is very much limited and for the most part totally forbidden. We will want to take a closer look at these intervals, one by one.+

And finally (p.106, Sub C):

[109] The major and minor sevenths are likewise totally forbidden; the difficulty of singing them correctly is the reason for this even though, according to the modern point of view, the ascending minor seventh in many instances offers no particular difficulty.

§ 10. The Permissible Intervals in General.

One must divide permissible harmonic intervals into consonances and dissonances.

The consonances are:++

a) Those intervals that refer back to the ratios 2, 3, and 5 of the overtone series, namely, the octave, fifth, and third (and their inversions).

b) The fourth, as the inversion of the fifth; the sixth, as the inversion of the third.

+ These last remarks of Bellermann shall be treated more thoroughly in later paragraphs.

++Cf. Harmonielehre, § 73 ff.
The dissonances are:

a) The second.

b) The seventh, as the inversion of the second.

There are, however, two enduring factors to all these intervals that determine their practical application as well as their essence, namely:

1. The factor of tension-width [Spannungsweite].

2. The factor of the development or of the inversion.

Manifesting itself in the overtone series, nature covers something that is to be remembered; not only the phenomenon of the vertical direction, i.e., the harmonic principle in the triad, but also the phenomenon of the horizontal direction, i.e., the melodic succession. Whether the octave sounds in the vertical direction or in the horizontal melodic plane, both the euphony and justification rest equally on the will of nature; it is the same with the fifth and third as well.


1. The Octave.

In its tension-width, the interval of the octave is indeed the largest within the octave range. However, this factor, which would otherwise be troublesome in practical application, is modified, fortunately, by the fact that the octave has the best harmonic qualities in relation to the overtone series.

In addition, the overtone series brings out a very remarkable distinction, namely, that only the ascending octave complies with the natural developmental drive within the overtone series, whereas the descending octave originates

*Cf. Harmonielehre, § 9.*
from the artificial inversion. For this reason, the descending octave exhibits one difficulty more than the ascending octave, a difficulty that is significant. The student must become acutely aware of this difference and should prefer, whenever it is possible, the ascending octave to the descending, at least in the cantus firmus.

By this means we can explain the old prohibition of the descending octave, which Bellermann cites (p. 106, Sub D):

The octave is permitted in ascending movement and has been used in a very characteristic way, as in the following theme by Palestrina in his motet "Ego sum panis vivus."++ It is forbidden, descending, according to the dictum of the theorists. However, this is a prohibition that is ignored quite frequently in practice, namely, by the bass voice in polyphonic hymns. However, I do not know whether the octave, as in the example, either ascending or descending, has been an essential and characteristic component of a theme. In the counterpoints it appears frequently enough, for example in Palestrina's four-voice motet "Sicut cervus desiderat," alto part, measure 13.

It is probably superfluous to point out Bellermann's lack of logic due to the fact that the practice itself has been called upon to shape the main argument of a contrapuntal insight--here, for and against the descending octave. Just because both types of octaves must be used in free composition, it does not follow, for that reason alone, that the teacher is freed from initially having to draw his students' attention to the difference between an ascending and a [111] descending octave, together with the reasons for it, particularly since this difference also occurs in practice, as for example:

---

+Cf. Harmonielehre, § 16.

++The example follows. (*46)
Example 86. Mozart, String Quartet in E-flat major.

Mozart, String Quartet in D minor.

§ 12.—2. The Fifth.

The fifth has a more moderate range than the octave. According to the disposition of the overtone series, it is the boundary interval of the harmonic triad.**

And even though with the fifth, exactly as with the octave, it is again quite understandable that the ascending interval, by its very nature, has the advantage over the descending one, it is, on the other hand, the advantage of the smaller tension-width which narrows the difficulties of intonation between the ascending and descending fifth in comparison to the octave. The fifth can be used, therefore, without restriction in the cantus firmus, ascending as well as descending.


**Cf. *Harmonielehre*, § 11.

The fourth cannot be found in the overtone series and must be considered an inversion of the fifth.

For example:

a) Instead of using an ascending fifth, we can, by using the descending fourth starting on G, go to the lower octave of D:

Example 87.

\[ \text{\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{example87}} \]

or:

[112] b) by starting with D in order to go to G, we can use an ascending fourth instead of a descending fifth and thereby reach the higher octave of G:

Example 88.

\[ \text{\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{example88}} \]

Since the fourth, as an inversion of the fifth, leads us again to the same tone as the original fifth itself—in the first case from G to D, in the second case from D to G—the fourth is also to be regarded as a boundary interval of the harmonic triad, a second sort of imitation of the original. Later we shall see the highly important consequence that results from this insight into the essence of the fourth as the second boundary interval of the harmonic triad.

We have to say here that since both intervals (i.e.,
the fifth and fourth) are boundary intervals of the same triad and since, according to the intent of nature, there can be but one boundary of the triad, so that both intervals cannot produce the same triad boundary with the same power—it can occur only once—we must assume that a strong distinction exists between them and that finally this distinction must be found only in the factor of the development of the fifth and the artificial inversion of the fourth. In this sense we can properly speak of a boundary interval of primary and secondary importance.

In the purely melodic sense—and this is precisely the thing we are talking about—the degraded character of the inversion in the case of the fourth can be found in the fact that it can only be gained, as it were, by the path over the fifth. It is as if we determine the fifth first in our perception in order to formulate afterwards the fourth. [113] Considering the fundamental peculiarity of the fourth, as inversion of the fifth, it would be going too far if we were to make a distinction between a descending or ascending fourth with the same consequences for practical application as in the case of the octave. Instead, let it suffice to state that the ascending fourth, although it originates from the descending and, therefore, simple fifth, appears more welcome to the ear simply by its upward direction than a descending one does—so strong is the external impression of an ascending direction by itself!

Our result briefly is this: the fourth is to be used in a melodic context, ascending or descending, without limitation. We cannot ignore, however, the presentiment of the fifth in this process, and thus we must assume that the ascending fourth originates from the descending fifth.
If the cantus firmus imposes no limitation at all with respect to the fourth, then its free use makes even more sense in free composition. However, I want to point out the peculiarity that, if it is used too often in succession—I am thinking only of a melodic line—it will appear inartistic and trivial.

The style of opera of the postclassic era has been too generous in the use of the fourth. This is not the place to elaborate this statement. It would be advisable, however, for the reader of this book to compare the recitatives of Bach’s *St. Matthew Passion* and the songs from Wagner’s *Tannhäuser* and inform himself of the different effects of the use of the fourth—for purely musical reasons as well as for a more just consideration of the traditional art forms.

Whoever wishes to free himself from dilettantism should bear in mind that, along with other surrogates for the fourth, there is, particularly at the beginning of a composition, one tasteful possibility, namely, to repeat the same note! Let us compare the beginnings of Schubert’s "Ihr Bild" and "Am Meer" in order to gain a clear perception of this method. (*47) On the other hand, let us not forget that the fourth does not wish to be, and probably cannot be, avoided at all times. In the chorale cited on page 52, it was precisely the fourth G-C that, composed as an inversion of the fifth C-G, had by necessity to express the key of C, in a totally normal fashion.

§ 14. The Third.

The third in its major form is a natural-born consonance;† whereas the minor third is only its artificial counter-

part. The third belongs to the content of the triad whose entrails it represents, so to speak.

§ 15.--5. The Sixth.

The sixth must be considered only as an inversion of the third. It suffers from the psychological disadvantage connected with inversion in general. Because of inversion, the sixth is an inferior interval to the third; in addition, the factor of its greater tension-width adds a further complication.

We have to remember that the minor sixth is the inversion of the major third; the major sixth, however, is the inversion of only the minor third. That is, then, the reason why the minor sixth has the advantage of easier intonation compared to the major sixth.

Finally, as with the fourth, the sixth is more pleasing ascending than descending.

[115] Fux remarks in first species, two-part counterpoint (p. 93): [Aloys.] From [the ninth measure to the tenth] you used the skip of the major sixth, which is forbidden in strict counterpoint, where everything must be as singable as possible."

Within the discussion of syncopation in three-part writing, Albrechtsberger remarks (p. 105):

The second mistake is the skip of a major sixth from D to E in the alto, which is forbidden because the note skipped into is the leading tone (nota sensibilis) of the key and is difficult to sing correctly without instrumental accompaniment. Other skips of a major sixth are permissible at the present time.

Surely, I am not doing Albrechtsberger an injustice when I consider the most valuable part of this remark to be only

\[\text{\textsuperscript{+}}\text{Cf. Harmonielehre, } \text{	extsection ~10.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{++}}\text{Cf. above, } \text{	extsection ~13.}\]
the reference to the intonation difficulties of the major sixth. He avoids giving the reason just as Fux does. As for the nota sensibilis, see Albrechtsberger's quote, which I use later in Section III, Chapter 1, § 18.

Cherubini, as we already know from his quote in Section I, Chapter 2, § 9, does not mention the major sixth. He does, by the way, permit the minor sixth, ascending as well as descending. He explains in two-part, second species counterpoint, Rule 7 (p. 16), that the ascending minor sixth presents more intonation problems than any of the other permitted intervals. See his quote in Section II, Chapter 2, § 9.

We read in Bellermann (p. 106, Sub B):

The use of the major sixth is totally forbidden. Since it is consonant and has a ratio of 3:5, this interval is easy to intone in most cases and is therefore frequently employed in modern music. In contrast, the old composers of the better schools have avoided it in the most strenuous way, perhaps because it impressed them as weak, saccarin, or passionate—as I remarked above—characteristics that do not fit into the strict simplicity of their composition. The few examples that can be used to illustrate the major sixth never show this interval in the middle of the melody itself; instead, it begins a new section after a cadence, as for example, at the end of the four-voice motet "Ego sum panis vivus" by Palestrina, tenor part. We find a similar example in the chorale melody by Luther "Mit Fried' und Freud' fahr' ich dahin":

Example 89.

\[\text{Example follows.} (*48)\]
What a quid pro quo, especially by Bellermann! Since he finds the major sixth so easy to intone, he is embarrassed when he comes to the reason for the prohibition as the strict school has expressed it. How very much he wishes he could turn this matter over to modern music if only it were somehow compatible with his theoretic conscience. Nevertheless, he holds with the prohibition—it has been forbidden by the ancients. Concerning the minor sixth, he states (p. 105, sub 4 a): "It is permissible to use it ascending; but it rarely appears descending."

§ 16.---6. The Second.

As mentioned before, the second is the only horizontal dissonance that is permissible in the melody. The second exceeds the domain of the triad and must, therefore, appear as a dissonance in relationship to it. It is the fifth of the fifth and therefore lacks a direct connection with the root of the initial triad.\(^5\)

Its tension-width is the smallest and because of this, as we shall see later (§ 20), it provides the most valuable service to the flowing melody of the cantus firmus.

In addition, the use of the second in the cantus firmus is justified by its particular melodic function. I want to make this point clear by means of Fux's cantus firmus, quoted on page 79 above. The E (note 3) as a second between F and D (notes 2 and 4) forms a "bridge" on which these two move toward one another producing the effect of a third. Following this third-sum, we at first expect a triad on D; but this lacks the fifth, A, and therefore the melody keeps progressing. Now the G (note 5) appears as the upper-

\[\text{Example follows. (}^\text{49}\)\]

\(^5\)As the horizontal inversion of the second, the seventh (cf. above, § 10) is therefore also a dissonance. Going beyond the given boundary of the fifth, we find it only as the third of a second triad. Since this triad is based upon another root and is different from the first triad, it is, by necessity, dissonant with the latter.
fourth of the first note, D, and suggests, even in the face of the initial third, D-F, a further completion and expression in a new triad, namely, G-D. However, it is precisely the second F (note 6) which immediately moves from this new triad back into the domain of the first one (D-F). Because the A eventually appears as the seventh note, the ear gains total clarity concerning the complete triad sum D-F-A; from this it thoroughly understands not only the role of the fourth, G, but also that of the seconds (i.e., notes 3 and 6 and also 8 and 9).

We must ask, since we have just seen that the second can also create unities, why is the second permitted at all in the melody of the cantus firmus where balance is of prime importance? The answer is simple.

In the first place, the second has the ability not only to bring together consonances that belong together* (thus, in the primitive sense of furthering the unity of a harmony), but also, by virtue of its dissonant nature, to lead away from an existing harmony** so that its unity is split and destroyed, so to speak. The second can, therefore, serve unity as well as contradict it. This is a property that it shares with all the consonant intervals; if several follow one another, they can lead to the establishment of a consonant unity as well as to a dissonant result, as for example:

Example 90.

*†Cf. meas. 3, 8, 10.
**‡See note 6 [in Example 40].
Second, the unity [interval sums] mentioned in §6 of this chapter must be rejected only in overly drastic formations, but not that larger unity which remains the desired [118] goal of every melody. But why, in such a larger, far-reaching unity should the second be more disturbing or less useful than the third, fourth, etc.?

Finally, we must bear in mind that the second, since it represents the last and smallest interval unity in the horizontal direction, is also the most suitable for measuring the remaining larger intervals and therefore, as we soon shall see, orients our ear in a favorable way to make the psychological valuation of them.

§17. The Use of the Permitted Larger Intervals in Particular.

If, in the following example, we consider that the path in Example 91a can be used to get from C to the sixth, A:

Example 91.

![Example 91](image)

and that it can progress through smaller intervals such as seconds, thirds, fourths, then we will understand that, compared to this, another more natural possibility can be used, namely, the direct skip of the sixth.†

A new and independent reason for the old prohibition

†See Example 91b.
of the major sixth and also for the warning of counterpoint teaching against larger intervals can be found in the fact that the larger interval can be replaced by several small, skillfully used intervals. In an intuitive way this is familiar not only to the creator but also to the listener. It is totally understandable, therefore, why the oldest church music, especially Gregorian Chant, adhered to the range of a fifth as the widest limit for interval skips, a fact that did not prevent composers from going beyond it in their melodies under certain circumstances.

We shall later see, however, just how the skip of a minor sixth must, even in counterpoint lessons, frequently serve to separate the voices when they have come too close together.

Concerning free composition, we see how the chorale melody in Example 12 achieves the collective range of a ninth, d-e₁, without using an interval larger than the second, third, fourth (two times), and fifth (once). It peaks specifically at the word "Mensch"—here, in a very meaningful way—on e₁, the major sixth above the initial g.

Let us go further and consider, for example, Schubert's song "Der Doppelgänger." Here, the total range is from b to g₂, and the nature of free composition favors unities of all sorts. In the main, only the small intervals produce the content while the voice part contains seven skips of the fifth, one of the sixth, one of the octave—interestingly enough, this octave occurs at the words "vor Schmer-

Introduction, pages 17-18.

In the original key of B minor.
zensgewalt" (meas. 30-32)—and extending beyond the octave, a descending ninth, $E^2-F^1$, at the words "eig'nen Gestalt" (meas. 40). Since, however, it is interrupted by a rest, this ninth may be considered an apparent ninth, that is, only a second. (*50)

By the way, the large skip in free composition can be justified more securely and, therefore, can be used in a great variety of situations. We have already seen that in the case of the seventh. But, still larger skips can be required by the nature of the situation; thus, for example, Brahms uses the ninth in order to render, musically, the word "Ode" in the Rhapsodie, Op. 53:

Example 92.

---

6. It is a shame that in vocal music we nowadays stray so often—and thoughtlessly—from the extremely important principle of modest and thoroughly motivated use of larger skips. How often in R. Strauss the voice jumps around to and fro—as if it were simply a keyboard instrument—disregarding the psychical value hidden in the skips! Yet, this double failure to adhere to a principle that is against large skips as well as against the nature of the singing voice, will become obvious even to the less-musical listener—of this, I am convinced.
In his "Tambour" Hugo Wolf uses these skips:

Example 93.

\[\text{Alles schnarchet Ross und Mann}\]

R. Wagner uses a tenth in Tristan und Isolde (vocal line, p. 98):

Example 94.

Hart am Ziel!

And, as a matter of course, still greater skips are used in instrumental music. Recently, in some cases, a problem appears which we have briefly mentioned in the discussion of the seventh (p. 91). The problem is whether or not, in a given instance, the skip actually appears in lieu of another, smaller interval. Thus, we should probably recognize the [121] tenth (in the violins) in the last movement of Haydn's D-Major Symphony, produced by the ever expanding skips beyond the octave, as a real tenth in the melodic sense.\(^7\)

\(^7\)One should certainly not consider it to be a contradiction when I speak here of the ninth, tenth, etc., which are those intervals I had to reject in my Harmonielehre, §§ 113 and 63, because they were judged there only in a harmonic sense and according to their harmonic capacity. In counterpoint they are allowed as intervals of horizontal
Example 95. Haydn, Symphony in D major.

Such is also the case in Beethoven's Symphony No. 3 where the bass skips in the development of the first movement:

Example 96.

or, in R. Wagner's Siegfried Idyll, with the thematic seventh:

Example 97. Full score, page 3.

and the inimitably expressive skips of the ninth in the celli:

direction—without regard to their harmonic, secondary meaning—particularly since, in the horizontal direction, the practice of the art stands for the disposition of even more than two, three, or four octaves.
Example 98. Full score, page 6.

Also, by the way, the skips in the following example by Haydn are probably as genuine as the ones above and logically emanate from high spirits:


In contrast, the bracketed skips of the tenth found in the first movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony (meas. 132 ff.), in the basses, should be recognized as disguised thirds:

Example 100. Beethoven, Symphony No. 9 (meas. 132 ff).

These skips that close the second theme group move diatonically in Bb major from tone to tone—observe the scale, (Bb)-C-D-Eb-F-G-A—until they, completing the scale, finally
arrive at the $b^b$, creating now (in the form of the third) the motive of the last theme group, theme III:


The third, having been hidden in the previous skips of the tenth, clearly emerges here as an honest third. That fact, I believe, should cause the conductor to give those tenths an "espressivo" feeling, in spite of the staccato on the second sixteenth note, and the sforzando on the quarter note, since both designations are far-removed from indicating the all-too-customary staccatissimo of our present-day double bass players. Only for that reason has Beethoven used it here to contrast the approaching legato (with portamento) of the oboes. In short, a stronger expression must be invested even in the tenth in Example 100, for the sake of its actual third-significance, which becomes obvious later, instead of misunderstanding its true thematic meaning by playing it as a stopgap in a rude, unthematic fashion.

---

See Example 101.

The editor at Litolff "corrects" a genuine and distressingly impressive interval of a ninth in Mozart's Piano Quartet in G minor (in the coda of the first movement) to a tenth ($c^7-e^b$)--obviously in order to avoid an enfant terrible dissonance:

Example 102.

Alas, the editor, what a sad subject that is!
Especially with J. S. Bach, we often find the most peculiar and original replacement of smaller intervals by larger ones. Let us look, for example, at the prelude cited in my Harmonielehre, Example 372, especially at measure 6.

The content of this measure, after the "keyboardsque" figure have been reduced to a harmonic structure, is illustrated in Example 103a. But this structure, after the two lower voices have been inverted, leads to the setting shown in Example 103b:

Example 103.

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a)} & \text{b)} \\
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example103a.png} & \includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example103b.png}
\end{array}\]

The prototype in Example 103b directly matches measure 11 (on the same page), with its skips of the ninth and tenth in the bass; see Example 104a:

Example 104.

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a)} & \text{b)} \\
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example104a.png} & \includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example104b.png}
\end{array}\]

[124] The prototype in Example 103b directly matches measure 11 (on the same page), with its skips of the ninth and tenth in the bass; see Example 104a:

Example 104.

\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a)} & \text{b)} \\
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example104a.png} & \includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example104b.png}
\end{array}\]

On page 439.
so that, in reality—this follows from the deduction above—we must assume that underlying the skips of the ninth or tenth in Example 104a are only the intervals of the second and third (as in Example 103b).

Now permit me to point out the portamento (porte de voix) that is often used with larger skips or considered by some authors as inseparable from larger skips. It is well known that the portamento, which has the real task of filling in at least partially the larger skips, is a basic characteristic of the human voice and the string instruments as well. There is some question, however, concerning the possibility of transferring this effect to the clavier, even if a clipped imitation is admitted. To be sure, if the so-called accent is regarded simply as a sign of a portamento to be carried out on the clavier, then it is no small wonder that it is generally disavowed. As far as I am concerned, along with the portamento that emerges through the anticipation as the decisive sign of a genuine clavier portamento, there often

9 Cf. H. Riemann's dictionary article "Accent and Portamento." The so-called double accent (accento doppio) is in reality an anticipation which can be the ingredient of a portamento in certain circumstances (cf. Harmonielehre, §163 ff.). In addition to the examples of anticipation in my Harmonielehre, let me give some other examples of portamento with anticipation:


or, beyond the separating rests, with deep yearning for
occurs even a different notation that was created long ago [125] quite specifically for the clavier; for example:


---

the note of anticipation:

Example 107. Mozart, Piano Quartet in G minor, First Movement.

Example 107. Mozart, Piano Quartet in G minor, First Movement.

---

or with Beethoven:
Example 109. C. P. E. Bach, Sonata No. 2, "Largo,"

[Music notation]


[Music notation]

---

or:

Example 110. Brahms, 1. Intermezzo, Op. 117, No. 2;

In all these examples we see a tie, hence a sustaining of tones, which by itself emphasizes the skip, e.g.: an octave in Example 105/2, measure 2 on the fourth beat; a seventh in Example 105/1, measure 1 on the second beat; a sixth in Example 105/2, measure 2 on the first beat; a third in Example 105/2, measure 1 on the fourth beat, as well as in Examples 109 and 110. Although at the completion of the skip the other tone of the interval is heard with its first—as a result of the sustained note—the interval will thereby be made much clearer to the ear than if the skip had appeared simply naked, so to speak, that is, in sequence without simultaneous coverage of the last tone by the sustaining of the first. In order to convince oneself of the portamento effect in these instances, one must only inversely avoid sustaining the tones. Every ear will immediately hear the difference.

But the portamento that is created in this way on the clavier is different from the portamento of the singer or the violinist. The latter, as we know, is not satisfied simply to show the distance from the beginning of the interval to the end, but also traverses the intermediate space of the interval itself with slurred notes. But that alone does not
allow us to credit this sustaining of tones, as it is generally assumed, merely to the tonal poverty of the clavier and its continual need for filling in. Rather, we must grant this notational figure the totally independent and original intent of a portamento in the interval, even if only to hint at a beginning and end through a peculiar and original connection of the successive and the simultaneous, in keeping with the limitation of the instrument involved (which does not permit a sliding of notes within the space of the interval).

We must remember here that the sustained tones are not voices in the accepted meaning of the word. This can be seen not only from the purpose mentioned above, but also from the realization that instead of having a genuine tie that conceptually would, and should, presuppose one and the same voice, it is, as shown in the above example, only a fake tie between two different voices. It is, then, specifically a clavier tie—nothing can be changed with regard to this intent—an original symbol that does not create real and obligatory voices but, as stated before, wants to animate the performer and force him to express the portamento.

The following example from Handel comes much closer to the real portamento of singers and violinists:
While the tie occurs here within the space of the skip—Example 111a, measure 1, at the fourth and fifth eighth notes (f#\textsuperscript{1} between a\textsuperscript{1} and d#\textsuperscript{1})—the effect of a genuine portamento is reflected in this manner, the effect of sliding the tones through the intermediate space. And again, it is the same here as in the example from Bach; the tie is only an apparent one since it connects two different voices.+

No matter how we consider the effect, it is clear that we have here a fully developed "legatissimo" as the sole property of the clavier, and, therefore, as a real and essential characteristic of the clavier. Thus, we may take it for

---

11 The ties being discussed here (those occurring between the fourth and fifth eighth notes of the first measure and the second and third eighth notes of the second measure) are printed in almost all editions of Handel's Suites—also in the old Nägeli edition—but strangely enough are lacking in the complete edition.

+ By analogy, in the fifth and sixth eighth notes of the first measure, the g#\textsuperscript{1} passing between d#\textsuperscript{1} and b\textsuperscript{1} could be designated as a portamento.
granted that the portamento is basically a "legatissimo." We will not go astray, then, if we frequently apply the portamento in the performance of clavier pieces—regardless of their epoch, classical or postclassical—even if it is not expressly demanded by such ties, but simply by the meaning of the situation.12

[129] But how could even the earliest clavier style be represented as expressionless in the face of such a portamento technique demanding expression?+ This seems just as incomprehensible as it would be to confuse the clavier style with the organ style of that era. In addition to many other distinguishing characteristics, it is the genuine clavier portamento technique that is strong proof that the earliest masters treated the clavier differently from the organ, requiring an almost vocal expression from it. How the performers of today sin against this tenet! How they hammer out, in public or at home, the clavier music of Bach and Handel in a tempo that makes it totally impossible to express the meaning set out in the notation! Chasing and running on the keyboard—behind the hands, as it were, a rising cloud of notes in the street of keys!—never a stop, never lingering, never purity, no soul! It is as if J. S. Bach or Handel, of all people, were confused and incapable of being moved by the soul, and that only we have discovered "expression" for which we presumably supply the best proof with our products! But remember this: the music of J. S. Bach also has expression; this is conceded, without hesitation, by every artist and layman with respect to his vocal works, e.g., the B-minor Mass and the Passions. The violin virtuoso still finds expression in Bach's works for the violin; but hardly does the pianist get himself seated at the


+Such as we see in Example 105.
keyboard to play a work of Bach before the soul of the composition is chased out and only a burlesque remains! Did J. S. Bach suffer from a partial eclipse of the soul? Why, then, [130] does the pianist refuse to hear how violinists or singers of the best tradition—e.g., Joachim, Meschaert—utilize Bach's art of expression? Perhaps they will finally recognize that it is not their task to label J. S. Bach as a clavier-buffoon just to be able to deem themselves as more soulful—alas, what foolish, useless, self-complaisance! Does the piano virtuoso of today really believe that a piece of Liszt, C. Frank, or Grieg has more expression than a suite, partita, or toccata by J. S. Bach? First he must learn to read music, then he will finally comprehend the significance of those very important notations, grasp their essence from within, causing him to become more modest and to recognize that it is his task to render Bach as the great artist and human being he was instead of considering his own art only, and foisting it upon us!

Bellermann writes (p. 107, Sub E):

Each larger interval such as the octave is naturally excluded from the melody. Accordingly, the intervals used in melodies can be classified into three categories:

I. Intervals permitted in both directions:
   - Large semitone
   - Whole tone
   - Minor third
   - Major third
   - Perfect fourth
   - Perfect fifth

II. Intervals permitted ascending only:
   - Minor sixth
   - Octave
III. Completely forbidden intervals:

Tritone  
Diminished fifth  
Major sixth  
Minor seventh  
Major seventh

The composers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries followed these laws with the greatest (i.e., absolute) strictness, and we must seek the origin of the principles, as I mentioned above, in the practice of Gregorian Chant where they were more narrowly defined because the fifth was the boundary of permitted intervals. I, at least, am not aware of any example of the minor sixth or octave in old Church music. Thus, one must assume that the Mensuralists added these two intervals for their own purposes.

§ 18. Several Skips in Succession.

1. In Different Directions.

When we deal with successive skips, but in different directions, for example:

Example 112.

the ear at first refuses to perceive all these paths as being natural. Rather, it wants to, and must, understand the skips only as detours for the possible, shorter, more direct path that reveals itself when one considers the point at which each successive skip ends. Thus, in the example, our ear must realize the path from d₁ to e₁ as the primary one (hence, the simpler one) once it has led to e₁ and to the second skip, a₁–e₁. Why, then, take the detour, a₁, if we could have gone to e₁ by a more direct path? Similarly, the ear would have the right, later in the composition, to hear e₁ as a detour
to the goal, \( g^1 \) (coming from \( a^1 \)). Time and again the skips\(^+\) only perplex us and create many doubts. The doubts, in turn, must cause us to judge a melody "bad" when it contains so many skips.

But the fact that we regard two skips in different directions as a detour gives the latter the power of special expression: there must have been a reason for it, since the normal path has been left and, rightfully, the foundation has now been laid for the skips themselves. It is clear that, because of the expression associated with them, such successive skips should still be forbidden in the cantus firmus.

---

Even if skips are excluded in free composition for the same reason, inasmuch as they are only a representation of a more direct path, they are, because of their strong expression, not only welcome but necessary. For example:


\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{That is} & \text{for:} \\
\end{array}
\]

\( \S 19.-2. \) In the Same Direction.

If two or more skips proceed in the same direction, they produce still other disadvantages for the leading of the melody. They may easily exceed the established limits of range or outline a triad or seventh-chord which is forbidden

\(^+\)If they are without the intervention of a second.
here because of the need to strictly maintain the balance. Thus the following skips are bad:

Example 114.

\[\text{Example 114.}\]

Rarely is the situation in the cantus firmus so propitious that the further melodic succession can absorb the dangerous sum of several skips in the same direction and thereby avoid the detection of the ear.

Referring to second species, two-part counterpoint, Albrechtsberger explains (p. 38):

Three or four skips should never create a ninth-chord or a major seventh-chord, even if the cantus firmus as the fundamental voice would produce good accords. Also, three or four skips creating a minor seventh are seldom good. The diminished seventh may be tolerated.

Here, many examples then follow to illustrate this statement. (*52) In reference to the skipping through accords, he recommends tolerance of the diminished-seventh sum. We even find the following example:

Example 115.

---

*Cf. Section I, Chapter 1, §3.*
Let us note that he discussed his rule only with regard to second species counterpoint. There, circumstances permitting (since four notes stand against two in the cantus firmus), a diminished-seventh sum can, through a beneficial turning of the cantus firmus, be more easily eradicated than in the cantus firmus or even in first species. So, in contrast to the rule stated on page 23 (where he forbids the diminished seventh), it is clear that he permits such sums in second species. In my opinion, only the surrounding factors can decisively determine whether the seventh-sum threatens to stand out too drastically from the total structure; through that alone it creates an undesirable effect and is, accordingly, to be forbidden. Furthermore, no distinctions should be made in the seventh, so that the sum of the diminished seventh, permitted by Albrechtsberger, must also be forbidden.

As far as Cherubini is concerned, let us compare his rule VI (p. 7) already cited in §9 of this chapter.

§20. The Requirement of the Flowing Melody.

If we want to avoid the dangers that large intervals entail, no matter whether they move in the same or different direction, we will probably find that the best means is simply to interrupt the succession of skips, that is, to impede the second skip by allowing only a second (or a slightly larger interval) to follow the first skip. Or we can change the direction of the second interval. Finally, we can also apply both expedients.

By such tactics a type of wavey line is created in the melody that as a whole represents a living unity. With its ascending and descending direction it offers an appearance of balance in all its individual phases. We call these lines "flowing melody" [fliessenden Gesang] and, at the same time, state that the second, as the smallest interval and savior in every emergency, is the medium of flowing interval melody.+

In flowing melody we therefore find a sort of compensating aesthetic justness with regard to the collective

+Cf. §21.
organization of the tones, so that each individual tone serves the collective purpose just as much as its own ends.

If a flowing melody has been achieved, it will, of itself, radiate a particular melodic beauty that, of course, remains far beneath that of the individual melody of free composition based upon unities. But, in spite of all its limitations, it is at least equally far-removed from a planless confusion. Even in the cantus firmus, burdened with its exercise function, there is a meager melodic beauty, but nevertheless a beauty. The small organism constructed by observing so many artificial restrictions also has its soul!

One will, therefore, immediately understand why the following cantus firmus models have to be designated unsuccessful:

Example 116.

Example 117.

Example 118.
The moral lesson of the flowing melody also applies to free composition.

First of all, in the highest metaphysical and exemplary sense, it applies to the fact that the totality of an art work represents nothing more than the sum of the individual parts whose individual ends serve the purpose of the whole as well. These two intentions must therefore exist in a symphonic work as a balanced totality just as in the modest cantus firmus that serves only as an exercise.

We want to describe in more practical terms, however, the demands of the flowing melody in free composition in order to mention special aspects that are rarely talked about, and we want to see them carried out, for example, in the lines of a keyboard or a violin composition. Such a line may be based on the presupposition of a polyphony and strive, in this sense, to link several latent voices to form a unity.++ It may only seek to vary a given melodic line in the sense of declamatory monody,+++ or it may represent only a filler voice that, nevertheless, takes its obligatory course--let us think of the often misunderstood line in Chopin's F-sharp major Nocturne, measures 18-24:

Example 119.

\[\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{Measures:} & 18 \text{ (r.h.)} & 19 & 20 \text{ (r.h.)} & 21 & 22 & 23 & 24 \\
\text{\textbf{(l.h.)}} & & & & & & & \\
\end{array}\]

++ Cf. above, Example 48 and Example 76.

+++For example, let us think of the violin figures created with such genius in the "Adagio" of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, measures 43 ff., or in measures 99 ff., which only signify a variation of the simple line of the theme. Or, think of the rhetorical non-legato violin figures in so many of Haydn's symphonies.
Finally, such a line may represent the most hidden product, the ultimate expression of ascending and descending figures as, for example, can be found in the "Prelude" of J. S. Bach's D-minor English Suite, measures 1-15:

Example 120.

All the same, the precept of the flowing melody governs in each of these cases and persists no less than in the modest, simple, cantus firmus itself!

Therefore, lines in free composition that lack balance in the to and fro of the tones and thus fail to bring to the expression a goal of unity strike us as being poor. That is to say, even free composition cannot always justify a misused freedom of tones. Along with so many other infractions of the laws of both tonality and form, the newest works of the literature often also contain such mistakes in the design of a simple melodic line. This too can surely be considered proof of the deprivation of artistic instinct. Strangely enough, no one was more susceptible to the danger of building a faulty melodic line than Anton Bruckner, who often enough was capable of constructing the most beautiful, original, and touching sort of melody. If we had not always had artists like him whose great talents were marked by a deep flaw, it would be hard to understand how Bruckner could have written such lines as, for example:

+These are hard to satisfy in an artistic way.
Example 121. Bruckner, Symphony No. 1 (full score, page 14).

Example 122. Bruckner, Symphony No. 1 (full score, page 16).
Example 123. Bruckner, Symphony No. 1 (full score, pages 26-27).

Example 124. Bruckner, Te Deum (full score, page 5).

Example 126. Bruckner, Psalm 150 (full score, page 16).

Do not suspect me of error about Bruckner, for I realize that in many cases the cited lines are simply accompaniment and receive their actual meaning from the harmonies to which they belong. But that is precisely the point—the awkwardness of those lines is caused by Bruckner's slavish chord-by-chord adherence to the harmonies even though the latter seem so variegated and changeable. How he abuses the third moving upward or downward with the most abundant use of color changes! Thus, it was obviously difficult for him to span a unified contrapuntal line over a harmonic succession that lacks unity. That is the reason for the very annoying angles in the violin and brass figures, with which, unfortunately, he often surrounds his harmonies.

With regard to second species, Albrechtsberger teaches: "After a large skip between two notes, the third note should at least return by a skip of a fourth or third [139] when it cannot return by step." Cherubini explains on page 2: "The movement is melodic and flowing if it moves stepwise. It is bounding if it moves by skip." Expressed in such a way, the flowing melody has, without a doubt, been conceived too narrowly. Surely it may have skips so long as they blend into the whole and do not disturb the balance.

*Cf. above, the remarks in § 19.

**Cf. further, Rule VI (page 7) cited in § 9.
To be sure, an irrefutable truth is expressed, nevertheless, in Cherubini's remark that the second provides the best foundation for the "flowing" and "melodic" song.

On page 104 we find the following statement in Bellermann:

On this occasion let me remark that one should not make two skips of a fourth or fifth in the same direction and should avoid, in any case, the use of several successive skips in the same direction. The beauty and the gracefulness of a melody depends on its use, if possible, of all the steps in its range, whether this is small or large. After a large ascending skip the melody takes a small interval descending, and vice versa [when the skip descends]. Yet, most of the matters discussed here depend on the composer's musical sensitivity. The ungraciousness and awkwardness in both of the following melodies will be heard by everyone:

Example 127.

On the other hand, the following will be sung with pleasure by everyone, even though we have a skip of a fifth and third following one another in the same direction ascending:

Example 128.

He makes a remark in reference to the Hypoaeolian example:

It cannot be denied that melodic skips such as a fifth and a minor third or the like in the same direction can now and then have a good effect; we can
find examples in Gregorian Chant as well as Protestant church tunes. However, we must advise the beginner in composition to avoid such skips entirely, particularly [140] two or three skips in the same direction whose outer tones frame the interval of a seventh, ninth, or tenth. Such skips are even worse descending than ascending.

We shall understand the explanation and the distinction between good and bad in all these examples of Bellermann when we seek the reasons, not only for the skips themselves but for other considerations as well. Thus, the example that Bellermann designates as "Ionian" should not be considered bad only because of the skips and the obvious outlining of the triad C-G and the seventh-chord C-D, but mostly because outlining appears twice,\(^\dagger\) whereby the outlining alone, as such, has an unwelcome effect. In the Dorian example, the "harmonic sum" of the whole cantus firmus lacks the third (f) altogether, so that the ear cannot decide with certainty the movement or the significance of the tones--and if, in addition, B and G are allowed to encroach in its place, then the doubt and the indetermination render that question entirely insolvable. Conversely, in the example that Bellermann designates as Hypoaeolian, the firmness of the triad A-E-C is the propitious condition that prevents the outlining of the seventh, E-B-D, from being noticeably disturbing; the ear adds to the previous skips the long-awaited C (third to A and E), and thus the unity and the balance of the melody must be declared safe and sound in spite of the skip. The last example speaks for itself.

\section*{\textsection 21. The Prohibition of So-called Monotony.}

The repetition of a set of tones within the cantus firmus draws attention and serves as a disturbance to the balance of the whole melody. Such repetition is therefore forbidden in the cantus firmus.

To this we must add the following error:

\(\dagger\)From \(c^1\) to \(c^2\) and, vice versa, \(c^2\) to \(c^1\).
Example 129.

This example does not concern a fixed succession of tones, but only the peaking on the tone $A$ two times. One of these is certainly superfluous. How much better is the following [141] revision of the same melody. It now has a more unified goal:

Example 130.

In my Harmonielehre, § 4f, I have already thoroughly stressed that in free composition the repetition of a set of tones creates a motive. Thus, what must be called monotony in the cantus firmus is, as repetition, to be considered a principal ingredient in free composition. The kinds of repetition that are available, small and large, will be shown in another context.

Albrechtsberger writes (p. 38):

**Monotonie**: The unity of tones, that is, the repetition of some notes, is forbidden. But, in free composition, which is not counterpoint, these are often found. After all, good masters add a different bass or middle part to the repetition, or change it with piano and forte, varying the instrumentation at that point, or set this same idea, occurring a second time, an octave higher or lower. Here, they are both loathsome and wrong even though the chorale is varied.
How naive all these remarks are in so far as they refer to free composition, even though the observation that the same idea is not to be expressed again in the same way has more value than is evident in this modest discourse concerning the problem of monotony. Let us think, for example, of the frequently misunderstood principle of varying the reprise of a sonata movement, a principle that has tempted so many editors of classical works (even Bülow) to make false and arbitrary revisions. We will have to talk about this problem in detail later. (*53)

Compare also Albrechtsberger's corrections that are included in Nottebohm's Beethoven-Studien (p. 48). See Example 131b, which "improves" Beethoven's mistake (Example 131a):

Example 131.

Yet, from the standpoint of monotony, I consider his own (later-stated) cantus firmus lesson in § 23, No. 7 (in minor) a failure.


The prohibition of chromatic movement+ does not prevent a melody from modulating to a related key if necessary, provided that the modulation is achieved through a reinterpretation of the affected interval and remains in an otherwise perfectly natural relationship to the work as a whole.++ Thus, in the following example, which presents a variant of Fux's cantus firmus that is cited on page 79, (Example 40), we may consider the bracketed passage as a

+See above, § 4.

++Harmonielehre, § 64, page 97, 171 f.
possible diversion towards C major as long as we perceive the work as a whole to be in D minor: Example 132.

Example 132.

Albrechtsberger constructs a counterpoint in C major:

Example 133.

and remarks: "The N.B. over f♯ in the alto points out that the sharp has been applied intentionally since we are permitted to modulate to the related keys."

Compare Cherubini's cantus firmus in § 23, No. 9.

CLOSING

§ 23. The Closing Formulas.

First of all, there is no doubt that even though the primary tone of the key must appear at the beginning as well as at the end of the cantus firmus, there are, nevertheless, many possibilities for approaching the final tone.

With regard to the penultimate tone, it must always be the second above or below if the closing effect is to be reached in the most tranquil and normal way, (which can be the only intent in the cantus firmus). For example, in C major, if we call the two approaching seconds "leading tones":

\[\text{On p. 32.}\]
Example 134.

at a) the descending, at b) the ascending, then the rule for a normal closing can be formulated: the penultimate tone must be one of the two leading tones.

Cantus firmus melodies in minor mode require the ascending leading tone to be a semitone instead of the diatonic whole tone. For example in A minor:

Example 135.

The raised tone should be interpreted only as a borrowing from the parallel major key, here, A major.

But that is not all. The exigencies of the flowing melody and the most natural close extend also to a third tone, in other words, to the tone that comes before the ascending or descending leading tone. For, in similar fashion, to reach the leading tone itself in the most tranquil manner and aid it most effectively in its cadence function, it is best once again to use only a second. But obviously, if we can push to the leading tone from either the second above or below, the closing formulas for the descending leading tone (see Example 134a) are these:

+Cf. Harmonielehre, § 23, § 45.
These formulas are to be preferred over the following ones where the leading tone is approached by the skip of a third:

Example 137.

In minor mode, the formulas are as follows:

Example 138.

If we want to judge these four formulas in major as well as minor on an absolute scale, then we must recognize 1 and 2 as equally good. Those two are better than number 3; number 4 is the worst. This last judgment stems from the fact that with B, in C major (or with G# in A minor), the path of the ascending leading tone has already been indicated—we could have gone directly to C in C major (or to A in A minor). Therefore, an unsteadying effect must result if we
abandon the original path and skip to the pathway of the descending leading tone so that both paths (i.e., the ascending and descending approach to the leading tone) will now appear in a somewhat impure and indistinct manner.

Mutatis mutandis, we have for the ascending leading tone (see Example 134b) the following closing formulas:

Example 139. In major:

Example 140. In minor:

N.B. Minor mode requires at the same time a raising of the sixth scale degree because the augmented second from F to G# must be avoided. Nevertheless, the standardization of the individual formulas serving the cantus firmus must result from the same principles as the formulas for the descending leading tone.

From this we can see that, for the cantus firmus, the

---

+ Example 140, at no. 1.
++ Cf. § 7 of this volume and § 42 in Harmonielehre.
+++ Above, Example 138.
interval of the third should be designated as the outer limit of the third tone from the end, regardless of the leading tone or the direction. Larger skips, for example, those of a fourth or fifth, must impair the effect of the close and spoil its repose:

Example 141.

They demand for themselves the expression of a particular mood and that is the very reason for such an effect. This demand can only be fulfilled in free composition, where it is most welcome.

Now, for an insight into possible closings—if, in free composition, the closing no longer depends entirely on the horizontal line but more on the vertical harmony, or more precisely, on the V-I progression, then in this alone we have [146] a source of numerous freedoms that the cantus firmus can never enjoy without injuring its primary purpose— that of teaching.

The following examples show that in free composition even with the unhindered use of intervals larger than a third on the way to the leading tone, the closing formula may otherwise adhere to the accepted order for the cantus firmus (leading tone, then tonic) in the melody.

Example 143. J. S. Bach, English Suite in D minor, "Gavotte."


Compare these examples to the skip of the sixth in the Chopin example (Example 113) along with the explanation.

If we can see how Beethoven simplifies and improves the cadence of the "Adagio" of Leonore Overture No. 2\(^+\) in the Leonore Overture No. 3\(^++\), then we will learn to appreciate Beethoven's honest and deep insight:

\(^+\)Example 145a.

\(^++\)Example 145b.
In his second effort, he understood that, despite the nature of free composition, to compose as in 145a would have been futile. Why should one produce tension through augmentation and rests, or transcend the actual cadence line with $D^b$? And finally, what is the meaning of the mysterious $<$? He obviously realized that at this point there should be no mystery, least of all one with such exaggerated self-purpose. He realized that all such efforts would fall into a void of ineffectiveness and that only the simplest and shortest setting as illustrated at 145b could be suitable here.

As far as the avoidance of the leading tone is concerned, one can cite the descending fifth to tonic:


or in combination, the descending fifth with the leading tone:

$^+$Cf. above, Example 139a, meas. 4:
Example 147. Haydn, Divertimento in F minor, Variation 1.

\[ \text{Example 147. Haydn, Divertimento in F minor, Variation 1.} \]

Finally, because the V-I descending fifth in free composition unburdens the melody of the same sort of contribution to the cadence that is required of the cantus firmus, it may be permitted to close on the third or fifth of tonic harmony, instead of only on the tonic note itself; for example:

Example 148. J. S. Bach, Three-Part Inventions, No. 5.

\[ \text{Example 148. J. S. Bach, Three-Part Inventions, No. 5.} \]

In another sense, the cadences in chorale melodies erroneously considered as Dorian, Phrygian or Mixolydian also belong in this category. If we rank them (to the extent that they are artistically structured) in one of the valid systems, that is, in major or minor, we shall see closings on the fifth of the tonic harmony, as in Example 12 of this volume and Example 141 in Harmonielehre.

We have seen in Example 80 above that Albrechtsberger does not shy away from skipping by diminished fourth into

\[ \text{Cf. below, three and four-part composition.} \]

\[ \text{As the cantus firmus always must.} \]
the leading tone. There, also, the explanation of this phenomenon was given from his point of view, namely, that he would be bothered less with the skip of a third. Thus, his view becomes quite understandable. Albrechtsberger's indifference concerning the problem of the tone to be used before the leading tone forces us to credit him with having a faulty view of the task of teaching counterpoint. He surely knew the difference in the effects but did not clearly perceive that it was his task to teach this difference instead of permitting all possible formulas, not to mention using them in the spirit of actual composition without having made clear the necessary distinction.

[149] Only Bllermann takes the time, in a separate chapter, to speak about the "establishment of cadences." Naturally, it would be too much to reiterate here the entire, very worthwhile chapter. Let me point out, however, that there, too, unfortunately, in addition to the praiseworthy material, the not fully matured viewpoint of the author is repeatedly prominent. That is to say, insights and judgments of the effects can not illuminate by actual practice when both counterpoint and free composition are presented in such direct connection. What is the meaning of the statement: "The skip of a third downwards to the seventh scale-degree is permitted and appears in some chorale melodies." And in the following example, what does it mean to indicate "good"?

Example 149.

\[
\text{Aeolian (good)}
\]

What could the abundant practice of a chorale melody affirm here before the effect of such a skip of a third, or other larger skips, in contrast to movement by step is presented and substantiated? Is it the task of counterpoint to give insight into the free life of tones based upon many other principles?

+Cf. similar skips of the fourth on page 75, skips of the fifth and sixth on page 36 of his work, etc.

++Chapter IX, p. 120f.

+++Which we have encountered again and again.

++++See the Introduction.
Dehn never gets to the point of communicating his thoughts on the general aspects of the cadence, but we can see that in his disastrous method he presents the students with real chorale melodies as cantus firmi. After all, the chorales progress through various fermatas and different cadences! What unnecessary difficulty and devastating confusion this must cause for the learner who should, and must, hear the cadence effect as something simple!

To the already-cited melodies—see in §6 the cantus firmus by Fux and a variation of it in §22—let me add a few more at this point.

Example 150.
I purposely cited the melodies of Fux, Albrechtsberger, and Cherubini, in order to show the attitude of these teachers not only in words but also in practice. We have many reasons for judging the melodies of Fux to be better than those of Albrechtsberger or Cherubini, but finding these reasons, according to the measures given in my previous discussion, may be left to the reader himself.

Bellermann, for the most part, uses the melodies of Fux; Cherubini uses them only occasionally.
CHAPTER 1
FIRST SPECIES: NOTE AGAINST NOTE
GENERAL COMMENTS

§ 1. The Concept of the Counterpoint.

If we set a second voice above or below a cantus firmus, it is called the counterpoint.

Such a two-voice texture brings about natural situations whose treatment offers a gratifying field for learning the discrimination of the musical sense.

§ 2. Permissible Intervals.

Only consonances may be used in this species.

The reason for this is exclusively connected with the nature of the present situation itself, which, due to the lack of scale-degrees and a richer motion of the counterpoint, does not have the power to clarify the true meaning of dissonances.

The use of dissonance would have to lead to the formation of larger harmonic unities as shown in the following example:

+Cf. Harmonielehre, § 84 f.
In Example 151a the ear would have to combine the interval succession 8-4 into the sum of $B\text{-}D\text{-}F$, and in 151b the succession 8-7-5 into the sum of $D\text{-}F\#\text{-(A)}\text{-}C$ with the passing tone $E$ in the cantus firmus. However, as is obviously seen, the balance of the united sonorities would suffer considerably. In the first case there would be a single prominent tone reaching over two harmonic figures, and in the second case it would reach over three such sonorities, i.e., $B$ in 151a, and $D$ in 151b; the motion of the voices could be derived from these tones and understood in that way.

Thus, consonance is its own proof; it is self-sufficient and signifies, in itself, beginning and end. This is not the case with dissonance, however, from which we demand further proof for its existence. In contrast to consonance, dissonance is not self-sufficient, rather, it points unequivocally beyond itself. It can exist only in relationship to a consonance; it must be understood from and through consonance, that is, consonance can be only the beginning and end of dissonance.

In this sense, consonance reveals an absolute character, whereas dissonance is merely relative and derivative: In the beginning was consonance! It is the primary
element, while dissonance is secondary:

From this it follows that dissonance must be proven,\(^+\) whereas consonance is supported by its pleasing sound and is, therefore, unconditional and without need of further proof. This is the real question: how do we deduce the proof for the necessity of a dissonance in a contrapuntal lesson that certainly lacks the leading quality and constraint of the harmonic scale-degrees? For the time being, in these lessons we must avoid dissonance as a completely unprovable entity. We must base sonorities exclusively on consonance, which by its very nature, as long as possibilities are lacking to prove dissonance, signifies the only principle, the only logic of united sonorities.

Later, to be sure, we will see how, under certain conditions, even dissonant sonorities can be cultivated over a sustained tone in the cantus firmus—that is the principal difference between the present and future situation. But, no matter how the situation may appear there, the basic axiom will always retain unalterable validity; namely: "In the beginning was consonance!"

Only free composition may renounce a genuine and clear continuation of assembled tones\(^++\) and assume merely hypothetical tones that can be the required bearers of dissonance. To be sure, these hypothetical tones are so much present in the consciousness that they may be designated as real. In the main, they are the scale-degrees that have their own

---

\(^+\)Namely, through a consonance.

\(^++\)Such as the cantus firmus in the exercises of later species.
concealed movement, and the familiarity of our feelings with them makes the acceptance of these hypothetical tones, which lie outside the actual voice leading, natural to us.

Without detriment to total freedom in free composition, practical significance must also be accorded to the main principle preached in the teaching of counterpoint: "In the beginning was consonance!" There, too, we must attribute to [155] consonance that which, for dissonance, can not, and may not be proven. Alas, if only the artists of today would finally realize how utopian it is to imagine that our senses could ever grant equality to consonance and dissonance. Consonance and dissonance cannot play the same role—the law of nature will not permit the same thing to happen the same way twice!

§ 3. Why the Vertical Fourth Is Forbidden.

If, in the consonances as they are used melodically in a horizontal line, we consider the octave, fifth, and fourth as perfect consonances, and the third and sixth as imperfect, then, in a vertical alignment, we must make only one exception, the fourth. Vertically, the fourth must be considered a dissonance, and as a result, it is entirely forbidden.

As we know from Section I, Chapter 2, § 13, the reason for this prohibition is that the fourth is a boundary interval of the harmonic triad, but its status is secondary to the fifth (the original boundary interval) because it is a boundary interval only by means of artificial inversion. As an inverted boundary interval, the fourth lacks from the

+Cf. Harmonielehre, § 76f.

+++Cf. Harmonielehre, § 73, and here, Section I, Chapter 2, § 10.
onset the perfection of the fifth. Thus, the changed situation of vertical alignment, in contrast to a horizontal line, is the reason the lack of perfection suddenly and disturbingly appears here (even though the same lack in the horizontal direction of a melody could not lead to such a prohibition). In the horizontal direction+ the melodic succession allows time, as it were, for the musical intelligence and at least permits it to make the necessary detour over the fifth. Here, on the other hand, the simultaneous appearance of both voices makes it impossible to have a [156] presentiment for the corresponding original fifth. The simultaneity of the vertical alignment is a fait accompli that makes it impossible to perceive the fifth except after the fact. It follows that, in the moment when two tones unite into the interval of the fourth, the simultaneity suddenly creates a barrier to the presentation of the perfection of the boundary interval as it is tendered in the fifth, so that one cannot attain it even by means of a detour. The only thing left, therefore, since the perfection of the effect++ cannot be achieved even after the fact, is to satisfy oneself afterwards as to whether the simultaneity of the fourth represents an inversion of an original fifth (and in this sense a boundary interval), or something else. The vertical fourth, since it is prevented from expressing the boundary of the triad perfectly,+++ can represent a suspension or an accented passing tone with a quite dissonant character. By this means, as we know, a perfect consonance must change into a dissonance immediately!

In order to make the uncertainty of the vertical

+As carried out in the place cited.
++As that in the fifth.
+++Exactly on the basis of this lack.
fourth clearly evident, let us examine a two-voice sketch. Is the fourth a boundary interval of the triad as in Example 152a or is it a suspension as in 152b, or is it an accented passing tone as in 152c?

Example 152.

We can express it in another way. With the vertical-sounding fourth, there is doubt as to whether it is an inversion of the fifth pretending to be, as such, a perfect consonance or a suspension, or the like. This doubt is caused by the fact that the simultaneous sounding of both tones unfortunately prevents the fourth from expressing, with the same certainty and perfection as the fifth, the character of a boundary interval that may be manifested in the fourth. In this new situation, this lesser degree of perfection necessarily creates doubts both unknown and impossible in a horizontal context,† and, at the same time, accounts for the fact that the fourth may become a dissonance, of course only by exception!

This implies e contrario—in order to pursue the problem of the fourth further—that the fourth, again, acquires its original consonant character as soon as it frees itself from the restraint of a rivalry‡ with the fifth, that is, as soon as its character as a boundary interval ceases to stand so strongly and exclusively in the foreground. This is

†Whether the fourth is not a suspension, or the like.
‡‡As boundary interval.
the case when, for example in composition for three or more parts, the fourth is not the lowest interval* but is placed in the upper voices. For example:

Example 153.

In this situation, the following intervals are heard ascending: at a) a third E-G, after that a sixth E-C; at b) a third C-E, a fifth C-G, and finally an octave C-C; in no case, however, does the fourth G-C stand in the foreground, and certainly not too drastically as a boundary interval.

To put it differently, in these cases the character of the questionable "boundary interval of second rank" is ever present in the fourth but is totally balanced by the forceful and certain effects of the other intervals based on [158] the lowest voice.

In comparison to the fifth, the deficiency of the fourth as a boundary interval is so unnoticeable in these situations that even the augmented fourth must be permitted, as for example:

Example 154.

To be sure, with regard to the disagreeable association of the notes B and F in the same diatonic scale,** the latter

---

*Where it would create the old doubt again.

**Cf. Harmonielehre, §§ 17, 18, 58, and 65.
are used where their encounter in the composition, particularly in polyphony, is simply an unavoidable necessity.

In free composition the scale-degrees provide a means for learning more quickly and easily about the nature of the fourth as the lowest interval. Thus, for example:

Example 155. Haydn, Divertimento in F minor.

[159] In the second quarter note of measure two, we probably expect the $F^7$ as a VI-degree to be followed by a descending fifth, $B^b$, as the II. And when the harmony of the latter expresses itself merely through the inversion of the fourth (thus less perfectly), our sensibility for scale-degrees is still able, by means of its logic and dominance, to overlook the imperfection of the boundary interval and the moment of
doubt, at least in the quickest tempo. Thus we are able to arrive at the conviction that here the fourth has meant nothing more than the inversion of the fifth all along. This is also the case in the next measure with the fourth $E^b_A^b$ on the second quarter note, which we hear, after the preceding progression, as nothing other than a fifth within the tonic triad, $A^b_E^b$.+++

As we see, the movement of the lowest voice acquires a flowing character by avoiding the skip of a fifth at the scale-degree change and utilizes, rather, the six-four position of the new harmony. The bass is thereby spared a large skip and guaranteed a quieter movement. Because of this economy, free composition uses the six-four inversion also in situations such as the following:

Example 156. a) Wagner, Tristan and Isolde.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Example 156. a) Wagner, Tristan and Isolde.} \\
\text{\includegraphics{example156.png}} \\
\text{\footnotesize As to whether we are dealing with one.} \\
\text{\footnotesize ++At the descending fifth progression, $E^b_A^b(V-I)$.} \\
\text{\footnotesize +++Cf. Harmonielehre, Example 62, meas. 3-4; Example 101, p. 147, meas. 6, 7, and 8!} 
\end{align*} \]
But it is wise to distinguish from such use the effect of the six-four inversion when it is simply an integral part of the organ point. Finally, I want to warn here of a misuse of the six-four chord; nowadays, it is being used too often simply with the intention of retaining the bass tone as long as possible without change!

Free composition is also, of course, in a position to grant a number of preferential treatments to the fourth used as the lowest interval through the abstract addition of a scale-degree below the fourths, making them simply "upper voices"; for example:

Example 157. Schumann, Piano Quartet in E-flat major, First Movement.

\[\text{Cf. Harmonielehre, Examples 82, 86, 93, etc.}\]
Here even the V-degree of E-flat major\(^{+}\) causes the seemingly lowest fourths to ascend higher where they move over the root \(B^b\) merely in a proper, passing context.

Lacking such a clear root, but nevertheless based [161] upon scale-degrees and on our sensibility for the change of harmonies, such low fourths appear in the following example:

Example 158. J. S. Bach, English Suite in D minor, "Gigue."

For all that, free composition does not give up the right to make use of the tension that the fourth creates when it appears in the lowest voices—a tension that is created precisely because of its indeterminate character.\(^{++}\) For example:

\(^{+}\)Which is made apparent, by the way, through the two framing octaves, \(BB^b - E^b\).

\(^{++}\)Just as in cantus firmus lessons.
Example 159. Beethoven, Symphony No. 7, "Allegretto."

![Musical notation]

The doubt raised by the fourth is this: do we deal here with the inversion of the A-minor triad, as the tonic degree, or with a suspension over the root E moving in a free manner, as the progression must be:

Example 160.

![Musical notation]

adapting itself quite admirably in order to provide an exciting introduction. To be sure, in measure three of the following example:

Example 161. Beethoven, Symphony No. 9, First Movement.

![Musical notation]
the logic of the degree progression forces us to assume at the second quarter note only the V-degree, so that we are willing to hear from this point the fourth as a suspension to the third:

\[ \frac{6}{5} \]

\[ A(4 - 3)D \]

D minor : V --- I

Surprisingly enough, the expected resolution does not appear in spite of the fact that in measure four even the basses have another occasion to sound the dominant, A; instead, the tonic simply follows. In the final analysis, was the fourth not a suspension but instead an inversion of the fifth? Was there, as a result, not the V but only the I-degree to be heard? In any case, it is only the fourth set in the lowest position that can pose such puzzles. Considering the situation backwards starting from the final goal, we cannot deny that we heard the V before the tonic and therefore an ellipsis of the expected resolution: \[ \frac{5}{3} \]. If we decide to take this as a solution, then it remains true, at least to the [163] decisive moment, that the tension of the fourth alone was the prerequisite for our expectation and our disappointment.++

Let us also compare a similarly ingenious construction of the six-four chord in Schumann's Waldszenen, No. 1

---

++Especially after the raised IV-degree, G#.

+++Let us not forget the two unassuming thirty-second notes c#\(^2\) and d\(^2\) in the beginning of the last measure of the above example, where Beethoven seeks to accommodate our disappointed expectation of the dominant harmony, at least in retrospect; particularly the c#\(^2\) sounds in every nook and cranny like a last, parting glance that has not been able to quite reach the intended object of our longing—the harmony of the dominant!
We read in Fux (Chap. 17, pp. 38 ff.):

Who fails to see that not the fourth, but rather the fifth and octave are responsible for the following example:

Example 162. Table I, Figure 2.

For the intervals are to be measured according to their bass note and not according to their middle parts... (*54) If we understand the fourths to be created from an arithmetic division:

Example 163. Table I, Figure 4.

then I do not know how we can classify them with the consonances. Some believe that they must have been considered consonant by the ancients, not only in thought, because this interval stems from the direct division of the octave, but also in practice. I do not wish to quarrel with anyone who wants to make such a claim, however, the usage established through so many centuries seems to contradict that attitude, and we should take our cues from established usage. Experience teaches that the use of the fourth does not differ from that of the remaining consonances except when it is placed in a syncopation or tying. Certainly the fourth sounds less grating than the other dissonances and is more agreeable to the ear. Yet, the ear is still not quite pleased by its sound; for example:
[164] Example 164. Table I, Figure 5.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
| & & \\
| & & \\
| & & \\
| & & \\
| & & \\
| & & \\
\end{array} \]

On the contrary, it obviously awaits the fifth below; for example:

Example 165. Table I, Figure 6.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
| & & \\
| & & \\
| & & \\
| & & \\
| & & \\
| & & \\
\end{array} \]

With what quiet words does Fux insist, in the last sentence, on the deep seated secret of the fourth having become a dissonance. He points up the doubt as to whether the fourth in the given case may only be an inversion of the fifth, the reason for the doubt being that the ear could not be "quite pleased." But how insecure and how hesitating are the conclusions he draws from that.

Let us listen to Bellermann (p. 128 ff., III):

To the third class standing between consonance and dissonance we include the perfect fourth, the tritone, and the diminished fifth. We have seen above that the first of these intervals, the perfect fourth, must, as the inversion of the perfect fifth, be classed with the primary intervals; it has the simple vibration ratio of $3:4$. The two other intervals are created only indirectly and they exhibit the most complicated vibration ratio numbers of the diatonic scale (namely, $32:45$ and $45:64$). Nevertheless, all three are treated, in certain cases to be discussed later, as imperfect consonances, and in other cases as real dissonances. In order to make myself clear I will discuss the respective intervals individually.

a) The perfect fourth is always a dissonance in two-part composition:
and, also in three, four, or more parts, if the lower of the two tones is, at the same time, the lowest tone of a sonority of the three, four, or more parts—thus, always in a six-four chord as here:

[165] Example 167.

It appears as an imperfect consonance, however, when it is created by two middle or upper parts. If we add to the case cited above a lower consonant note, then the fourth situated in the middle or at the top loses its dissonant quality and becomes an imperfect consonance, for example:

Example 168.
This phenomenon can be explained as follows: We consider the lowest voice of a chord as the basis upon which the higher voices are built and on this basis we compare the tones. If we add to a fourth a lower tone consonant with both tones of the fourth (therefore either the lower octave or sixth of the upper tone of the fourth), the ear hears in the first case (measured from the bass) a fourth and an octave and in the other case a third and a sixth. The fourth situated between the upper parts seems to disappear completely.

Such a disappearance of the dissonance by means of an added bass tone only happens in the case of the fourth; according to its nature it is an actual consonance.

I must interrupt Bellermann to ask why the fourth has been declared a dissonance in two-part composition. It seems that Bellermann does not even notice that in the meantime he has accepted the dissonant character of the fourth and has maintained this without proving it. And when he, at the end of the thought process, declared that the fourth "is an actual consonance according to its nature," then one can not understand his point of departure: "the perfect fourth is always a dissonance in two-part composition." What, then, has Bellermann proved? Nothing other than the fact that the fourth ceases to be a dissonance when it is not the lowest interval. This, however, presupposes that he should have proven somewhere that the fourth begins to be a dissonance when it is in the lowest position. The proof of that statement however--thus the most important thing--is lacking in Bellermann's discussion. [He continues]:

It is another matter when two upper voices stand in a truly dissonant relationship, that is, when they form a second or seventh. These intervals, because of their many complicated frequencies and because they are actually dissonant, can never be ignored by the ear.

Unfortunately, I must interrupt Bellermann again. It is quite unnecessary to make such a big distinction between the fourth and any other dissonance in the upper voices. For example:
Example 169.

which can be heard as a fourth and second in a), or a fourth and seventh in b) or, from below, as a fourth and fifth in a), or a fourth and third in b). It is a fact that when a dissonance is created between two upper voices, like the second or seventh in the just-cited examples, these intervals in the upper voices are dissonant not so much by reason of their own being, than inversely, because they both cannot combine into the same triad. It is only because a fifth and a fourth cannot both be part of the same triad, and for that reason alone, that they must be dissonant with one another and, according to their position, form either a second or a seventh. But it is clear that this fact is entirely unessential in the face of the more important one that a tone is directly dissonant with the bass tone and in what way it is. The question remains open, according to Bellermann's logic, as to why the fourth is a dissonance only when it is the lowest interval, since it is not dissonant in the upper voices and there it is not even important which interval is used, whether it be a consonance or dissonance, or a fourth, second, or seventh.

Finally as far as the augmented fourth is concerned, Bellermann says (p. 129): "A typical exception is found in the augmented fourth (tritone) and its inversion, the diminished fifth, of which we will speak later." And further (p. 130):

b) The tritone and its inversion, the diminished fifth, have been used by past composers only in rare cases as actual dissonances on the weak beat . . . (*55) However, between two middle voices or a middle and upper voice, these two intervals frequently appear and have the rights of an imperfect consonance just like the perfect fourth. The bass note accompanying them must, however, be bound to each of its tones in a consonant relationship. There is, therefore, only one type of association in which they may be used, namely:

\[ + \text{Cf. Harmonielehre, § 17.} \]
In the Harmonielehre of R. Louis and L. Thuille, we see how these authors approach the problem of the fourth as a temporary dissonance with far keener sensitivity. We read in § 14 (p. 34 ff.):

Sixths and fourths are, in themselves, anything but unquestionable consonant intervals. They are consonant only when they can be interpreted as inversions of the third or the fifth respectively. For, to the harmonically sensitive ear, it is not the consonant interval but the consonant chord (the triad) that is primary. The perfect octave, perfect fifth, and the major and minor thirds are consonant intervals for the musician only because they are constituents of the major, or minor triad. On the other hand, the consonance of the major and minor triad does not come from its construction out of "consonant intervals."

Although the harmonic relationship must always determine whether the intervals of the fourth and sixth are, in a given situation, to be regarded as inversions and therefore consonant, or as changing tones (suspensions or passing tones) and therefore dissonant, an essential distinction appears when we compare them with one another with regard to their double character. It is more appropriate to consider the sixth as an inverted interval; on the other hand, the fourth is more easily heard as a dissonance as opposed to the inversion of a consonant interval. That becomes evident when we consider each interval in isolation.

If we sound a major or minor sixth alone, we will hear it immediately as the inversion of the major or minor third, and therefore, doubtlessly as a consonant interval. Another interpretation could be forced upon us depending upon the context in which the sixth appeared (perhaps as a suspension before the fifth). This only occurs when, for some reason, we cannot get by with the first interpretation. For the consonant interpretation of the sixth, the ear has something
that jurists call *praesumptio juris*, that is, it is considered consonant until the opposite conviction forces itself upon us.

The perfect fourth acts in just the opposite way. If we hear it alone, we do not think of an inversion of the fifth but hear a suspension directly before a (major or minor) third. Harmonic feeling presupposes it as a dissonance; we permit a consonant perception of it (as an inverted interval) only when the context forces us to.

Thus, the old controversy whether or not the fourth is to be considered as a consonance or dissonance has been finally resolved. In a purely acoustical respect, the fourth is exclusively consonant and nothing else but consonant. But this acoustical "consonance" is of no concern to the musician as such. In reference to harmony, the fourth can be consonant or dissonant depending on whether or not the ear conceives it as an inversion of the perfect fifth or as an (upper) changing tone to the (major or minor) third (in some cases also a changing tone to the perfect fifth). The peculiarity of the musical impression of the fourth, particularly the isolated fourth, stems from the fact that the perception of it as a changing tone is the more natural one. This, then, is the reason for the old contrapuntal rule that in two-part, strict counterpoint, the perfect fourth must always be treated as a dissonance.

Confronted with an interpretation that must be judged ever-so-much more valuable than Bellermann's, I am truly sorry that I cannot affirm that the old controversy has been totally resolved, as these authors assure us. It is their profoundest point that needs further explanation. It is simply not enough to say that "harmonic feeling presupposes the fourth as a dissonance" because "the perception of it as a changing tone is the more natural one, particularly the isolated fourth," irrespective of the fact that, as the Haydn example has shown, this presumption is only an imagined one and sometimes disappears when confronted by the directional force of scale-degrees which are capable of replacing it with other presumptions. For, then, one would have to determine the reason why our feeling prefers one interpretation over another. That both of these authors have felt the thorough lack of proof themselves is best shown by their search for an answer to the original question. In a footnote they explain (pp. 36-37):

The discussion of why the fourth and sixth can act so differently with reference to their consonant or [169] dissonant interpretation does not properly belong in
the realm of our consideration. Briefly, however, we would like to point out that something seems to appear here which has to be taken, not as something primary (as was thought formerly), but as, under certain circumstances, an important secondary characteristic of consonant or dissonant judgements, namely, the degree of pleasantness (the "pleasing sound") of the interval. We will find the justification for the experience in the fact that an interval, in otherwise equal circumstances, will be more willingly heard as a consonance the more it is pleasing to the ear. Of all the intervals that are considered consonant, the perfect fourth will be heard as the least acceptable, and in any case, as more unacceptable than the major or minor sixth. This is probably the reason for the difficulty in interpreting it as a consonance.

At this point, as I believe, there is only one answer: the imperfection of the fourth as a boundary interval is the reason why the ear becomes confused about its meaning when the fourth occurs as the lowest interval. This doubt would, with such an otherwise perfect consonance, be sufficient to explain the fourth in this situation as a dissonance. What related problems there are in regard to the sixth cited by these author will be the subject of the following paragraphs.

§ 4. Further Distinctions Regarding Permissible Consonances.

The unison, as an agreement of two different voices in reference to both the absolute and the relative register [Höhe] of a tone, is entirely plastic in two-part composition. For while it can be interpreted horizontally, perhaps at best only in the form of a tone repetition (and, at that, not in the cantus firmus itself but, as we shall see later, only in the counterpoint) it is here, vertically, for the first time, a true and independent interval—in spite of the fact that it is obviously foreign to the overtone series.

In contrast, the overtone series does give us valuable insights about the other consonances* and about the

* Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 11-15.
practice of voice leading.

[170] It is verified for us that the octave is the most consonant interval since it produces the identity of the tone and only differentiates its register.

The perfect fifth proves to be somewhat less perfect in that it contrasts with the root [Grundton]; not only is it not a repetition of the root, it is also a new tone. The fifth expresses most perfectly still another property, namely, it represents the last possible boundary of the triad-effect [Dreiklangswirkung] of each root (that is, the fifth appertains to its root as a boundary in such a way that nothing beyond it is possible without damage to the unity and consonance). Thus, this insurmountability presents precisely—in a different sense, to be sure—the perfection of the fifth.

The order of precedence, i.e., the rating of the perfect consonances is the following:

a) 1
b) 8
c) 5

d) 3
e) 6

From the most perfect unity of the tone and the register, which the unison represents, the path leads to the offspring of the overtone series: to the octave which repeats the tone in a differentiated register, and next to the fifth, which conveys both tone and register differentiation at the same time. The fifth, however, establishes the last, unsurmountable boundary of the consonance of the root-tone.

In regard to the differentiation of tone and register at the same time, the fifth provides the transition to the imperfect consonances:

d) 3
e) 6

The imperfect consonances, likewise differentiate tone and register in relation to the roots. They differ from [171] the fifth in that they are not boundary intervals and
therefore are incapable of limiting the harmonic content of the root-tone. Instead, they are merely the content of the triad as defined by the fifth. Thus the possibility of inferring from them the chord to which they belong does not exist. For example, does:

Example 171.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>b)</th>
<th>c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Example 171a" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Example 171b" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Example 171c" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be sure, the overtone series leads us to the major third and in this sense it carries with it the conjecture that the third\(^+\) C-E would perhaps have to belong to the root C, first of all. However, we cannot go beyond such conjectures—particularly not in the case of the minor third—and we cannot obtain so sure a foundation as with the perfect consonances. The situation is the same with the sixth except that the sixth, unlike the third, cannot be ratified by the overtone series, but can only be viewed as the inversion of the third.

Now, by reason of the simultaneousness (and the successions connected with it) in two-part composition, we may ask why the sixth should not be forbidden in the same way as the fourth since it also represents an inversion, that of the third.

The answer is as follows: First, in the case of the sixth, the question about the boundary interval is no longer relevant, so that the other question regarding the detour—here, over the third—is not complicated (as it is with the

\(^+\)Example 171a.
fourth) by the more important boundary-interval consideration. However, we understand that the latter factor must have a greater significance, for, by its very nature, it ultimately determines the limitation of the consonant content, thereby making the third, as an internal consonance, possible in the first place.

Second, the sixth, just like the third, is only an imperfect consonance which displays by its very nature less sensitivity in any direction than the perfect fourth. In other words, while the fourth possesses such a purity and perfection that any shading causes it to become a dissonance immediately, the very imperfection of major and minor thirds allows them to maintain their character as consonances so that inversion does less harm to them than to the fourth. We may even say that the imperfectness of the third is not damaged when through inversion it becomes a degree more imperfect, as a sixth.

For two-part composition the practical use of both imperfect consonances is permissible without restriction in spite of all their inner differences. But in the case of doubling in a three or four-part composition, as we will see later, the third must be granted the proper preeminence as a better interval than the sixth, for the reasons just explained.

I finally wish to remind the reader that the inversion of the fourth and sixth, of which we speak, must be understood only in the sense of contrapuntal/practical voice leading, hence in contrast to the inversions discussed in Harmonielehre that are merely abstract and learned with

---

Cf. above, § 3.

‡‡I.e., diminished and augmented fourth.

+++Cf. Harmonielehre, § 74.
regard to scale-degree significance. Thus, when the teaching of harmony presents the six-four chord it has no right at all to present the fourth as a dissonance. What is important, however, is to first of all explain this phenomenon as the possible derivative of another basic and original phenomenon with which the six-four chord then has to share the significance and the rank of a scale-degree.

[173] The teaching of harmony has then—to cite the Haydn example again, § 3, Example 155—only the task of making clear to us that the six-four chord in measure two (or the one in measure three) proves to be not a suspension but an inversion: that of the B-flat (or A-flat) triad, constructed so as to share the meaning of the scale-degrees with the latter.

Concerning the sixth, I must reply to the gentlemen Louis and Thuille. No matter how they interpret the presumption, we are never permitted to speak of the sixth as becoming a dissonance, not even when it forms a suspension—there are also consonant syncopations and suspensions! From this vantage point we can best judge the diverse natures of the fourth and sixth. Because the fourth is usually perfect, it must really become dissonant as soon as it does not possess this perfection anymore. This is the case in two-part composition when it constitutes the lowest interval. In contrast, the sixth remains consonant even if it is not an inversion but a suspension—to be sure, an imperfect consonance, its original state of being. Therefore, it is not very carefully expressed when the quoted authors write: "It (the sixth) is considered consonant until the opposite conviction forces itself upon us."

§ 5. The Three Types of Voice Motion.

In their relationship to one another, two voices can have three types of motion:

---

+Cf. above, § 3.

++Cf. Chapter 4, this section.
1. Direct motion (motus rectus): when both voices move in the same direction ascending or descending; for example:

Example 172.

2. Contrary motion (motus contrarius): when the voices move in opposite directions, for example:

Example 173.

and finally:

3. Oblique motion (motus obliquus): when one voice remains stationary while the other moves away from or toward the stationary voice, for example:

Example 174.

§ 6. The Prohibition of Direct Motion to the Perfect Consonances in Two-Part Composition.

We may not enter into the consonant accords of the unison, octave, and fifth by direct motion in the lessons in two-part composition.
In any case, this prohibition is valid in two-part composition— and only here— no matter whether we approach a perfect consonance:

1. from a perfect consonance, or
2. from an imperfect consonance.

In the first case it makes no difference whatsoever whether the two perfect consonances are the same:

Example 175.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 1 & 8 & 8 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
5 & 5 & 5 & 5 \\
\end{array}
\]

etc.

or different:

Example 176.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
5 & 1 & 5 & 8 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
8 & 8 & 5 & 5 \\
\end{array}
\]

etc.

while in the second group such a distinction does not have to be made:

Example 177.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
3 & 1 & 6 & 8 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
6 & 6 & 5 & 5 \\
\end{array}
\]

etc.

[175] Moreover, when we consider that even in two-part composition exercises in contrary motion, for example:
the inversion-character of the skipping fourth or sixth is expressed all the more strongly\textsuperscript{+} as the ear shows itself to be more sensitive to the progressions to the perfect consonances.\textsuperscript{++} And when we consider that we are forced to convert contrary motion into a direct progression because of that unconscious awareness of the original interval (the fifth and third instead of the fourth and sixth), then it follows that in the lessons in two-part composition one should refrain from using such contrary motion to the perfect consonances—such moves are called "antiparallels." This can be done much more easily if we hold to the small distance between both voices\textsuperscript{+++} that can hardly give us proper occasion to use those "anti-

\textsuperscript{+}Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, §§ 13 and 15.

\textsuperscript{++}Concerning the reasons for this sensitivity, see the paragraphs that follow next.

\textsuperscript{+++}Cf. below, § 24.
parallels" which demand a larger distance, as Examples 178 and 179 illustrate.


Because older theory unfortunately misunderstood the true basis for the prohibition (as I shall soon show), it separated the types shown in Example 175 into "open" prime, octave, or fifth successions in contrast to all the others, including, thus, both those of Examples 176 and 177, which were collectively designated "hidden" successions. Here we want to state that in contrast to a changing nomenclature—one speaks of "parallels" generally, of "direct" and "unequal-direct" successions—it would perhaps be most correct, even though not necessarily the shortest method, to take the effect into account and speak only of parallel primes, octaves, or fifths instead of "open successions" and only of "nonparallel direct successions"+ instead of using the term "hidden."

I say "take the effect into account," for by means of the so-called hidden successions one may speak only figuratively of real "parallel" motion; the latter designation is correctly applicable, in the strictest sense of the word, only to "open successions."

Yet, one could obviously avoid the older nomenclature entirely and speak, for example, of "like-named" prime, octave, of fifth successions and (instead of nonparallel direct successions) of "direct nonparallels."

---

+To be understood as progressions to the prime, octave, or fifth.
§ 8. The Reasons for Prohibiting Direct Progressions to the Perfect Consonances in General.

The prohibition of direct progressions to the perfect consonances in two-part composition exercises is based upon several easily distinguishable, yet simultaneously valid principles:

First, the nature of perfect consonances (as pointed out in § 4 of this chapter), which offers the identity of the tone or else the boundary of the harmonic content.

Second, the character of direct motion generally and its differentiation from oblique and contrary motion.

Third, stemming from the original meaning of the polyphony, the fact that, in special circumstances, one or the other lines emerges more prominently.

We have already discussed the state of affairs for the first principle of the harmonic boundary.

In reference to the second principle, direct motion is to be interpreted, psychologically speaking, as the agreement of both voices toward a common goal, in contrast to contrary or oblique motion in which the difference of direction seems to exclude agreement.

In contrast, the third and last of these principles states that if two-part texture should have any meaning at all, the second voice as well as the first must have its own manner, that is, an independent course.

In order to better clarify the application of those reasons to special cases, I wish to examine them one by one starting with the parallel successions.

§ 9. Parallel Primes and Octaves (1-1 and 8-8).

The inadmissibility of parallel primes and octaves, such as the succession of two primes or two octaves, rests on
the third of the principles discussed above, that is, on the simple recognition that the counterpoint must never be a mere copy of the first voice, either in primes or octaves.

The other principles supporting this prohibition speak for themselves.

§ 10. Parallel Fifths (5-5).

Regarding parallel fifths, it is my opinion that the first two principles take precedence.

[178] If we merely consider the direct passage from one harmonic situation as restricted as that represented by the fifth to another one just as severely restricted (especially in the course of two-part composition where such a limitation must be avoided as much as possible in the interest of a more forceful stimulus), we will find here alone sufficient reason for the prohibition. So much for the first principle.

If the fifth is approached by oblique or contrary motion, it will still sound as if both voices have accidentally entered into the unwelcome, restricted situation of the fifth; for example:

Example 180.

But—and this is the second principle—such a consequence proves to be even more unfavorable by direct motion, which must signify here and throughout only a deliberate searching for that faulty succession of unwelcome limitations. But, to

\[+\text{As will be discussed in detail in § 22.}\]

\[++]\text{Cf. § 8 above.}\]
what extent should one, on principle, permit the voices to seek out an error so deliberately?

§ 11. Nonparallel Direct Progressions to the Perfect Consonances.

Direct motion, which we have just now explained as the common intention of two voices toward a common goal and recognized as the compromising element that has compelled us to forbid parallel perfect consonances, appears "compromising" for the same reason and in the same manner not only for non-parallel direct motion to the perfect consonances but also for successions in direct motion of non-primes, non-octaves, and non-fifths to primes, octaves, and fifths.

[179] Using the older terminology of "open" and "hidden" successions--but with a different interpretation than originally intended--we can say that through direct motion the so-called hidden succession is made into an open one--"open," however, only in the sense of the acknowledged common intention of both voices toward the same goal, owing to the direct motion.

Accordingly it follows that, like genuine parallels, nonparallel direct progressions are forbidden in two-part composition without exception.

But if direct motion happens to be one cause for making the nonparallel direct progressions in two-part composition sound bad and therefore impermissible, then it is totally superfluous to believe in that older theory, which quite awkwardly and naively sought the cause in the "open" successions in order to be able to prohibit "hidden" successions. The older theory suggested the apparent necessity for filling-in the skip of the one voice through "diminution," whereby a tone appears which forms an "open" succession with the other voice, as for example:

\[\text{Cf. in Fux, page 89 ff., the annotation by Mitzler,} \]
also Albrechtsberger, page 31. In a remark on page 6 about ex. 16, Cherubini explains:

This rule seems ill founded at first sight, for since the in-between tones are not written, the fifth and octave do not really exist. However, since it is possible for the singer to add these in-between notes, this will always produce octaves and fifths; in previous times the singer had such freedoms without limitation, and for that reason we have the prohibition. The rule that gives preference to the use of contrary motion is an excellent one because it prevents us from making inconspicuous mistakes. This is a second example of a mistake which the application of direct motion brings about.

The older singing practice cited here by Cherubini is historically accurate. He is thinking of the so-called diminuation era in which the singer could make the decision to adorn a succession of tones with all sorts of embellishments and colorature. Here, instead of older examples that can be checked in music history books by the reader himself, I prefer to cite an analogous example from a more recent time:

In this example (meas. 3 and 4 in Vln. I and II) we find the originally conceived interval $g^2-c^3$ in Violin I being expressed in a quarter-note diminution instead of the original half notes, and we find—and this relationship is what counts—precisely because of this diminution real parallel fifths: $b^2-c^3$
$e^1-f^1$
from the fourth quarter note of the third measure to the first quarter note of the fourth measure (in the two instruments mentioned). Nevertheless, it was wrong of Cherubini to cite such a similar diminution practice as proof for the correctness of the prohibition of hidden successions; the proof speaks more strongly against the prohibition. It is well known from many tracts of that period that often enough the instances of diminution as well as the theory—yes, even the theory itself!—gave license to the forbidden successions in spite of all admonitions. Such license was only too justified. The solo singer's part or the choral setting already represented free composition. Thus, it was understandable in those days that the prohibition against fifths and octaves had to bend to the psychic elements of diminution as a stronger force and could not, therefore, be absolute under these circumstances. Similarly, nowadays we ourselves have been forced to permit voice leading such as that found in the Wagner example (Example 182), for many reasons which I shall discuss later, and in spite of the parallel fifths.

How illogical it is to mention the principles of diminution within the framework of two-part composition as [182] Cherubini does: Are such two-part textures designed for diminution or coloration? Do we have to sing and perhaps color such exercises? If so, what shall the practice of diminution prove at this point in a situation that is not ready for it? On this account, I find it more artistic to derive and to base the prohibition of nonparallel successions, once again, only on the traditional situation of the two-part lesson.
The designation "hidden succession" refers to the fact that within it there is a real "open" one that merely appears to be hidden. What blatant abandonment of what may be an even artistically correct necessity for a prohibition of this kind to such a grotesque and forced motivation of the correct instinct!

The interpretation was so forced that it has always been easy to make fun of its unnaturalness. But what can mockery help as long as a more satisfying explanation coupled with a more satisfying nomenclature is not offered? As the discussion makes evident, it seemed easiest to simply proclaim a total lifting of the prohibition of hidden successions—a solution that would have to exclude the question of nomenclature. Nevertheless, artistic instinct, having always felt the need for the prohibition, holds fast to it to this day. Therefore, we must deal with the very difficult problem of finding convincing language to express the true artistic principle underlying it.

§ 12. Refutation of the Presumably Unified Basis for Doubling in Parallel Octaves and Fifths.

The adjudication of such special reasons for both the prohibition of parallel octaves and primes, and the prohibition of parallel fifths in two-part composition must be more precisely substantiated from a historical standpoint for the definitive solution to the problem of parallels.

[182] As we know, the first experiments in polyphonic music started by adding only fourth and fifth successions in parallel motion (i.e., organum) to a given melody. This fact might persuade us to think that the unpleasant impression derived from successive fifths would be only a presumption

+Cf., for example, K. G. P. Grädener's System der Harmonielehre (Hamburg: K. Grädener, 1877), § 38.
of later times, since in early days, as history confirms, a
c contrary practice was used.

In truth, the opposite is the case. Since in those
days there was as yet no artistic experience in polyphony
whose proper interpretation would have created a true theory
of art—the theory of art always has to follow practice in an
interpretive and abstract manner—the theory (or what was
considered as such) had to point the way to practice. And if,
according to theory, the fifth was truly a perfect consonance,
was it naive to give directions to double the melody simply in
fourths or fifths? Could, then—as they thought—perfection
follow after perfection and leave anything but a perfect im-
pression? Thus the practice of organum consisted of fifth
successions that ultimately could also be called true fifth-
doublings, "doublings" in the same sense that we now speak of
octave "doublings." Yet the teaching of theory proved itself
totally inartistic and wrong in this regard; because it was
still captivated by the speculative notion of the perfection
of fifths, it had no artistic feeling for the purity and
beauty of the vertical sonorities of voices that may be de-
erived from sources other than the perfect intervals. And as
[183] the practice of subsequent times began to include
thirds and sixths along side the fourths and fifths—partially
for the sake of variety and partially from a correct, artistic
instinct—this initial contrasting of the intervals revealed
at the same time their true role in the service of the voice
leading. Only then did the contrast of the thirds and sixths
cause us to recognize the restrictions of the sound of the
fifth—a single fifth, or a succession of fifths! Conversely,
the fifth was recognized as the essence of the third and sixth
because the sixth, being far less able to offer a boundary for
the sonority, serves rather to continue the setting by giving
rise to ambiguity. Step by step we learned from the battle
and tumult of thirds, sixths, and fifths how detrimental it
is to forget the limiting effect of the fifth's perfection
and, accordingly, how inappropriate it is to saturate and to "double" the movement with incessant fifth-to-fifth succe-
sions. Finally, with fresh understanding, we realized that if the sonority boundary is established by the fifth, we must not produce this effect which is certainly unwelcome in the middle of a setting, at least not in direct motion, that is, through agreement of the two voices. And thus a rule of combat for the contesting sixths, thirds, and fifths, among others, resulted: a fifth must not be approached in direct motion in two-part composition. By means of this well-founded fifth-prohibition--perhaps its first written appearance can be attributed to Johannes de Muris (14th-century)--the definitive artistic perception was expressed once and for all: a succes-
sion of fifths must never be heard and understood from the standpoint of mere "doubling." On the contrary, no matter whether it is used for interpretation and justification or only for the purpose of clearer perception, we must use it exclusively from the standpoint of voice leading, indeed, a [184] consistently solid voice leading.

No matter how strongly the outward appearance of the composition speaks in favor of it, there are no genuine fifth "doublings." Although doublings of unisons and octaves do indeed exist, we must beware of using that term with regard to fifths, even if only to prevent the ear from perceiving falsely. Therefore, in the case of the much-cited composition of Beethoven:


\[\text{Diagram of piano sonata} \]
or in an even more telling example:


[185] we must not speak of bare fifth "doublings." Later we shall see another way in which such voice leadings have been set by composers and how these should be understood by the listener.

It is regrettable that the lesson imparted so clearly to the artist and theorist by the development of our art has not been better understood in its essence. What has been consistently overlooked is that the milieu of the first prohibition, i.e., that practical experience which necessarily led to it, had first of all to grow from the realm of two-part composition, on a terrain where the setting looked like a primitive two-part counterpoint exercise in spite of the fact that it was free composition. Only in two-part vocal composition could the effect of parallelism in its absolute
purity be recognized. That the prohibition, with its absolute sharpness and its true basis, turns to two-part composition, therein alone lies the significance of the historical experience: Under no circumstance may we measure the later polyphony in exercises and in free composition with a prohibition that is valid only for the two-voice texture of the free composition of that time; we could create contradictions where there are none.

It is to the honor of M. Hauptmann that he provides at least an inkling of the true state of affairs in his Harmonik und Metrik (*56):

The basis for the unpleasant effect in both cases (fifths and octaves) is not the same; in the succession of fifths we miss the unity of harmony, in the succession of octaves the variety of melody.

The best part of this statement is undoubtedly the recognition that in the case of parallel octaves and fifths, the reasons for the prohibition are different. Yet, the phrase "unity of harmony," which presumably is applicable in fifth successions, remains hollow. While apparently pointing in the right direction, the words go too far by reproaching the voice leading as lacking unity of harmony; for example:

[186] Example 185.

\[ \text{Example 185.} \]

Without a doubt, Hauptmann probably felt the limitation of sonority through the fifth, without, however, being able to express this feeling more directly. Indeed, he makes the fundamental mistake made by all theorists who investigate the reasons* for the prohibition by referring only to free composition (where fifths are no longer alone and undisturbed).

The more regrettable is the relapse of H. Riemann,** who recently "expounded" and assumed the reason for the prohibition against parallel octaves to be the same as that against parallel fifths. He expressly states (p. 29ff.):

---

*I.e., those valid for two-part composition.

"Parallel octaves are unnatural and wrong because they deny the independence of the voices; parallel fifths are wrong for the same reason." Furthermore, he elaborates:

A voice that constantly produces the octaves of another is only a reinforcement of its sound, not a separate voice; likewise, the voice progressing in parallel fifths or twelfths with the other voice blends too much with it to be considered an independent voice.

In order to attribute to the prohibition of parallel fifths the same basis as that against octaves, he advances the quite tempting hypothesis of several degrees of blending. He attributes to the octave the strongest degree of blending, to the fifth the middle, and to the third, naturally the major third, the weakest. In reference to the third he says: "In contrast, the fifth overtone, the third, is so weak in the clang that we may ignore its independent production and thus conceive parallel thirds as mere doublings."

As we see, he bases his hypothesis on the phenomenon of the overtone series. This is evident when he states:

The mutation stops of the organ prove conclusively that the sound reinforcement continued throughout an entire composition by means of parallel octaves, twelfths, and pipes corresponding to the overtones in general, is practical and effective.

Thus, he comes to the following conclusion:

Neither parallel octaves nor fifths in themselves sound bad, therefore planned octave doublings sound good and are natural in orchestral settings, however they are totally outside the realm of settings with four real voices. Likewise, reinforcement with parallel fifths (twelfths) frequently appears in full-textured piano or orchestral compositions, but it should never be considered as proper voice leading.

There we have it. According to Riemann, parallel fifths are hardly more than sound reinforcement (analogous to octaves), a doubling voice, so to speak, as in organ mixtures.

+ Note the phrase "blends too much."

++ Sound reinforcements through added octaves.
Thus we would arrive at the beginning once more. Every development achieved by artistic practice in accordance with theory since the assertion of the prohibition against parallels proves to be fundamentally misunderstood: All this came about because the origin of the prohibition was not even conceived, as history shows, in relation to the phenomenon. Riemann is even naive enough to believe that the prohibition is an absolute one and that we must let it stand absolutely or negate it entirely. But since this intention quite obviously must fail because of the contradictions inherent in the various situations, we understand it when he talks vaguely and uneasily, sometimes about an orchestra and full-textured piano composition and sometimes about lessons. With the basis of the prohibition constantly shifting from one place to another, he is not able to come to an absolute statement, but only to one that produces poor consequences:

In regard to parallel fifths, we now have generally become more liberal and permit them to pass without criticism when they are concealed by contrary motion or dissonance, that is, when the ear is compensated by other points of attraction for the lack of richness (because the voice moving parallel disappears, so to speak, for the duration of the parallels). A pure fifth-succession in essential voices is still a stylistic error in all circumstances. It is to be banned without exception in all lessons. If the teacher neglects to foster in his students a natural sensitivity for such offences against the purity of the composition, then he must not be surprised when his pupils run rampant.

What a horribly confused and at the same time naive chaos! In lessons, the student must avoid parallel fifths, for as Riemann maintains, they are mere reinforcements like successive octaves. But, he asserts that beyond the schoolwork, namely, in free composition, "a real fifth-succession" is still a "stylistic error" in all circumstances; however, a composer may use them as "reinforcement" and only as such. [188] But it remains, I say, for Riemann to explain the most important aspect. First, how do we know whether we deal in a given case with a justified "reinforcement" or only an involuntary, compositional and "stylistic" error. In most cases the criticisms of the expressed opinion

+That is, in the differences between two-part composition and composition in three, and more parts, as well as in that of a lesson related to free composition.
center on this point! Second, what is the reason for the reinforcements through fifths which in comparison with the octave doublings occur quite rarely? Third, and finally, how does the license of the fifth-reinforcements tally with the greater number of fifth-successions, those that Riemann, himself, would never consider mere reinforcements and that he would be willing to judge "milder" and probably let pass "without criticism"?+

Are there also pure fifth-successions of a different nature that are permitted without falling under the principal notion of the middle degree of blending? Are they exceptions, one must ask, or are they allowed under another point of view? If the latter is the case, why then, has Riemann put the fifth-succession in the category of mere "doubling"? If there are "open" fifth-successions that are permissible even though they are not doublings at all, what purpose does the prohibition serve? Or, ultimately, if all "open" fifth-successions are permissible anyway in free composition, is the prohibition in truth only a false alarm perhaps intended to intimidate the student to the glory of the "forbidding" teacher? What a naive method!

What will Riemann's students do when they get ready to deal with free composition? Will they stick to the prohibition or stay with the license, since both basic situations remain indefinitely defined?

Riemann's mistake, however, stems not just from the fact that he declares the fifth-successions "doublings," even though he carelessly cites other fifth-successions that are not doublings, and that by so doing he ignores the history of the beginnings of polyphony which might have prevented the return of such a false and already disavowed conception. Beyond that, it stems from the fact that for him the ignoring of purely artistic and psychological observations and the forced inclusion of natural phenomena into art backfires with respect to the overtone series. Already in Harmonielehre** I drew attention to the unfortunate consequences that must attend the effort to abstract the art, in so far as its entire content is concerned, from the overtone series alone. Instead of that, I made the claim (to be understood at last) that the proposal of nature, as found in the overtone series, was accepted by the artists only up to a certain degree, while, in [189] a very original way, they developed artistic elements as their property, which then lead back to nature only in the last analysis. Here, where Riemann takes shelter in the over-

+Cf. the above quote.

**\$ \S 10, \S 19, etc.
tone series in order to gain the previously described degree of blending in the presentation of the prohibition of parallel fifths, the mistake becomes obvious. If the overtones are truly only components of an individual clang+ that are unable to claim any degree of independence--this lack of independence is expressed through the designation overtone, partial tone, or aliquot tone--then it is clear that an overtone can never truly be identical with the living tone that appears in the counterpoint to the cantus firmus as fifth (or as octave or third). On the contrary, this tone forms its own independent tonal manifestation which it must carry on its back, so to speak--an "unfortunate Atlas" that must carry "a world, a whole world" of overtones. It carries its own overtones in precisely the same way as the tone of the cantus firmus which it opposes. Each of them is, accordingly, an independent tone, both the tone of the cantus firmus and that of the counterpoint which forms the fifth. Both have the particular overtones absolutely necessary for their clang generation, two infinite tone columns, so to speak, that are totally distinct and that fundamentally have nothing in common with one another. We must bear in mind that even the octave doublings which according to Riemann, reveal the strongest degree of blending, in reality signify only a confrontation of two independent voices and that the independence of the octave tone is clearly audible not only in the orchestral composition but also in the organ itself--consider the organ couplers, for example. There is a significant difference between the organ mixture that loses itself in the clang of a tone and a purely independent tone that brings about its own mixture by encountering the tone of the cantus firmus as a fifth. If the fifth of the counterpoint were little more than an organ mixture, i.e., the third partial of the cantus firmus tone, then we would be permitted to unload upon the given tone "a world" of undefinable tones under the license of mere reinforcement and, at the same time, we would have to expect that the sonority of the composition would be satisfying. We would simply be permitted to copy what the overtone series states--thus, the ninth, or the fifteenth partial--and thereby, the voices would have only the effect of doublings. And I believe such a reinforcement manner and mania would be even more dreadful to get rid of when the present-day chaotic style of alleged polyphony++ burdens almost every tone with its seventh--remember, the seventh that

+ And therefore the so-called organ mixtures are also, in this sense, only elements of a single tone.

++ A polyphony that draws unlicensed advantage from a fast and indistinct tempo as well as from a misunderstood concept of the passing motion.
conforms to the system is a totally different phenomenon than the seventh partial! It would pronounce itself "polyphony," not as one would expect it to do according to the above theory as a mere "reinforcement," but, rather, conceitedly and braggingly as being actual voice leading! While we can demonstrate that the blunders of contemporary artists, who unfortunately work only with debased instinct, are often enough objectively bad from the standpoint of voice leading, it would, on the other hand, be impossible to combat the feeling of total displeasure with a composition that, appealing to nature (or the overtone series), would move in the strangest doublings.

If then the tone of the counterpoint, as an octave or fifth opposing the cantus firmus, is in reality not identical with the second or third partial, the consonant relationship of the two independent tones is based on the foundation of the overtone series, but in a different sense than assumed by Riemann. In the case of the independent tones that constitute the octave or fifth, nature asserts their consonant relationship and its character according to the significance of the octave and fifth within the overtone series. This means that although the second partial presents the identity of the tone differentiated only by the register, the third partial—in the form of a tone already distinct through register as an absolute value—supplies the last possible boundary tone of the comprehensible consonant space. Thus the same characteristic holds true even when a totally independent tone similarly confronts another one: there follows either the identity of the tone with differentiation of the register or a final consonance-boundary with differentiation of the tone. Or, to quote the presentation used in my Harmonielehre (§ 14, p. 42):

When we ask which relationship between two tones can be the most natural, Nature has already given her answer. If for example, G has revealed itself as the strongest overtone emanating from the root tone [C], the potency and privilege of this close relationship remains intact even when, in the life of a composition, the latter is confronted by the former as an independent root tone.

+Cf. Harmonielehre, § 10.

++For example, over-estimation of the strength of a scale-degree or ignorance of the technique of the passing motion, etc. Cf. Harmonielehre, § 89.

+++In this case, the specific quality of the consonance produced, i.e., the octave or the fifth.

++++Even with their given "overtone worlds."
It is as if the ascendant recognizes its descendant. This primary and most natural relationship between two tones I shall call the fifth-relationship.

One item remains to be commented upon. Riemann has also used the hypothesis of degree of blending to fortify his prohibition of antiparallels as follows:

The prohibition of octave and fifth successions must be generalized and sharpened with regard to its customary formulation. Since the unison, octave, and double octave, and likewise the fifth and twelfth, do not in a measurable way distinguish themselves from one another in their degree of blending, all progressions from the unison to the octave or to the double octave and vice versa:

Example 186.

or from the fifth to the twelfth and vice versa are to be forbidden because they contradict the independence of the voices:

Example 187.

+Or also including the octave extension of the twelfth, the nineteenth.
Unfortunately, Riemann succeeded in intimidating the younger theorists. For that reason, the Harmonielehre of R. Louis and L. Thuille+ contains at least the suggestion of one compromise between the opinion of M. Hauptmann and that of Riemann. We find here (p. 376):

If we decide to accept the explanation of Riemann for the unpleasant effect of parallel fifths as such, then we think it is necessary to utilize Hauptmann’s opinion, at least as an additional theory, when we are confronted with the actual appearance of parallel fifths within a harmonic relationship. Therefore, the prohibition might be formulated in the following manner: because of the high degree of blending in their interval relationships, the parallel perfect fifths (and to a lesser degree, parallel major thirds) under certain circumstances can be very unpleasant. That is the case when this kind of progression appears in the direct succession of two accords standing next to each other without points of relationship.

When we finally sum up all these points, we conclude that the mistakes that have been taken for granted in the theoretical foundations of the prohibition of parallel fifths are these: (1) the misunderstanding of the first artistic experiences in the contrapuntal style which led to the formulation of the prohibition; that is, the all-too-faulty appraisal of the fact that the prohibition evolved primarily from the basis of two-part composition only, where actually it is completely valid even today, and (2) the criticism also of free composition according to the prohibition that is appropriate only for lessons.

With our establishment of the fact that the prohibition of parallel octaves and fifths is based on different reasons that become evident only in a two-part texture in all its clarity, the essentials of two-part, first species counterpoint have been discussed sufficiently for the time being. Meanwhile, as is our custom, we intend to take a further look at multi-linear counterpoint as well as free composition and to illustrate the influence of the new situations in both of these on the prohibition. Of course, we shall do that for the time being only to the extent needed for the understanding of the problem and save the more detailed discussion for an appropriate later time.

---

+Cited above.

As we have seen, the birthplace of the problem is two-part composition. It directs our attention to the fact that the succession of two primes or octaves destroys the quality of the counterpoint as one of two independent voices, and the succession of two fifths signifies an unwelcome clash of two equally drastic, harmonic limitations. Moreover, in two-part writing this effect is not only caused by the nature of the perfect consonances, but also by the direct motion as such. It would certainly be wrong just now to work for effects that would contradict the independence of the two voices or damage their combined sonority if we intend to learn precisely how a second voice is to be led in relation to an independent first one. Therefore it is quite alright if the theory of two-part composition, striving for agreement between intention and fulfillment chiefly in the proper realm of its two-part exercises, formulates the prohibition in question just for the exercises without further distinction as to whether the progression to a perfect consonance happens to be in parallel or only in nonparallel direct motion.

But if we know that this prohibition has to be solely understood from the intention and situation of two-part writing, then, logically, we will avoid the mistake of considering the prohibition an absolute one, i.e., a prohibition that holds jurisdiction, without exception, beyond two-part composition, as for example in multi-linear counterpoint or free composition. Rather, we shall prove that, in the long run, complicated situations cannot bear the pressure of that prohibition in so far as they are supposed to find their

*That is reproved in the previous paragraphs.
proper solutions—especially since newly appearing factors in such situations raise new individual demands that require urgent fulfillment.

Thus, on principle, three-part composition + must at least permit nonparallel direct successions ++ when it seeks to fulfill its main intention of contrasting the cantus firmus with two counterparts each having true melodic independence. Often enough, for example, the line of the flowing melody +++ will indeed demand that the voice include in its course a tone which involves such a nonparallel direct progression. And thus from the standpoint of the higher law of independence, it is perfectly justifiable to accept direct nonparallels, particularly since their unpleasant effect will recede into the background due to the stronger prominence of the effect achieved through the good line. Later, we shall see, ++++ in three-part composition, how new, stronger effects can be created to enable the composer, under certain circumstances, to push into the background the unpleasant effect of the nonparallel direct successions. For the sake of providing a preliminary hint at this point, these new effects are achieved by:

1. paying due tribute to the flowing melody in the form of smaller intervals (the smaller the better, i.e., seconds), or:
2. making the contrary motion prominent, or:
3. gaining the advantage of a full-bodied, complete triad.

+For the time being I shall pass over the new and different situations in the second, third, and fourth species of two-part counterpoint.

++So-called "hidden" successions.

+++As the main characteristic of such an independence of the voice.

++++Cf., Section III, Chapter 1, § 8.
Again, by reason of the numerous newly created difficulties caused by the greater number of voices, four-part composition must of necessity tolerate the nonparallel successions even under conditions in which three-part composition still adheres to the prohibition. Four-part texture brings with it the inevitable consequence that direct nonparallels must be permitted under stipulations freer than three-part composition has required.

However, the teaching of counterpoint* does not permit parallel primes, octaves, or fifths. On the contrary, these continue to be completely forbidden in counterpoint in three \[195\] or more parts. On the basis of the effects already discussed, the remaining factors of composition are still too weak under the limited circumstances inherent to the cantus firmus to fully counteract these parallels.

Finally, it may be worthwhile to state here that the prohibition of all direct progressions to perfect consonances is meant to be, by its very nature, valid only for two-part, first species counterpoint. Should we so desire, we could, for the time being, spare the latter of every outwardly ideal distinction within the forbidden direct successions. For, as we see, it is basically the situations of the other species written in two parts, but most clearly those of three and four-voice composition (ignoring free composition) which, while they already allow and in fact require a certain type of direct progressions to perfect consonances, now (for the first time) compel the theorizing artist to force the breach of a first ideal distinction with respect to a prohibition that is valid in and stems from two-part composition. Naturally, that which is unnecessary in the first species of two-part counterpoint becomes necessary in the following species because of the new situations. Thus, starting no earlier than

*In the realm of its exercises.
the second species of two-part writing, we would have to limit, ideally, true parallels from mere nonparallel direct progressions in order to categorize both types as established permanent categories of direct progressions.

But aside from every method of systematic presentation of this problem, it is significant to both the evaluation and comprehension of the prohibition to understand the circumstances just described: how two-part, first species counterpoint has presented the prohibition as without exception in its realm, and how the differentiation of the prohibition organically proceeds only with the differentiation of the situation.


At last, the very freedom allows parallel successions to become part of free composition.

The changing character of the voice in free composition, whose contrast to the fixed real voice in contrapuntal exercises will be detailed in the last section, brings with it, as a new consequence, the fact that in order to be able to regulate the arbitrarily free number of voices, parallel octaves are sometimes necessary.

With regard to parallel fifths, free composition joins to the principles of contrary motion, flowing melody, and triad completeness (whose influences could successfully confront the unpleasant effect of nonparallel direct progressions even in strict counterpoint) the movement of the scale-degrees and the change of keys, as the greatest influences in free composition. These alone, or even better, these in union with the others, can totally alleviate the effect of parallel fifths.

To express it differently, by virtue of the identity of the tones in the unison and the octave, free composition
uses parallel octaves and unisons as "reinforced" voices, for example.* In addition, it is possible—to be sure only under the heading of real voice leading!—for free composition to use parallel fifths because it successfully contrasts them by its new and stronger forces still unknown to lessons in strict counterpoint.

That nonparallel direct successions, as well as antiparallels, gain freer manipulation space in free composition than in three or four-part counterpoint is self-evident.

[197] In reference to the end result that free composition is in the position to annul the prohibition of not only nonparallel direct successions, but also parallel and antiparallel successions, we must question quite urgently the significance of our continuing to teach the prohibition—even if only in the realm of counterpoint and in a lesson context. If, as we might think, there is no longer a limit for the above successions in free composition, why should we maintain a prohibition in the lessons whose results will never find practical application?

This question is only apparently valid and the answer is easy to give. I have already stated that only stronger intentions and counterforces moving clearly and convincingly into the foreground can link the naturally unpleasant effect of direct motion to the perfect consonances. In other words, with each parallel octave or fifth and with each nonparallel direct progression the pitfall of its respective effect awaits us even in free composition—just as though free composition were nothing more than a lesson in two-part counterpoint! Indeed, this occurs to such an extent that the bad effect must immediately "send word" to our ear if the opposing forces of contrary motion, flowing melody, complete harmony, scale-degrees, modulation, variation of voice character, and

*Which, at the same time, reduce the number of voices.
the like, fail to combat it successfully. Thus, even in free composition, the interval of the fifth, for example, leads to a clang-defining effect; this may become evident whether it is really intentional or simply the result of a lack of skill. The school must point out this effect in two-part writing to the young student even though it may later supply him with the means—depending on his need—to actually combat it. In short, the effect of direct progressions, and to be sure the effects in all the possible categories taught by counterpoint, remains a psychological reality even if it stays in the background, vanquished by foreground forces!

§ 15. Departure from the Perfect Consonances—In General.

Since, in the lessons of the present species, each departure from the perfect consonances prepares the approach to the consonances that follow, everything that needs to be said about "departure" has already been said under "approach." In itself, departure is not subject to any additional limitations and prohibitions. The only exception is the departure from the unison.

§ 16. Departure from the Unison—Specifically Considered.

The fact of the complete unification and blending of the two voices, as it is expressed here in the unison, requires foresight+ so that the voice leading following the unison does not create an overly drastic contrasting situation, at least not directly after the unison.

If we consider the three types of motion possible in departing from a unison, we have the following effects:

a) The use of direct motion carries with it the risk

+Something, by the way, that also best suits the postulate of the flowing melody.
that it will be difficult for the ear and the sensibility to
determine, with regard to larger skips, which way one or the
other voice has moved. In the following example there is at
least the risk of a mix-up in the voices, since it is none
too clear which $d^1$ went to $d^2$ and which to $f^1$:

Example 188.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{or: }
\end{array} \]

[199] b) In contrast, oblique motion, by sustaining one
voice, grants such a strong counterweight of repose that a
large interval may follow a unison without harm; for example:

Example 189.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \]

c) In contrary motion, the danger of the explosive
effect of a larger interval following the unison has become
very real by virtue of the situation itself; for example:

Example 190.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\end{array} \]

This danger can be best avoided by following the unison
with only a moderate interval which, in addition, is approached
only by small movements. Thus, in contrary motion, the best
solution to the departure must be the diverging of the two
voices toward the interval of a third:
From these effects we obtain the following advice for departing from a unison: oblique motion is the first choice and is the one most capable of avoiding the explosive force in the succession of the intervals. Contrary motion is the second choice, and then only under the circumstances described above. Direct motion proves itself the least usable and that is why it should be avoided in the exercises if at all possible.

Since, as we shall see later, the unison is forbidden [200] in the middle of an exercise and, therefore, must be used only at the beginning or end of an exercise in two-part, first species counterpoint, the question discussed here becomes practical only in one situation, that is, when we begin the exercise with a unison. Therefore, we should investigate the situation according to the consequence, that is, we should determine whether the lesson is suitable for starting with a unison. For example, if we have to add an upper counterpoint to a cantus firmus beginning in the following manner:

Example 192.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{\textbullet} & \text{\textbullet} \\
\text{\textbullet} & \text{\textbullet}
\end{align*} \]

then it is clear that to begin with the unison sets up the obvious necessity for direct motion:*

*See page 72.
Example 193.

unless we choose instead to cross the two voices\textsuperscript{+} which, to say the least, would seem inappropriate at the beginning of an exercise. It is more advisable, therefore, to use the octave or fifth instead of the unison as the opening interval with such a cantus firmus.

How free composition deals with all the above-mentioned effects according to the nature of its own disposition, may be illustrated by the following example:

Example 194. Schumann, Symphony in C major (piano score pp. 25 and 26).

\[\text{[201]}\] In the oboes we see the departure from a unison in direct motion to a fourth in Example 194a and even to a seventh \textsuperscript{[sic]} in 194b. Note, however, the effects Schumann creates with one stroke: measured by the modest movement of the second oboe, the skip of the first oboe appears all the more expressive, i.e., the skip of a fifth in Example 194a,

\textsuperscript{+}Cf. below, § 27.
the skip of a seventh in 194b. In addition, a genuine portamento effect is created by the step motion of the second oboe within the space of the fifth (or the seventh) that has been outlined by the first oboe.++

In Fux we read (p. 73):

[Alloys.] Let me point out that movement by skip from a unison to another consonance is not permitted, nor is it permissible to skip into a unison, as I have mentioned before. But since this skip exists as part of the unalterable plainsong, it may be tolerated here. It is different when we are not bound by the chorale melody and can do as we please.

As we clearly see, this observation contains a fundamental misconception in reference to contrapuntal lessons and to free composition as well. This misconception has tempted Fux to grant the latter less freedom than the former. He finds it necessary to tolerate skips from the unison by virtue of limitations within the lessons. In contrast, he deduces the necessity for greater strictness from the unlimited structure of free composition. In fact, the reverse is true. Free composition, as seen in Example 194, can be obliged to skip more often than strict counterpoint simply for reasons of effect.

In more detail than Fux, Bellermann teaches (p. 136):

The skip from a unison to another consonance in direct motion is not good in two-part composition and should be avoided if possible.+++ But, such a skip is permissible when one of the two voices remains on its note, thus, in oblique motion.++++ We do well to avoid skips in contrary motion, so that it makes no difference whether only one or both voices makes such a skip. However, we frequently find exceptions to this rule and that is why we do not have to observe it as strictly as the others.

+Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, §18.

++ Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, §17, especially Example 111!

+++Examples follow. (*57)

++++Examples follow. (*58)
Here, Bellermann quotes the teaching of Fux in order to follow him with regard to free composition, which his [202] following words corroborate [footnote, p. 136]; "Of course, there is no reason to use such unrefined progressions." To be sure, it is correct that contrary motion cannot be avoided in many cases, but then we should adhere to the advice given in the text.

§ 17. Free Approach to the Imperfect Consonances.

The approach to the imperfect consonances is free no matter whether we set out from a perfect or an imperfect interval.

Likewise, when they lead to imperfect consonances, all three types of motion are permitted without restriction with the possible exceptions of the cases that follow.

§ 18. The Possible Prohibition of Two Major Thirds in Succession.

a) The first exception arises in the succession of two major thirds as we encounter them in the natural diatonic scale from the fourth to the fifth scale degrees in major and from the sixth to the seventh in minor. As you know, they occur only once:*

Example 195.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{E} & \to \text{G} \to \text{B} \to \text{E} \\
\text{G} & \to \text{B} \to \text{E} \to \text{G}
\end{align*}\]

However, the exception occurs only if this succession, through its sum of an augmented fourth--the tritone--intrudes upon the ear so wretchedly that the effect cannot be averted by means of later voice leading. Thus, in contrast, the sum of the augmented fourth can be pleasingly counter-

* Cf. Harmonielehre, § 64 f.
acted through the further flow of the voices, as in the following voice leading:

Example 196.

![Example 196](image)

The reason for the prohibition of such a succession of thirds is found less in the juxtaposition of F and B or in \[203\] the sum of the augmented fourth itself, than in a specific situation in which the unpleasant sound of the sum of the augmented fourth becomes drastically apparent to the ear because it is not masked by a subsequent resolution.

Therefore, a voice leading such as the following is permitted without ado:

Example 197:

![Example 197](image)

From this we can conclude that not every movement of F and B confirms the prohibition—it is only in certain unfortunate cases involving the unresolved sum of the augmented fourth. That is all we need to say about the notorious legend of the unjustly labeled "tritone cross relation"!*

b) Just as the sum of an augmented fourth should not be permitted to result from a succession of two major thirds, the sum of a seventh growing out of a pure, diatonic context is not permitted when it must remain uncovered, as for example:

---

*Cf. below, § 28:
Example 198.

If, however, two major thirds progress as follows:

Example 199.

then we must naturally presume a mixed minor key, wherein the first example represents the progression V-VI, the second example, III-V. Assuming that the student would use a mixed minor key in a lesson, he would have to avoid the sum of the augmented fifth illustrated in the second example but he would be justified in using the succession in the first example without any restriction.

It is well known that today we use the succession of major thirds (if possible, in series of six-chords) with partiality in free composition. The following example might show us how free composition justifies such successions:

+Cf. Harmonielehre, 38 f.

To be sure, through its predominance the scale-degree (here the V) completely covers, by itself, the entire passage of the major thirds (meas. 4-5), by reducing them to mere melodic bridges moving chromatically between $g$ and $c^1$. Yet, the ear understands very well the course of the total process that had to lead up to this passing-effect. We finally recognize that what we have here are only apparent major thirds which, in reality, stem from real minor thirds. We are surprised by how quickly our perception functions as it hurries with tremendous speed through so many stages toward the abbreviation:
Example 201a indicates the normal diatonic passing tones lying between $g$ and $e^1$ in the lower voice and between $b$ and $e^1$ in the upper. Actually this is the background of all subsequent developments, the first stage.

Example 201b offers the chromatic filling in of the diatonic lines, at 1, the lower voice, at 2, the upper. This is the second stage.

Example 201c represents the first, and for the time being, the normal attempt to apply all the chromatic passing tones shown in 201b while still retaining the given space of the fourth.

Here, for reasons of clarity and in order to maintain the passing character of the chromatic tones in a pure fashion, the two voices indicate a willingness to oblige one another, so that at any given time, only one voice completes its passing tone. Not until the first voice has its passing tone
completed does the second advance its tone. Thus, the lower voice passes from a\textsuperscript{b} to a on the first quarter; then, while the lower is stationary, the upper voice passes from c to c\# on the second quarter. On the third quarter, the upper voice waits until the lower voice passes from b\textsuperscript{b} to b, and then, on the fourth quarter, it passes from d to d\#, while the lower voice remains passive. That is the third stage of development.

It is easy to see that this procedure leads to a more abbreviated and complicated stage which constitutes the fourth and last of this process.\footnote{See Example 200.} It is always just a stationary diatonic tone that presents the chromatic tone the opportunity to pass through:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diatonic Tone</th>
<th>Chromatic Passing Tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>below c\textsuperscript{1} of the higher voice</td>
<td>\textsuperscript{a\textsuperscript{b}} - a of the lower voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over a of the lower voice</td>
<td>c - c#\textsuperscript{1} of the higher voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>below d of the higher voice</td>
<td>b\textsuperscript{b} - b\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}} of the lower voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over b of the lower voice</td>
<td>d\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}} - d#\textsuperscript{1} of the higher voice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence it follows that since the chromatic passing tone c\#\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}, or later d\#\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}, must in any case make its way over the diatonic a, and, later over b, it amounts to the same thing when both tones, the diatonic and the chromatic, relentlessly sound together instead of alternating their movements.

Because the ear learns to understand that the third (on the second quarter) was originally minor, \( \text{\ reducing } \frac{c\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}}{a} \), before it expanded into major, \( \text{\ reducing } \frac{c\#\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}}{a} \),\footnote{Just as later \( \text{\ reducing } \frac{d\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}}{b} \) expanded into \( \text{\ reducing } \frac{d\#\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}}}{b} \).} it also accepts, without ado, [207] the abbreviation, that is, the contraction of the just described two-act process into one act that relinquishes, at
the intermediate stage the minor thirds, $\frac{c_1}{a}$ and $\frac{d_1}{b}$ (on the second and fourth quarters) and reaches immediately for the major thirds at this point.

The succession of major thirds in the cellos and violas in this Brahms example is based upon the fact that here the VI-degree in B minor is unfolded entirely in pure minor:

Example 202. Brahms, Symphony No. 4, 1st Movement.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example202.png}
\end{center}

In this case, the harshness of the effect—-an intentional one—originates less from the succession of major thirds than from the strongly dissonant passing of the major third $a-c#1$ (at *) under the chord tone $b_1$ in the violins and from the rhythmical property of this modulation-motive which starts on the second quarter!

The pair of major thirds in this Wagner example:

Example 203. Wagner, Rheingold, Scene III (piano score p. 23).
[208] originates from the fact that after the I and VI scale-degrees in C-sharp minor, the series of fifth descents comes to the II in its lowered form (G# Phrygian) and now, with the latter scale-degree, the G#2 in the upper voice of the tertian pairs is called upon to indicate that we have remained in the key of C-sharp minor throughout. To be sure, G2 could have appeared at this place (as if it were suddenly D major*) had Wagner preferred to follow a tonic propensity of the II-degree. But it is precisely the comparison of the effect of the G2 that shows how much finer the G#2 is here in the service of preserving the diatonic key. What beautiful fruit of the composing-out process of scale-degrees!

By way of contrast, it is instructive to see how Smetana, in the next example, utilizes a succession of two major thirds in order to create a special mood:


Fux pays no particular attention to the succession of two major thirds, as the following examples prove:

*Cf. Harmonielehre, § 137.
Example 205. a) Table IV, Figure 15;  
b) Table V, Figure 16.

[209] Albrechtsberger attacks the problem more energetically. He, too, describes this succession of thirds only on the occasion of the prohibition, and, throughout, he avoids speaking ex officio of a "tritone cross relation" as such. Thus, he says (pp. 21-22, VII):

Two major thirds are forbidden in the progression of a whole tone up or down, but not that of a semitone. They are also forbidden in a skip of a major third in both voices because an inharmonious cross relation results, a mi contra fa. However, they are not forbidden when both voices skip a perfect fourth. In the case of a skip of a perfect fifth, two major thirds are likewise forbidden, not because of the mi contra fa, but because the major seventh placed laterally in two measures or notes, whether they ascend or descend, is too difficult to sing.

When we order his suitable examples, we arrive at the following illustration:

Example 206.

a) Progressing by whole-step "bad"  

b) By major third skip "bad"

c) By perfect fifth skip "bad"  
d) By semitone "good"  
e) By perfect fourth skip "good"
Note: He approves Example 206d because of his basic conception of the mixed minor system already well known to us.+

The above rule shows that he does not forbid every cross relation of $F$ contra $B$, but only the one that occurs when two major thirds lead to a forbidden sum of an augmented fourth, ++ so that my example, Example 197, does not fall under his prohibition either.

In the last analysis, what is lacking in his rule is that he, unfortunately, neglects to state that a succession like the one in 206a can be permitted under better circumstances, when, through successful voice leading, the effect of the sum of the augmented fourth is softened. The germ of this idea, to be sure unconscious and given only in the sense of an exception, is expressed by Albrechtsberger in the words: "In cadences in three or more voices, such as those seen here, two major thirds ascending a whole step are permissible".

Example 207.

Yet, this idea in which the author obviously seems to have forced himself to grant an exception in the spirit of teaching harmony+++ is unjustifiably limited to the cadence and is, therefore, not expressed precisely enough as it stands. That he, in the practice of the lessons, pays attention only to a given situation might finally be proved by the corrections he undertook on Beethoven's lessons; +++

---

+Cf. above, Section I, Chapter 2, § 9.

++See Example 206a.

+++Here, the degree-progression II-V-I.

++++Given by Nottebohm on pages 48-9.
Example 208.

\begin{example}
\begin{music}
\(\text{Beethoven}\mid\text{Albrechtsberger}\)\\
\(\text{Beethoven}\mid\text{Albrechtsberger}\)
\end{music}
\end{example}

In Rule 7 Cherubini explains (p. 8): "We should always avoid the false relation of the octave and of the augmented fourth; both of them, but especially the octave, produce an unpleasant aural effect."* In the false and topsy-turvy assumption that only the tritone relationship itself** must be the sole reason for the prohibition, Cherubini is unfortunately compelled to categorically forbid every similar relationship, as for example:

Example 209.

\begin{example}
\begin{music}
\end{music}
\end{example}

[211] To be sure, this idea is radical and full of consequences; unfortunately, the assumption lacks intrinsic truth. For the same reason, Cherubini also overlooks this possibility:

Example 210.

\begin{example}
\end{example}

---

*After that follows a remark, the pertinent part of which I have cited in Harmonielehre, § 19.

**And not just the situation pertinent to it!
because B contra F\(^{\#}\) should be forbidden. But Cherubini—fortunately, even though quite inconsistently—does not voice such a prohibition.

On this question, Bellermann returns to the indifference of the old master, Fux. The suspicion is raised that he is exclusively inclined to judge only from the standpoint of the Mixolydian mode, when he writes this in a lesson he declares to be Mixolydian:

Example 211.

\[\text{Cantus firmus} \]

\[\text{Counterpoint} \]

and explains (p. 149):

In the second example of the Mixolydian mode, (\#59) we see F already raised to F\(^{\#}\) in the fourth to last measure while, according to the strictest rule, the sharp should be used only in the cadence itself. This exception can sometimes be permitted in Mixolydian when F, approached from above and rising again, is heard while B is heard in the other voice. In one such case, F\(^{\#}\) is not only permitted also at the beginning of a lesson but is imperative.** Here, if one should preserve the F in measure two, the tritone (F-B) between the two voices would produce a very unpleasant effect at the third measure, an effect that is called a cross relation—an inharmonious relationship. In the course of the melody, an F must appear again but by virtue of the mode.***

The last statement refers to the presumed Mixolydian character of the lesson.

---

*In the diminished fifth configuration.

**Here, the lesson follows. Its beginning and ending are quoted here [Example 211].(*60)

***Measure 5 [See (\#60)].
§ 19. Departure from the Imperfect Consonances.

Departing from imperfect consonances is free of prohibitions. But, in so far as the departure provides, at the same time, the approach to the next consonance, the principles concerning approaches discussed in §§ 6, 11, 17, and 18 remain in effect.


To better understand the special theory of the three types of voice motion cited earlier, I wish to present the appropriate rules as they are found in other theory books. In Fux we read (p. 81):

First Rule. From one perfect consonance to another you may either proceed in contrary motion or oblique motion.

Second Rule. From a perfect to an imperfect consonance, you may proceed in any of the three motions.

Third Rule. From an imperfect to a perfect consonance, you may proceed in contrary or oblique motion.

Fourth Rule. From one imperfect consonance to another, you may proceed in any of the three motions. In this connection, observe that oblique motion is permitted in all four progressions. The understanding of this threefold motion and its proper use depends, as one would say, on "the law and the prophets."

No mention is made here of antiparallels.

According to Albrechtsberger the rules of voice motion are (pp. 19-21):

+In the paragraphs above, Section II, §§ 9-19.
I. If, in two accords, the second pair of notes makes a perfect consonance, then we must avoid direct motion from the first pair to the second and use contrary or oblique motion. The first accord may be perfect or imperfect.+

Also, we must guard against two fifths or two octaves in contrary motion, especially when an organ equipped with a pedal provides the accompaniment. This is because the organist uses the pedal with the left foot for most of the root tones and very often makes skips of a fourth up or a fifth down, and vice versa, thereby causing us to hear just the fifths and octaves.

Albrechtsberger takes the occasion of antiparallels to make a prohibition of them. Since he reaches here for an explanation taken from free composition, we should reply at once** that, disregarding the fundamental unsuitability of such a procedure, the question itself ought to be posed differently. Observe, for example:

Example 212. a) Beethoven, Piano Sonata, Op. 2, No. 1, last movement;
   b) J. S. Bach, "Aria variata."

In the first example we need not assume a unison in order to permit the parallel octaves,*** since the tones G–C of the bass represent to a greater extent the scale degrees V–I than voices in a purely contrapuntal sense. In other words we hear the same succession of tones in the lower register on a different basis than in the higher register with the melody --there it is more a matter of degree progression, here it is

---

+Examples follow. (*61)

++Without prejudice to later explanations.

+++Even though this secondary effect must appear there of its own accord.
absolutely melody. In comparison, if the manuscripts are not faulty, we find more complicated circumstances in the Bach example; either there are from the second to the third quarter of the measure real parallel fifths \( \{b-e^1\} \) or from the first to the third quarter mere antiparallels \( \{b/e^1\} \). In the latter case, for reason of clarity, the \( E \) of the bass must be understood as a half note.\(^*\) But whether it is a matter of parallels or antiparallels, in either case there are scale-degrees whose expectations and fulfillment justify the fifths here.

II. If, in two accords, the second pair of notes makes an imperfect consonance, then we may use any of the three types of motion from the first to the second accord. The first accord may be perfect or imperfect.\(^{++}\)

Cherubini ventures more deeply into the clarification of the prohibition. We read (Rule 4, p. 5):

One should never permit several perfect consonances of the same type to follow one another regardless of their range. Consequently, two octave or fifth successions are forbidden. This prohibition covers all types of composition in strict style, be it for two voices or for more.

The explanatory remark follows:

An octave succession is almost entirely without harmony, and parallel fifths produce an unpleasant sound because the upper voice, at another pitch, instantaneously follows the footsteps of the lower voice. For example, when we add an upper voice to the \( C \) scale forming a fifth with each note, it necessarily follows that the one voice is in \( C \) while the other voice is in \( G \):

\[^{+}\text{That is, without subdivision into quarter notes.}\]

\[^{++}\text{Examples follow. (\#62)}\]
Example 213.

(Here, merely reduced to one staff.)

From this simultaneous presence of two keys an unpleasant sound results and, accordingly, the prohibition of writing fifth-successions, even if the progression is not by step but by skip. The effect remains the same.+

The formulation of the justification contained in the last remark makes it obvious that Cherubini was dominated by an excessively vague conception of the real nature of key. [215] As a consequence, the justification suffers from exaggeration. Even if we might justifiably bring it to bear on a phenomenon such as primitive organum, ++ could we, in either strict or free composition, reasonably apply it as an argument against a succession of only two fifths, for example? Is it, after all, possible to express simply by means of a series of two fifths even a single key, let alone two different keys running parallel?

And now to continue the rule, Cherubini says:

Fifths have been and still are tolerated in contrary motion.+++ By means of this example, we see that the one is a twelfth and the other a fifth; that changes the meaning. Nevertheless, this procedure is forbidden in two-part counterpoint, especially in note-against-note style. It is only permissible in four-part writing when we have difficulty in leading the voices in an acceptable manner.

He completely lacks a justification for the prohibition of antiparallels. He continues:

The student may encounter successive fifths and octaves in works of the galant style, that is, in opera,

---

+Example 12 follows showing several fifth successions in skips. (*63)

++See above, § 12.

+++Example 13 follows. (*64)
sinfonias, etc. However, they are then merely licenses that are tolerated in compositions of this sort.

How little trust in his own reasoning must Cherubini have had when he, the eternally stern and radical teacher, condescends at last to "tolerate" real parallel octaves and fifths under the guise of "license" in free composition. In place of the catchphrase "must be tolerated"—ah, so much insecurity and helplessness regarding this subject is hidden in the word "tolerate":—how much more effective it would have been to cite the possible reason that caused Cherubini to tolerate licenses in free composition.

But more surprises are found in his Rule V (p. 6):

It is forbidden to progress in direct motion to a perfect consonance except when one of the two voices moves a semitone. This case for example is permitted because one voice progresses by semitones:

[216] Example 214.

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 214.}
\end{array}\]

And after he has given the justification for the prohibition that was first stated in the same rule—we already know it from § 11—in reference to Example 15 he adds:

In regard to the tolerated progression shown in Example 15, the case is different. If we fill out the space between, two fifths do indeed appear; but one is diminished, the other perfect. These two fifths are tolerated because they are not of the same nature and because the unpleasant sound we have mentioned does not take place here. The older composers have always avoided this situation in two-part counterpoint and have permitted it only in multi-linear compositions in middle voices when the need arose to avoid another fault.

*Next follows Example 14 with the title "forbidden motion." (*65)

**Example 17 follows. It illustrates what has been said. (*66)
I do not need to amplify here that my argument in the remark to § 11 (pp. 179-180) refers also to the exception in Example 15 [Ex. 216] which Cherubini mentions in such an inconsequential way, and that it includes it likewise, under the prohibition. Obviously, Cherubini has been induced merely by the association of the degree-progression in free composition (VII-I) to decree those exceptions, and that is the reason for his vacillation of opinion.

Bellermann, like Fux (but with a logical reversal of the second and third Rule), formulates the basic tenets (p. 134 f.):

Rule 1. From one perfect consonance to another, you may proceed only in contrary or oblique motion.

Rule 2. From an imperfect to a perfect consonance, you may likewise proceed in contrary or oblique motion.

[217] Rule 3. From a perfect to an imperfect consonance, you may proceed in any of the three motions.

Rule 4. From one imperfect consonance to another, you may proceed likewise in any of the three motions.

With Bellermann we lack, as with Fux, any observation concerning antiparallels.

Those are, collectively, the rules of voice leading to be mentioned here, which, unfortunately are also customarily presented in the teaching of harmony, indeed immediately in the first lessons. In Harmonielehre I have already explained why they belong only in the teaching of counterpoint as the ex officio doctrine of voice leading, and what damage they do to the instruction when they are already used, confusingly, in the teaching of harmony.

+As, by the way, was Albrechtsberger with regard to the question of two major thirds; see Example 207.

++Example follows. (*67)

+++Example follows. (*68)

++++Example follows. (*69)

+++++Example follows. (*70)
BEGINNING


At the beginning, thus in the first measure, we must place only a unison, octave, or fifth—never a third, tenth, or sixth. The rank order of the perfect consonances is known from § 4 of this chapter. Beyond that, the question of whether we should prefer a unison, octave, or fifth must be decided most properly by the situation of the second measure, that is, whether the unison, for example, can find a favorable departure or not, etc. However, there is a point that must be given careful attention.

When the counterpoint is in the lower voice, we may not set the under-fifth in the name of the usually required fifth, since that would cause us to leave the key. Thus, for example, the following opening in C major would not close in C major, but rather in F major, whereby, to be sure, we would have to assume the lower of the two voices to be the cantus firmus, the upper voice the counterpoint:


\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C.f.} \\
\text{Cpt.}
\end{array}
\]

Naturally, the prohibition of the imperfect consonances in the first measure of a lesson is to be understood as only relative. That is to say, it follows as a matter of course in counterpoint that the unraveling of all emerging problems must always proceed from the simple and natural to the complicated and less natural.++ That the perfect conso-

---

+Cf. § 16, above.

++See Introduction, p. 16.
nances are the more natural ones is doubtlessly true, especially since the purpose of the beginning can be none other than to mark the tonic and its harmony (as fully as possible in two-part writing) in the quietest and surest way.

In this purely contrapuntal conception of the objective (merely to give a beginning to an exercise), the value scale advanced above cannot submit to any deviation according to modes of teaching and always remains invariable. Likewise, as far as the beginning of a musical composition is concerned, the free composition style of a certain period, whether past, present, or future, may behave as usual. Lessons and free composition are such entirely different matters that, least of all, can the latter furnish obligatory inferences for the former.

The present problem is best expressed by Albrechtsberger (p. 21, Rule III):

A perfect consonance must be used at the beginning and end with the exception that we must not end with the fifth in the upper counterpoint or begin with it in the lower one.++

[219] On the other hand, when Dehn states (p. 5):

On these two (beginning and ending notes), the old composers simply demanded a perfect consonance of the key. For us, it is good enough if the beginning and end of a composition clearly defines its key, and we may, for example, end with a third in the upper voice as long as the bass note is in the tonic.

--and when he actually opens a lesson with the interval of a third (p. 7), we must recognize in this, simply, a childish delusion to "modernize" the counterpoint, a rebellion against a rule whose meaning he has not understood at all. What an accursed confusion of the teaching of counterpoint and composition!!

+Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, §1.

++Cf. also p. 66.
§ 22. The Preferability of Imperfect to Perfect Consonances.

In the middle, one should use more imperfect than perfect consonances. Because of the harmonic properties of the imperfect consonances (elaborated in § 4 of this chapter), they appear to be more suitable for the continuation of the setting than do the perfect consonances, which either limit its harmonic content too much or merely repeat the tone of the cantus firmus.

Here, where it is our task to learn the ways and means of creating such a modest organism, the pupil must be made aware that in imperfect consonances there is an active stimulus to the rolling-forth of the content.

On the other hand, good taste prohibits setting more than three thirds or sixths in succession without a special reason. For, even though it is easiest to write the counterpoint to a voice merely in thirds or sixths, in such a case the undesirable effect of "interval monotony" is unavoidable, and the lack of variety and contrast of intervals lowers the artistic value of the counterpoint.†

[220] However, as to the question of whether sixths, when several appear in succession, are better directed descending or ascending, see the discussion of the six-three chords in three-part writing.‡‡

†For that reason alone, it is totally unnecessary for us to make use of Riemann's false hypothesis concerning the degree of blending of thirds—see above, § 12.

‡‡Section III, Chapter 1, § 5.
Fux criticizes the use of several ascending sixths in succession (on page 92).†

Albrechtsberger writes (p. 24, Rule X):

Unless there is good reason, one should not set more than three thirds or sixths in direct succession for the sake of the folk or ballad-like quality of the song.++

§ 23. The Use of the Perfect Consonances and Several Commonplace Exceptions.

From the standpoint of the voice leading, it is obvious that perfect consonances can and should be used in the middle as long as we observe the proper laws governing departure and approach inherent in them (§§ 6-20), and exercise moderation, at least in principle, in their use (§ 22).

The only exceptions are:

1. The unison, which here in two-part, first species counterpoint is forbidden because it would too suddenly and drastically hamper the flow of a texture already characterized by sparseness of sound; and

2. The octave, whose use in the middle would set up a cadence which in turn—considering the brevity and sparseness of sound in two-part exercises—would establish a premature and misleading goal for the voice leading and thereby weaken the impression of closure at the last cadence. The fact that, in a purely contrapuntal sense, we must understand here by such a cadence only the succession 6--8, will be shown later, in § 29.+++ Nevertheless, cadences are, of

†See quote in Section III, Chapter 1, § 14, Table VII, Fig. 11.(*71)

++Cf. furthermore, pp. 30, 32.

+++ Concerning the same question in three-part writing, see Section III, Chapter 1, § 23.
course, permitted in the closely related keys.+

Fux combines the present question of the unison with the ottava battuta (10--8) on pages 72-73, at which point he [221] also prohibits the unison in the middle of an exercise.++ He does not speak explicitly about the cadence, but he does discuss the avoidance of cadences on page 131 in his instruction on fugue. (*72)

Albrechtsberger discusses the prohibition of the unison on page 21, Rule V; concerning cadences he states (p. 22, Rule VIII):

Cadences, the half as well as the full, are forbidden in the middle of a setting. In the last two measures of the ending a half cadence is permitted; for example:

Example 216.

"bad"

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
5 & 8 & 3 & 8 & 3 & 8 \\
\text{\#} & \text{\#} & \text{\#} & \text{\#} & \text{\#} & \text{\#} \\
\end{array}
\]

Example 217.

"good"

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
6 & 8 & 3 & 1 \\
\text{\#} & \text{\#} & \text{\#} & \text{\#} \\
\end{array}
\]

We can see from this, first of all, that he calls a "full cadence" one in which the dominant intervenes; a half cadence is one in which only the two leading tones are used.+++ On page 27, he teaches only in a casuistic way—since no other way would be possible in this situation—what other means must be used when there is a threat of cadence:

---

+Cf. § 28 of this chapter.

++See quote in Section II, Chapter 2, § 12.

+++Concerning the permissibility of half cadences in three-part writing, see his page 81.


The Distance between the Two Voices.

The requirement of a good effect, by itself, stipulates a modest distance between the voices. For that reason, two-part writing preferably should make use of only adjacent voices, for example, soprano and alto, or alto and tenor, or tenor and bass, etc.

The same postulate of the good effect also requires that the distance between the two voices should, if possible, never exceed a tenth. If, on the contrary, the voices should turn out to be too close at some point, it would be especially advisable to use, along with other remedies, the skip of a sixth in order to establish once again the contrast of the distance and at the same time achieve thereby other advantages for the voice leading.

Fux writes (p. 76):

[Aloys.] Furthermore, if the two voices should approach each other so closely that we hardly know where to proceed, and if there is no opportunity to advance in contrary motion, then we may achieve such motion through the skip of a minor sixth, which is permissible, or the skip of an octave.
Concerning the distance between the voices, Fux strictly adheres to the principle of proximity in lessons of first species, while later, to the detriment of his teaching, he ignores it.

Bellermann writes splendidly (p. 143): 

If a two-part setting is to sound well modulated, both voices must stand in a correct relationship to one another and not too far apart. In his exercises, the student must therefore combine two voices that are near each other, that is, the tenor with the bass, the alto with the tenor, or the alto with the soprano—never the bass with the alto, or even the bass with the soprano, etc.—for without instrumental accompaniment, a pure intonation is difficult to obtain in intervals that exceed the octave. In addition, such intervals sound empty and scanty unless a middle voice fills them out. Therefore, in two-part composition the tenth is considered to be the widest distance permitted between two voices.

We must be careful here not to interpret the euphony of the lessons in the sense of a free composition as Bellermann has so often done through his fundamental misunderstanding of counterpoint teaching. Also, in reference to euphony, the student has here at first only to discover that which is nearby.* The "euphony" of the setting stands merely in the service of the lesson; only the nature of the voices and voice leading must be explored!

---

*Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 20.

All the rules and prohibitions that are valid for the cantus firmus are applicable to the counterpoint as well; for instance, the rules in reference to intervals,† cadences (§ 23), the flowing melody (§ 20), the prohibition of chromatic movement of monotony, or the outlining of harmonic sums.++ In short, in strict counterpoint lessons, the counterpoint is to be no less a melody than the cantus firmus itself:

The necessity for the counterpoint to have a melodic character in each and every situation applies even more in free composition. For there, in accordance with the unlimited freedom which the melody is justified in demanding, its counterpoint, too, may claim and expect an unconstrained arrangement.


The very fact that the cantus firmus is the element given a priori, in contrast to which the counterpoint can only be considered as a complement added a posteriori, makes the latter dependent on the former in many respects. As a curse of this dependency, so to speak, the counterpoint must often deviate from the rules and norms that are the main stays of the independent cantus firmus.

Thus, for example, the very postulate of a flowing melody—which is the main demand in the counterpoint as it is in the cantus firmus—can, under certain circum-

†Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, §§ 5-19.

++ Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 4, § 21, etc.
stances, cause the counterpoint to stay on the same pitch, that is, to simply repeat the tone which violates the prohibition of tone repetition.+

A unison in the first measure may also cause a tone repetition in the second because the eminent advantage of departing the unison in oblique motion++ should be secured thereby; for example:

Example 220.

How often such a tone repetition may take place successively can be decided only by the requirements of the given cantus firmus and the line of the counterpoint. Perhaps we cannot designate even a three-time repetition as the final permissible limit.

Albrechtsberger remarks (p. 24):

The counterpoint in two-part writing may, at the most, continue on the same pitch for only three measures (even of alla breve, two-four, three-four, or three-two time) because of the sluggish melody created.

But when he adds, "the Tasto solo in compositions of three or more parts is naturally exempted from this rule," then he has given a much too naive expression to an undoubtedly correct insight. That is caused by the fact that he did not present all the connecting thoughts in the detail required by the matters explained in the text of §§ 25 and 26 above. I only fear that he did not know them himself.

---

+Section I, Chapter 2, § 3.

++Cf. § 16.
§ 27.--B) The License of Voice Crossing.

As a rule, the counterpoint remains in its place during the course of the entire lesson, that is, consistently above or consistently below the cantus firmus. However, under certain circumstances the flowing melody (also the necessity, here and there, to avoid a forbidden succession) can cause a crossing of the two voices to seem entirely desirable. It is obvious that such an exceptional placing of the voices must not continue too long, and that, above all—so that our impression of the position of the two voices will not be completely reversed—it must not affect the cadence formula itself.

Albrechtsberger offers this charming remark (p. 32):

(*) **4** . . . we are permitted to set more than three thirds in succession, if among them one (or several) is set above or below.

Example 221.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Cpt.} \\
\text{3} \\
\text{c.f.}
\end{array}
\]

We also infer from this example that Albrechtsberger does not shy away from permitting voice crossing even towards the end of a lesson.

In contrast, Bellermann justifiably opposes such a voice crossing at the cadence (p. 145):

At the cadence, we must avoid this at all costs unless the cantus firmus itself should have a large skip from the low register directly before the ending. Such cases are rare, however; for example:
Example 222.

\[\text{\textcopyright{\textcopyright}}\]

Here, too, the counterpoint can easily be written in such a way that the voices do not have to end up crossed.

Example 223.

\[\text{\textcopyright{\textcopyright}}\]


By the addition of the counterpoint, a harmony in vertical direction comes to life for the first time in two-part writing—a situation that could not occur in the melody of the cantus firmus alone, because there we perceive harmony in the horizontal direction. The possibility of establishing the eventual modulations with relatively greater clarity than was evident in the cantus firmus now naturally follows.

Nevertheless, it remains the rule in two-part writing that a modulation must never be produced through a chromatic inflection [chroma] because, depending on whether or not the chromatic inflection is brought in the same voice or another, a chromatic movement or the effect of a modal mixture (or else of a chromatic modulation) would thereby be created. All these effects must appear, as mentioned in Section I, Chapter 2, § 4, inadequate and vague at this

+Section I, Chapter 2, § 22.
point, and are therefore forbidden.

Accordingly, if a modulation is correct when it moves as the Albrechtsberger example cited on page 142, Example 133, shows, it is, on the contrary, wrong in the following voice leading, in which we must assume a modal mixture, if not a real chromatic modulation:

Example 224.

The chromatic inflections characterizing the latter cases are called inharmonious cross relations and with that we express the limit of all freedom of modulation in the tersest manner possible--we simply forbid any cross relation.

Thus, to finally summarize, the concept of cross relation includes any chromatic change of a tone that is distributed between two voices. We have to exempt from this concept not only the chromatic movement occurring in the same voice but also the opposing of F and E.+

To the degree that free composition urgently needs modal mixture and chromatic modulation, the resulting cross relation becomes not merely a "tolerated license" but an altogether justified necessity.

Already in my Harmonielehre we find some examples

+The tritone; Cf. § 18 above.
that, by chance, also display the cross relation. I can, therefore, limit myself here to a single example:


By reason of a chromatic tonalization process established retrogressively, the first measure of this example shows a cross relation: the $e^1$ of the melody itself ($e^1 - g^b - e^1$), as a chromatically raised third of the II-degree [228] in B-flat minor contrasts with the diatonic third $E^b^{++}$ of the very same scale-degree. (Because of the resulting interval in the melody, a diminished third, $e^1 - g^b$ results.)

By virtue of the chromatic modulation presented in the second measure of the example, when the $A$ (as a third of the $V$ in B-flat minor) and the $A^b$ (as the seventh of the $V$ in E-flat minor) meet one another there is a cross relation.

---

*Cf. Example 81, system 3: from the third to the fourth quarter; and at the same place, page 126: from the second to the third quarter; Example 88, measure 2: from the second to the third quarter; Example 89, measures 1 and 2, and later measures 5 and 6 (4); Example 97, measures 3 and 4, etc.

++By the way, in three octaves.

+++Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 8.
Albrechtsberger's Chapter IV (p. 7), entitled "On Musical Modes and Keys," treats modulation among other items. But, mistakenly, it does so only in free composition* so that the opinion presented there cannot apply directly to the teaching of counterpoint.** Compare, in contrast, § 22 of the previous chapter with reference to Albrechtsberger's failure to deal directly with modulation in contrapuntal lessons.

The analogous lessons of counterpoint instruction are glossed over in a similar way by Cherubini. He states (p. 11):

In a composition, we should not modulate to any key other than those that are within the scale. In C major, we may not modulate other than to G major, to A minor, to F major and D minor, and in the latter, we must take care to use F only in passing because B does totally destroy the idea of the main key whose leading tone is B. The same is true with C#, which is the leading tone in D minor and stands in opposition to the principal key. We may also modulate to E minor, but we must not linger there because of the F# and D#. The key of B is totally forbidden because the fifth in it is raised. In A minor, we may only modulate to C major, and we may, in passing, use F major and D minor. The key of E minor may also appear, but B major is forbidden here just as in C major.

All these modulations are naturally related to the principal key. Practice and reflection produce the means to combine them into a beautiful whole and apply them in a satisfying and effective way.

So much for Cherubini. In teaching composition, all this is probably very appropriate. In counterpoint, however, it is valid only in so far as it is not presented as an appropriate instruction in counterpoint teaching, but only as an excursion into free composition.

It has unfortunate repercussions for Cherubini that he does not recognize cross relations for what they are, namely, a modulation through modal mixture or chromatic inflection. He assumes that they are simply a relationship to be absolutely condemned. One reads (p. 8, in a remark to the seventh rule):

---

*Symphony, concerto, quartet, quintet, psalm, chorus.

**Let us not overlook the fact that Albrechtsberger considers counterpoint a real part of an "introduction to composition."
Relation signifies the direct affinity of two successive tones or two tones that are heard simultaneously. This affinity is considered, according to the nature of the interval formed by the two tones, in such a way that the relation is true when the interval is diatonic, false when the interval is augmented or diminished. Let us include here, in harmony, those whose two tones cannot belong to one and the same scale. The diminished or augmented octave is a false relation in harmony and in melody, no matter in which way it is used. We can reduce this unfortunate effect but we can never eliminate it totally. Therefore, it is completely forbidden.

False relation of the diminished and the augmented octave.

Example 226.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
  & \text{C#} & \text{C} \\
\end{array}
\]

In harmony, the simultaneous use of such octaves is entirely unsuitable.

Example 227.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
  & \text{C#} & \text{C} \\
\end{array}
\]

There are, however, more recent composers who take the liberty to use them in the following way:

Example 228.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
  & \text{C#} & \text{C} \\
\end{array}
\]

They, then, regard the C# and the Cb as passing alterations and as notes that have little value because they fall on weak beats. This is a great license which can barely be tolerated in the totally free style and must be forbidden altogether in strict style.
What serious errors are piled up by Cherubini!
Simply because lessons of strict counterpoint must reject
[230] modal mixture, chromatic modulation, diminished and
augmented octaves—to give the reason for this prohibition
should have been Cherubini's task!—must, then, for that
reason alone, free composition refrain from using them also?
Why, then? Perhaps by reason of consistency? Is it more
consistent when free composition, which is permitted to use+
dissonant passing tones surely as much as strict counterpoint,
now sets in motion, under the same title as dissonant passing
tones, chromatic movements for which it has indeed++ won a
new, independent justification?+++ 

And why then should Wagner—in order to respond to
Cherubini's Example 20—where so many new demands appear,
hesitate to write:

Example 229. Tristan and Isolde (full score, p. 151).

To the contrary, would then it not have been condemned as inco­
sistent if, when, despite the many reasons that Wagner had in
this place to choose this manner of writing, he had decided
against it, that is, if in deference to strict counterpoint, he
still within his lessons could not summon those reasons, and
refrained from doing it in free composition.++++

Finally, I wish to remind the reader that Cherubini,
unfortunately, also considers the tritone to be a cross
relation. We find more information about that in the remarks
in § 18 of this chapter.

---

+Cf. next chapter.
++Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 4.
+++Cf. above, for example, Examples 30, 31, etc.
++++Cf., in addition, Harmonielehre, § 53 ff.
But let us read further:

There is another occasion where we can find ourselves in a position to write a false relation in the harmony between two different accords. For example:

Example 230.

[231]

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{Ex. 22.} & \text{Ex. 23.} \\
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{False} & \text{False} \\
\text{relation} & \text{relation} \\
\text{of the} & \text{of the} \\
\text{octave} & \text{octave} \\
\end{array} \]

In the first example the upper-voice C of the first accord makes a discord with the contrasting C# in the lower voice of the second accord. This is undoubtedly true for any trained ear, and the intellect easily proves that these two tones belong to totally different accords which bear no close relationship to one another and therefore cannot follow one another directly without producing an unpleasant effect on the ear.

There is, however, a simple means by which we can mitigate this unfortunate situation, namely, if we insert another note so that the voice which sang C, in the above example, lets C# be heard beforehand; the idea is that the C is obliterated by this in-between note, for example:

Example 232.

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{Ex. 24.} \\
\end{array} \]
Through these and similar expedients, we can mitigate the unpleasantness of the false relation and accustom the ear to it because the impression is not so direct. In strict style, however, we should always avoid such cases.

Of how little use this is in free composition and how superfluous and confusing in strict counterpoint: Certainly it is correct for Cherubini to emphasize that C and C♯ "belong to different accords which bear no close relationship," but, it is no less correct that in addition to modulation through reinterpretation or enharmonics, free composition is obliged to often use, for many reasons, modulation through chromatic inflection whose content forms the cross relations of diminished octaves, etc., that are in question here:

CLOSING


From the fact that like the cantus firmus the counterpoint is permitted to use only one of the two leading tones for its own closing, + it is apparent that only the following formulas may be used if we are to avoid the formation of parallel octaves or primes by applying the same leading tone in the cantus firmus as in the counterpoint:

Example 233.

I prefer to call the above cadence formulas, for which the term "half cadence" has been used, "contrapuntal cadences." My reason for this terminology is based on the fact that they have originated precisely from contrapuntal voice leading through the interval of the second, as if from the main agent

+ Cf. above, ¶ 25.
of the flowing melody.

But, another form of cadence, such as the following:

Example 234.

\[ \text{Example 234.} \]

lacks, in the lower voice, the leading tone and substitutes
the interval of the fifth for it. If it on the one hand,
ignores the contrapuntal postulate of the leading tone as
irrevocably the penultimate note of a melody, it shows all
too clearly, on the other hand, the characteristic of a
purely harmonic origin, namely, that of the V-I degree-
progression. Precisely for this reason, we may call this,
in contrast to the first-mentioned contrapuntal cadences,
simply the "harmonic cadence"--a designation that gives us a
better notion of its essence than does the term "full cadence,"
[233] which has been used up till now. The harmonic cadence
must therefore be banished from two-part writing and be intro-
duced no sooner than three-part writing. Moreover, it is per-
missible there only if the two leading tones cooperate at the
closing and pay tribute, thereby, to the spirit of the voice
leading:† Thus, the counterpoint adheres, without change, to
the true contrapuntal laws concerning the leading tones,
ever sacrificing them. This is true without exception in
all exercises!

From the above discussion, we can conclude that a
succession like:

†See Section III, Chapter 1, below.
can be called neither a contrapuntal cadence nor a harmonic cadence. Even the cooperation of one of the leading tones in the upper of the two voices is not sufficient, as we see, to include this interval succession under the concept of cadence.

Finally, it follows from the tendency to adhere strictly to the vocal basis in these lessons, that the closing formula 3--1 must be preferred over the formula 10--8:

Example 236.

We must not overlook the fact that a closer relationship of the voices is always more suitable to the character of the closing than the more distant one of the tenth or octave.

Those who pay less attention to the distance between the voices may, in spite of everything, choose the formula 10--8.

[234] Albrechtsberger uses the closing formula 10--8 in his lessons without ado.+

Bellermann writes (p. 145):

The cadence from the tenth to the octave is not good and should be avoided in the exercises since one must see to it, particularly at the closing, that the

+Cf. quote in § 23 of this chapter.
voices stand in an acceptable relationship to one another. The tenth, as the widest distance between two voices, ought to be used only in passing in the middle of a setting.

LESSONS

Example 237.

1. Alto, C.f. (Supposedly Dorian)

2. Tenor

3. Alto, C.f. (Supposedly Lydian)

4. Bass

5. Alto, C.f.
Remarks Concerning These Lessons

About 1. Fux used fifths in measures 4 and 6 as if they came about spontaneously from contrary motion to the line of the flowing melody. Under such favorable circumstances of the line as he found here, he did not wish to avoid the fifth by substituting a sixth or the like in a forced manner. Measures 5 and 6, and later, measures 8 and 9, pay no heed to the B against F.+

About 2. Beautiful; an especially successful mixture of perfect and imperfect consonances (measures 3, 8).

About 3. In measures 3-4 and 9-10, the parallelism of the steps is very noticeable, almost giving the impression of monotony in the larger sense of the word.++ By using the interval of the sixth in measure 3, this unfortunate effect could have been avoided without great damage.

The succession 3--8 in the same measures is not a cadence.+++ 

About 4. The low path of the cantus firmus under the tonic in measures 5-7 (supposedly Hypolydian!) caused Fux to cross voices for the duration of no less than four

+Cf. § 18 of this chapter.
++Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 21.
+++Cf. Section II, §§ 23 and 29.
measures. The lesson presents only imperfect consonances, but, to be sure, in suitable variety and in beautiful mixture.

About 5. Let us not overlook here the three measures (4-6) that use tone repetition.

About 6. The tenth in the final measures is unpleasant.+

About 7. The conduct of the counterpoint suffers from the unfavorable nature of the cantus firmus itself. In the last four measures, Albrechtsberger goes beyond the principles of strict counterpoint by having the diminished fourth follow a skip of the sixth++ while he had the means at his disposal to simply tie over the B, in the third measure before the end, in order, then, to approach the leading tone by a third.+++

+Cf. Section II, Chapter 1, § 29.

++Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 9.

+++Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 23.
CHAPTER 2
SECOND SPECIES: TWO NOTES AGAINST ONE
GENERAL COMMENTS

§ 1. The Downbeat and Upbeat.

This species teaches us how we are to set two notes (i.e., half notes) in the counterpoint against one note in the cantus firmus.

For the first time it will become necessary to distinguish two counts. The first one we call the downbeat and the second the upbeat. This designation is taken from time-beating whereby the first, so-called strong beat, is expressed by the lowering of the hand or baton, and the second, so-called weak beat, by the lifting of the hand or baton. Conceived in this sense, it is, certainly, better to translate the old designation "thesis" as downbeat, and "arsis" as upbeat rather than vice versa.

Fux writes (p. 74):

[Aloys.] Before I begin to explain this species of counterpoint, you need to know that we are dealing with a binary meter, whereby the time or the measure consists of two equal divisions, one of which is determined by the lowering of the hand, the other by the lifting of the hand. The downbeat is called thesis in Greek and the upbeat is called arsis. We shall use these two terms in our exercises.

Bellermann uses the terms arsis and thesis in reverse fashion (p. 150). The reason for this should be read on page 2 in a footnote.

§ 2. Dissonance on the Upbeat.

That the downbeat must always have a consonance is self-evident from the discussion in the previous section regarding the need for consonance in strict counterpoint.
[238] To be sure, it conforms with this postulate when there is also a consonance on the upbeat. Yet, under certain circumstances, the latter may bear a dissonance with the cantus firmus.

§ 3.-A) The Necessity for Stepwise Motion to the Dissonance.

If we use dissonance arbitrarily and unrestrictedly on the upbeat, we will easily perceive, in cases such as in Examples 238a and b:

Example 238.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a) } \quad \text{b) } \\
\text{c) } & \text{etc.}
\end{array}
\]

a harmonic relationship between the dissonance and the two tones placed on the following downbeat. This relationship is known in free composition as the anticipation,\(^{++}\) which, in strict counterpoint, brings about an unwelcome melodic-harmonic unity. In a case such as Example 238c, it becomes clear to the ear that instead of taking the counterpoint from F to G, it would be far more natural to take it from E to G because of the C in the cantus firmus:

Example 239.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\end{array}
\]

\(^{+}\)Of the cantus firmus and counterpoint.

\(^{++}\)Cf. Harmonielehre, § 163.
Moreover, in the case in Example 238c, it is above all the two-voice texture which, unfortunately, must be blamed—particularly within the realm of an exercise—for the fact that instead of the natural, more individual path, the less natural one was taken.

If, as we have pointed out frequently, strict counterpoint must now avoid perplexing unities and must always prefer the natural over the artificial, then for it to sanction within its sphere of interest a dissonance-tactic that leads to effects such as those in Examples 238a, b, and c, is quite obviously against its nature. In the quest for the solution of this problem (i.e., the means to alleviate the danger of an anticipation or of an all-too-individualized and differentiated melodic turning), strict counterpoint found, as the most suitable means, the interval of the second in a horizontal line. As the second, this interval can then introduce various dissonances in the vertical-harmonic direction:

Example 240.

We see that the second, as used here, creates total neutrality from tone to tone by not granting more harmony to the following than to the preceding tone. Since it is dissonant to both surrounding tones, it cannot possibly maintain a harmonic relationship with either of them. Finally, we must add here that the interval of a second complies especially

+Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, §16.
well with the postulate of the flowing melody—could we find a more fortunate solution?

As a result of the advantageous consequences of both the harmonic neutrality and the flowing melody, this principle was formulated long ago: the dissonance on the upbeat must be used only in stepwise movement.

Therefore, one cannot "skip into" or "skip out of" a dissonance on the upbeat—to express this law in terms frequently used in textbooks.

§ 4.—B) The Direction of the Stepwise Motion to the Dissonance.

[240] Judging only according to these elements, it would be logical to call the following a good solution to our problem:

Example 241.

![Music notation]

since here, just as in Example 239, the dissonance is on the upbeat and appears only in passing. Unfortunately, the fact that the consonant tones framing the dissonant tone are identical brings about a situation where all three tones belong to a higher melodic unity because it appears that only the one tone C of the counterpoint is melodically inflected. If we want to avoid this effect in the interest of the balance demanded in the counterpoint, we must avoid returning to the same tone (as seen above), by sticking to the principle of passing movement. In other words: stepwise dissonance placed on the upbeat must continue in the direction from which it came.
§ 5. Appearances of the Passing Second and the Neighboring Tone.

The problem of the dissonance on the upbeat thus leads conclusively to the following value-scale of solutions:

1. The first and most natural solution, one that makes all errors impossible, is the one that demands the maintaining of the direction in passing movement.

   In this situation we call the dissonant tone a passing second.

2. Less natural because it is connected with an unwelcome effect in strict counterpoint and therefore given second place, is the solution that permits a return of the same consonant tone on the downbeat of the next measure.

   [241] In this case, the stepwise dissonance appearing between two identical consonant tones is called the neighboring tone.

3. By comparison, all other solutions, which involve skipping into and out of the dissonance—and there are, understandably, an endless number of them--must be declared totally unfit for strict counterpoint.† Rather, they are held in reserve for free composition, which alone, in contrast to the former, can add and express the psychological basis for each individual style according to the measure of the compositional moods.

   With regard to the neighboring tone, let us not overlook the important advantage it offers to the composition: the advantage of the second. By means of the neighboring tone, it is often possible to supply the ever welcome second to the flowing melody in situations in which one might choose to skip because the genuine passing dissonance is not

†I.e., for the lesson stage.
feasible. If the neighboring tone shares with the passing second the advantage of the second, then the two are essentially distinguished by the fact that in the former the note of the melody turns around its own axis, so to speak, as we can see in Example 242. This point can be seen more clearly in free composition than in a strict counterpoint exercise.


[242] As it turns out, it is easy to distinguish the passing second and the neighboring tone from the so-called accented passing tone [Wechselnote], whose appearance belongs only in free composition.++ Like the others, the latter represents a dissonance locked between two consonant tones, except that it appears on the downbeat instead of the upbeat:

Example 243.

+Couperin's works, edited by Brahms.

++Cf. Harmonielehre, § 167.
The previously discussed value-scale of dissonances on the upbeat is totally independent of time or mode. Therefore, it is useless and childish—under the pretense of wanting to write a "modern" contrapuntal theory—to advocate, for example, the permissibility of the neighboring tone as proof of a presumably advanced standpoint. The effects indicated in this value-scale remain the same forever and are ranked only among themselves. For the sake of the distinction, we may at times acknowledge a stricter standpoint (which excludes the neighboring tone), and at other times a less strict one (which, inversely, includes it). However, the possibility of such a choice never means anything but the differentiation of the problem—never a "modernization" of it.

Unfortunately, none of the generally accepted textbooks has substantiated the principle of the passing second. Thus a correct solution of the dissonance problem that appears here for the first time has always been expounded in a righteous tone as the exclusive "rule." That the student suffers harm by such instruction is obvious. However, the teacher, too, suffers because he fails to understand the basis of the rule he inherits and teaches. He becomes insecure and unprincipled as soon as he must decide whether the neighboring tone, or the more distant solution, such as the accented passing tone, is permissible in the lessons. Following the previous representation, each solution with its characteristic effect has now been clearly profiled. It only remains for the teacher to decide, beyond any individual quirk and with full clarity, either for the very strict or for the less strict viewpoint. Each teacher and student may do with it as he wishes—but, he should know where he stands.

Fux comes to terms with this problem without giving

+Of course only one of several.
an explanation (p. 74):

[Alloys.] In this species of counterpoint, no dissonance can appear other than one which fills in the space between notes that are a third apart; for example:

Example 244. Table II, Fig. 21.

We need not worry whether the note filling in is consonant or dissonant. All that matters is that the empty space between these notes a third apart is filled in.

We see that his definition of the dissonance permitted here refers only to passing dissonance going in the same direction, and that this logically excludes the neighboring tone. In actual fact, Fux avoids the neighboring tone in his lessons and uses dissonance only in the strictest, stepwise-passing movement. All the more striking (to be sure, unique) is, then, the voice leading in Table IV, Figure 1 where a seventh is approached by skip on the upbeat:

[244] Example 245.

If we consider the consequence of this and if we know that such a voice leading belongs only in the free composition that is governed by purely harmonic concepts, then we are not in the position to excuse Fux of the utter dilemma he has created for himself. Without doubt, the tenor had to go by contrary motion to D if he wanted to avoid a nonparallel, direct approach to the fifth. On the other hand, the tenor

Measures 2 of the example.
could not, under any circumstances, descend below C. What was to be done? Obviously, he should have altered the voice leading at a much earlier point in order to have spared himself from such an irregularity.

Probably only following the delusion of a falsely-understood modernity, Albrechtsberger permits the neighboring tone on the upbeat (in addition to the passing dissonance) without distinction as to whether it is an upper or lower neighbor.++ After he has presented the rule of the passing dissonance,+++ he adds, without pointing out the differences in effect: "It is also permissible to introduce dissonances, even those that are diminished or augmented, between two identical tones which, however, must be consonants."++++ Actually, in his exercises Albrechtsberger uses neighboring tones as if their effect were totally equal to the strict, passing dissonance. However, the practice of ignoring the differences as if there were none causes the ear and the consciousness to become increasingly apathetic, for in the process, the ear neglects its capability of distinguishing different effects. Inevitably, a destructive sameness of goal and accomplishment must appear in the lessons.

Cherubini is even less constrained than Albrechtsberger and for that reason, even further distant from the true purpose of counterpoint instruction:+++++

[245] The strong beat should always have a consonance. There are particularly difficult cases where we may insert a dissonance on the strong beat; it is rare, and appears only when we cannot escape from other unfortunate situations, for example, those that cause a melody to skip, or the like. The weak beat can bear a consonance or dissonance if it is located between two consonant notes and the melody which it forms is flowing. Such a dissonance is called "passing."

Thus, passing dissonance, the neighboring tone, and even the accented passing tone are bunched together in this

---

*Cf., Section I, Chapter 2, § 2.

++Cf., p. 35.

+++Unfortunately without any foundation!

++++Examples follow. (*75)

+++++Cf., Rule 2, p. 12.
rule and no clear distinction or proof is offered regarding the different concepts! It is clear from the wording that Cherubini also includes the neighboring tone; he uses them freely in his lessons. But, the more surprising aspect is his allowance of the accented passing tone in lessons of strict counterpoint—cf. Example 48, page 17:

Example 246.

\[ \text{Example 246.} \]

Whoever is undecided whether or not to believe that Cherubini confronts us here with a regrettable misunderstanding of the true task of teaching counterpoint needs only to read the following remark concerning this same figure:

I could have done it differently, but by putting the dissonance on the strong beat, I obtain a freer and more agreeable melody. That is sufficient reason to justify ignoring the rule. As he progresses, the student will find solace in this method in other situations. From the above examples one can learn how the counterpoint must be made according to the strictest rules of art in order to combine with the pleasing melody the particular style which suits this kind of composition.

If, in the lesson—which, through its modest opportunities, is supposed to inform the ear, initially, about the manifold phenomena of the living tones—one wants also to convey, at once, that which is called "style"; if one exclusively presents lessons instead of examples of a specific kind of composition and then also ventures—with an appeal to the requirements of the latter—to permit in them, at the same time, transgressions of "rules"; and, in brief, if one promotes genuine composition in which, at first, one is supposed to learn to distinguish effects by means of a lesson contrived for these purposes; then the confusion of concepts and principles has probably reached its peak! And yet I have the suspicion that Cherubini’s mistake, one similar to Albrechtsberger's, can be ascribed once again to the unholy desire for modernity which, as we have seen before and shall see again, suddenly

\[ ^{+}\text{As for example, in our case, about the passing dissonance, neighboring tone, and accented passing tone.} \]
hinders the theorist from understanding what alone is the task of the teaching of counterpoint.

Bellermann is the first to hark back to the total strictness of Fux. He likes to transmit the latter's teachings in other ways as well. He requires progression in the same direction for dissonance and expressly excludes the neighboring tone with the following words (pp. 150-51):

It must be emphatically noted that this can take place only in the manner shown here and that a passing dissonance is not to be confused with the neighboring tone. By this we mean a dissonance on the weak beat that does not move in the same direction but returns to the first tone or occasionally moves to a foreign interval; for example:

Example 247.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
1) \quad 2) \quad 3) \\
\end{array}
\]

Of course, the composers of the sixteenth century knew this type of dissonance, but they used it only in the quicker note-values, and then only rarely.

Aside from the fact that Bellerman, much like his predecessors, lacks justification for the main rule of the passing second as well as for the prohibition of the neighboring tone, he, in addition, makes the mistake of confusing the concept of the neighboring tone, thereby mistaking it for the anticipation. In itself, his allusion to sixteenth-century compositional practice could be called fortunate had he confined himself to saying that the effect of the neighboring tone and anticipation was practiced for a long time in composition. This is correct and needs to be pointed out in the teaching of counterpoint. Unfortunately, it becomes clear from his closing statement that Bellermann perceives such dissonances, despite the fact that they could have been motivated at a given place by mood or other, technical reasons, as only a "license"—an ignoring of the rules. Regarding this lawlessness he seems consoled and pacified by virtue of its appearance "only in the quicker

\[+\text{In the second and third examples.}\]
note-values . . . and then only rarely." Bellermann simply
overlooks the fact that even in free composition of the
sixteenth century, there was very little occasion or necessity
for these dissonances. From the standpoint of principle, it
is totally inadmissible to sanction Bellermann's thought and
teaching or to support his attitude in reference to the
neighboring tone.

§ 6. Psychological Significance of the Passing
Dissonance.

If the consonance of two voices expresses most suit-
ably the wills of both coming together--the avowal to merge
into unity--then, inversely, in the dissonance appears the
sign of an independence of one voice opposed to the other,
to be sure, only temporarily.

When, as here, the appearance of the dissonance is
bound by such stern prerequisites and required to proceed to
a consonance again, whereby it must be considered only as a
path or bridge from one consonance to another, then there is
no danger that such dissonance would be able to disrupt the
unity of the two voices. Indeed, the temporary independence
increases the value and power of the unity of both voices
that was sought from the very beginning. Thus, at this point,
a beautiful vista opens into the free composition that seeks
to abstract from the independence of many voices the unity of
its "scale-degrees." It shows that the aesthetic effect of
the unity is the more perfect as the independence of the
single vocal line is increased.

Here, in two-part writing, where dissonance is intro-
duced for the first time, we must learn, first of all, to
understand its most important function and to recognize the
preconditions of this function. Let us not forget that, as
§ 54 ff.

+Cf. Harmonielehre, § 54 ff.
hailed as the initial source of infinite beauty in free composition.

Accordingly, the moral lesson of this problem must be similar to that of the problem of the intervals permitted in first species:

In the beginning was consonance, concord!

Only from a consonance follows the contradiction, the dissonance, until in the end, concord has the last word:

Dissonance, therefore, always presumes a consonance!

Consonance comes first, and only through it does the contrast, dissonance, become sharply profiled!

As for free composition, it so emancipates the passing dissonance from the postulate of stepwise movement that we--by broadening the concept--can describe as a passing dissonance even a dissonant note that forms a skip (within a certain presumed harmony) between two harmonic points.

The formulation of harmonic unities striven for and permitted in free composition does not permit doubt concerning the character of such passing tones, no matter what skip they may make; for example:

+Cf. Section II, Chapter 1, § 2.
Example 248. a) J. S. Bach, English Suite in D minor, "Prelude."

b) J. S. Bach, C-minor Prelude and Fugue for Organ.

Specifically, free composition solves the problem of the passing dissonance in the space of a fourth in such a way that each of the two in-between tones are equally permitted to function as passing tones; for example:

Example 249.

Whatever special effect the leading tone of the scale may have, if it occurs in the space of a fourth, it may be omitted and replaced by the other passing tone:


Or:

$^+$Not merely the space of the third as we find it in strict counterpoint.

As a particularly interesting example, compare the application of the leading tone in the space of a fourth in Harmonielehre, Example 308.† Note the circumstances there under which the leading tone directl passes between \( b^\sharp \) and \( a^b^\flat \).

In free composition, moreover, the passing tone can move in opposition to the direction of the two harmonic notes, for example:


†Measure 5, left hand, in the first quarter.
Let me remind you at this point that in previous times† the passing tones (also the accented passing tones) were sometimes not even written out but notated only with the sign ○.

The following harmless yet utterly delightful example shows what delicate and suspenseful effects can be achieved when one assigns greater duration to the passing tone than to the harmonic note it resolves to:

Example 254. Fr. Schubert, German Dances, No. 41.

Regardless of the secondary effects that are heard, the significance is essentially this:

Example 255.

Free composition also allows the passing tone to be interrupted. In the following example, we find the passage from d♯2 to e2 in the soprano interrupted by another tone, whereby, at least up to the appearance of e1, the d♯2 temporarily acquires the effect of a neighboring tone:

†Cf., J. S. Bach's Suites and Handel's keyboard works.
Example 256. Handel, Suite in E major.

As further examples of interrupted passing tones, I would like to cite here:

Example 257. a) R. Strauss, Till Eulenspiegel (piano score p. 3).
               b) R. Strauss, Till Eulenspiegel (piano score p. 59).

The possibility of using larger skips to represent smaller intervals in free composition produces passing tones of the type found in the following example where the ninth is used instead of the second:


+Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 17.
The abbreviation of two or more tone-processes (usually called ellipsis), common in free composition, leads [252] to the following phenomena when it is applied to the passing tone:

Example 259. R. Strauss, Till Eulenspiegel (piano score pp. 6-7).

Here we conceive the e\#^1 implicitly as coming from a g^1 that was elliptically eliminated: (g^-1) e\#^1-g^1. Therefore, with justification, we may call such passing tones elliptical, or directly added, passing tones. +

I have already mentioned in Harmonielehre, § 164, that according to need, free composition has the power to suddenly change the character of originally dissonant passing tones that initially appear to be simple passages. Thus, a portamento due to an anticipation ++ is, in many cases, simply a second that at first seems to be a passing tone. Compare the following example with Examples 116 and 117 given in Harmonielehre:

---

+Cf. Harmonielehre, Example 331:

++Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 17.
Example 260. Schubert, "Der Kreuzzug."

The first eighth note of the uppermost part is a suspension leading to f#1.

The second eighth note is the harmonic tone, that is, the root of the chord which appears here in 6 inversion.

The third eighth note once more brings the f#1; consequently, in retrospect we interpret the tones altogether differently. We perceive the second eighth note as a portamento-anticipation of the third eighth note (see Example 261b):

Example 261.

originally: later:

The fourth eighth note moves up by step. We must therefore ask whether this step is only a passing tone or something else.

The fifth eighth-note answers this question. Itself a suspension, it causes the preceding eighth note to appear in reality as an anticipation, that is, as a portamento.

The sixth and seventh eighth notes act the same as the second and third.

At the eighth eighth note, one should notice the tie,
the designation for a keyboard portamento.+

The following design finally gives an overview of all the effects as the succession of eighth notes casts them together so sensitively:

Example 262.

```
1. sus. res.
2. (ant.) res. (p.t.)
3. sus. res.
4. (ant.) res.
```

In addition, compare the fluctuation of such passing tones in the "Aria" from Beethoven's Piano Sonata, Op. 110. [254] To this genre also belong anticipation phenomena++ such as those written by Liszt:**

Example 263. Liszt, Hungarian Rhapsody, No. 12.

```
```

After Liszt we find them in Richard Strauss:****

---

+Cf. § 17, above.

++Appearing mostly in passages of seconds, they are ostensibly passing tones.

+++Pay particular attention to the legato in the melody as a whole:

++++In violin I we see the original designation of a true violin portamento between d3 and c2.
Example 264. Till Eulenspiegel (piano score p. 22).

Since free composition also offers complete passing chords, it gives to the concept of passing dissonance the highest potential gradient.

Concerning the neighboring tone, strict counterpoint, of course, recognizes the use of both the upper and lower in direct succession, as we shall see in Chapter 5. However, this occurs only in the service of a syncopation resolution, whereby the first neighboring tone is less than authentic. Instead, it is only the dissonant syncopation itself. In contrast, due to intention and potentiality, free composition seeks to create larger melodic unities aside from syncopation resolution. Thus, there are more reasons for using successive neighboring tones—the upper and lower second—in the service of the principal tone. To be sure, the arrangement in the grouping can be different.

We have seen in Example 77 how the two neighboring tones came to be situated between the principal tones in the following arrangement:

1 principal tone  2 upper neighboring tone  3 lower neighboring tone  4 principal tone

In the following example:
Example 265. Handel, Air in B-flat major (Variation 4).

we see even a still larger melodic unit containing the $a_1$ in addition to the neighboring tones of the principal tone $e^2$:

1 principal tone 2 upper neighboring tone 3 lower third neighboring tone 4 lower neighboring tone 5 principal tone

Notice Mozart's ingenious construction of the neighboring tones in the following example:

Example 266. Mozart, Symphony in E-flat major, "Andante," meas. 10 ff.
The first neighboring tone, $g^2$, presupposes the return of the principal tone $e^b2$. However, as a replacement for this tone, another harmonic tone appears, $g^2$. In addition, at the bracketed tone-successions, the ear hears autonomous unities, as if, for example, the $g^2$ in 266a were the principal tone followed by its two neighboring tones, $f^2$ and $e^b2$, the latter of which assumes, as we learn from the succession, an even stronger passing character without detriment to its neighboring character.

That the neighboring tone can appear in two or more voices simultaneously in free composition is related, in general, to the unrestricted number of voices in a free composition.

Here is an example of neighboring tones in thirds:


For neighboring tones that are led in three voices, see Harmonielehre, Examples 147 and 228. (J. S. Bach was a master at setting neighboring tones in three voices.)

---

See * in Example 266a.

Cf., Example 265.

Particularly interesting is the effect of these examples since they appear in the bass later, meas. 40 ff.
Recently, R. Strauss has managed to compose four-voice neighboring tones in a very admirable fashion:

[257]

Example 268. Till Eulenspiegel (piano score p. 9).

Beware of interpreting the fluctuation between $C^\flat_7$

and $B^\flat_3$\# as a real modulation:

Example 269.

This assumption is contradicted by the bass, which, as we can see from the above, produces only the V-degree in F major.

Let us show proper fairness to the concept of the neighboring tone, even in such applications, without being hindered by the unfolding of the neighboring-tone seventh-chord as part of a motive.+

---

+In passing, note that R. Strauss has attempted to make a similar even more daring experiment in the same composition—piano reduction, p. 18, measures 1-4—which, however, according to my opinion, is a total failure. The chord $B-D-F^\flat-A^\flat$ (or G#) between the F $b^7$ chords is much too remote, because the voice leading (B of the bass goes to F) implies a modulation as well as a neighboring-tone harmony.
Let us also beware of hearing something other than neighboring-tone harmonies in the following:

Example 270. F. Schubert, "Frühlingsträume."

![Schubert Example](image)

or:

Example 271. Wagner, Rheingold, Scene 3 (piano score p. 357).

(Rhine Maidens)

![Wagner Example](image)

In the Schubert example, the reiteration of the e\textsuperscript{1} in the middle part\textsuperscript{*} undoubtedly causes us to hear the F# and A as neighboring tones to G and B. Then, by analogy, in the next measure, where E is reiterated in the upper part at the third eighth note, we hear the three lower tones as neighboring tones:

Example 272.

![Example 272](image)

\textsuperscript{*}The fourth eighth note of the first measure.
In the Wagner example, we merely need to imagine the fifth, $e^2_b$, as part of the first quarter-note chord in order to understand, at once, the true character of the neighboring-tone harmonies in the original example:

Example 273.

[259] If G. Capellen, in his *Musikalische Akustik*+ intended this (p. 93) to refer to the latter example:

In Wagner, we now and then find these formulations, as for example,** where $G-B^\flat_F$ is not an enharmonic E-minor chord but an incomplete raised-fifth, lowered-ninth, $F^\flat_9$, so that it belongs to the cadence progression $M \rightarrow R \rightarrow M$ [=Tonic Dominant Tonic]. Anyone who possesses a well-developed acoustical sensibility should have no trouble hearing this.

then I advise Mr. Capellen to become an esteemed acoustician and leave his hand and ear out of our art. Anyone who hears this somewhat individual appearance of the neighboring tone+++ as nothing more or less than an "incomplete raised-fifth, lowered-ninth chord" (sic!) is simply a barbarian who deserves his exotic music:++++ I must repeat what I said in *Harmonielehre*, § 63: "Oh! How easy it is to fabricate music theory and history when one's ear is deficient."

+Leipzig, Kahnt, 1903.(*76)

++The above-cited example follows [Example 271].

+++How much loftier stand the daring neighboring tones of J. S. Bach in Example 148!

++++Cf., page 33 ff.
I recommend as extremely stimulating the study of neighboring tones in the "Arietta" from Beethoven's Piano Sonata, Op. 111, Variation 4 in $\frac{9}{16}$, especially those in the triplet figures of the right hand.

The following example illustrates how the accented passing tone* is used in free composition. Within the space of the fourth, $a^2-a^1$, passing tone $c^2$ appears on the strong beat of the measure:


[260] In still another daring example, the accented passing tones (see at *) are not used as unrestrictedly as one might think, but as proper passing tones. By ignoring the eighth rests and making the connection between the fifth eighth note of one measure and the first eighth note of the next, one can see clearly the primitive passing character of the accented passing tone:++

Example 275. Mozart, Symphony in G minor, "Andante."

---

*Cf., Harmonielehre, §167.

**Cf., these same figures later in measures 88, 89, 92 and 93:
Albrechtsberger mentions "unacknowledged notes" (notae ab.jectae) and defines them as follows (p. 17):
"A skipping-passing note that does not belong to the accord, for example:

Example 276.

BEGINNING


To the rules concerning the beginning, which apply in first species and remain in force here, we add, as a license, the use of the half rest in the first measure. It must, however, be followed on the upbeat by one of the perfect consonances: 1, 8, 5.

Although we will learn how to apply other rests in [261] the counterpoints of the remaining species, here we can only consider the half rest for the following reason: it points to the character of the intended species (two half notes) with the same power and ingenuity as the half note.

However, for lessons set in triple time, it is better to use a quarter rest rather than a half rest.

Albrechtsberger emphatically mentions this point (p. 71) at the conclusion of the two-part composition where he writes out lessons in triple time for all of the species.

MIDDLE

§ 8. Variety in the Treatment of Upbeats.

Surely, the question of whether the upbeats are to be
set generally with consonances or perhaps exclusively with
dissonances is fundamental. Although the latter choice may
not always be possible because of the nature of the given
cantus firmus, the former is, nevertheless, always forbidden
even though it might be possible. As justification for this
prohibition we should not only cite the objective of learning
to use passing dissonances, but we should consider even more
the aesthetically good effect that can result only from a
well-mixed application of consonant tones and dissonant pass-
ing tones on the upbeat.

The artistic principle of variety already shows its
beneficent effect in counterpoint lessons and that is why we
point it out to the student at this early stage.

§ 9. The Distance between the Two Voices.

Here, too, we must pay attention to the proper dis-
tance between the voices if we seriously intend to carry out
262] the vocal principle and the strictness of the writing.+ It is particularly the vocal element that requires a proper
distance between the voices. Only through an intentional
relaxation of strict teaching or an effort to get to know
passing effects of an instrumental nature may teachers and
students set two voices further apart than is ordinarily per-
missible by vocal standards. Thus, we must affirm that in
elementary study only the purely vocal style is suitable and
that the instrumental style should not be used until later.

Earlier I mentioned (in Section II, Chapter 1, § 24)
that large skips, particularly the sixth++ and the octave, are
useful for regulating the distance between the voices while
still producing a beautiful line. They are especially useful

---

+Cf. Section II, Chapter 1, § 24.
++Note well, the minor; cf. Section I, Chapter 2,
§ 15.
in places where the voices have gotten too close together
and need to be moved apart again.

Fux, unfortunately, does not always observe a suitable distance in his lessons in the present species. Thus they all too often lose themselves in instrumentalisms. Such inexactnesses must complicate the studies and confuse the purposes connected with them.+

Unfortunately, Albrechtsberger also pays little attention to strict vocal principles and develops his lessons mostly in an instrumental manner. As a result, the distance between the voices has little relevance for him.

Cherubini deals with the skip of the sixth more precisely than Fux, but, without giving any basis (Rule 7, p. 16):

In first species counterpoint we permit the skip of a minor sixth. In second species we should not use it except when the voices, by the nature and range of the given melody, find themselves too close to one another and there is no other means by which we can put distance between them.

And in the annotation to this rule:

To a certain extent, we forbid the skip of a minor sixth in first species, especially ascending, because this interval is much more difficult to sing than all the other intervals. This difficulty becomes even greater when notes of short duration unavoidably allot even less time for the preparation of singing it.

If it were somewhat less strictly expressed, Cherubini's advice might be quite correct. We must be guided by the disposition of the cantus firmus and the line of the counterpoint, either of which might let the skip of a sixth or octave appear advisable under certain circumstances even when, according to the rules of Fux and Cherubini, one or the other should be avoided. For even in strict writing, not only the real distance of the voices but also the aesthetic quality of the line is a determining factor.

[263] If it were somewhat less strictly expressed, Cherubini's advice might be quite correct. We must be guided by the disposition of the cantus firmus and the line of the counterpoint, either of which might let the skip of a sixth or octave appear advisable under certain circumstances even when, according to the rules of Fux and Cherubini, one or the other should be avoided. For even in strict writing, not only the real distance of the voices but also the aesthetic quality of the line is a determining factor.

+For the quote referring to the sixth, see p. 222 above.
10. The Use of the Unison on the Upbeat.

In the previous species, the unison was forbidden in the middle of an exercise; here, on the other hand, it is forbidden on the downbeat. It is, however, permitted on the upbeat as long as a favorable departure can be secured, that is, in so far as a stepwise return with a change of direction from the skip is possible. For example:

Example 277.

Bellermann writes about this in detail (pp. 152-53):

Although it is totally forbidden in the former species, the unison may be set here on the weak beat; by this means, an otherwise faulty progression can turn out to be good. With the application of the unison, we must exercise caution and see to it that the counterpoint is led with melodic beauty—that is, if it skips to the unison it should not move further in the same direction, for when it continues in the same direction it is awkward. The unison is always well handled if, after skipping into it (ascending or descending), the counterpoint returns by step.

---

+Cf. Section II, Chapter 1, § 23.
++Examples follow. (*77)
+++Examples follow. (*78)
++++Examples follow. (*79)
The Possible Expansion of the Prohibition of Parallel as well as Nonparallel Direct Progressions as the Result of New Situations.

Because of the additional note on the upbeat, the prohibition of parallel and nonparallel direct progressions acquires new nuances.

In order to understand the content of two measures that follow (2x2 halves), we must analyze them according to the bracketed relationships:

Bracket 3.
Bracket 2.
Bracket 1.
Counterpoint \[ \begin{array}{c} J \cr J \end{array} \]
Cantus firmus \[ \begin{array}{c} J \cr J \end{array} \]

1. In the first relationship, i.e., the one from the upbeat to the downbeat (bracket 1), the customary prohibition still displays its full, undiminished power. Since this direct succession is identical with the original situation known to us since Section II, Chapter I, § 6, it is forbidden, as before, under all circumstances and without exception.

An interesting problem occurs with the neighboring tone—assuming we decide to use them now and then. We must ask ourselves whether the neighboring tone on the upbeat radiates so much of its own effect that it could cause us to forget the bad effect of progressions in nonparallel direct motion. I would not assign such a dispensing effect to the neighboring tone since, even with its help, progressions in nonparallel direct motion do not seem to sound any better. I understand it when Albrechtsberger, who permits the neigh-
boring tone, + declares Beethoven's voice leading faulty in the following three-part exercises and corrects it: ++

Example 278.

Finally, I must remind the reader that, in this bracketed relationship, caution should be exercised regarding the so-called ottava battuta with which we will become acquainted in the subsequent paragraphs.

2. Strictly speaking, the relationship of downbeat to downbeat (bracket 2) should be excluded from the prohibition even in parallel successions since it no longer represents a direct succession of tones. Nevertheless, the ear demands--and in this we find the new extension of the prohibition!—that even in this relationship, certain considerations must be given to the prohibition. It becomes apparent that under certain circumstances, downbeat to downbeat will sound exactly like direct parallel octaves or fifths in spite of the note placed on the upbeat—the ear connects the two downbeats. In other words, the bad effect of parallel successions shows itself so strongly that they cannot be tolerated by the ear even if there is the intervention of a third note. The third on the upbeat is too small, and too modest an interval to be able to overcome totally the bad effect of parallel successions from downbeat to downbeat:

---

+See § 5, above.

++ Cf. Beethoven-Studien, Nottebohm, pages 51 and 52.
[266] Only a larger skip, for example that of a fourth, is able to distract the attention of the ear from the parallel succession, directing it more to its own larger significance. This is the reason—assuming that the skip is larger than a third—for the fact that we are again in the position to permit parallel successions from downbeat to downbeat.

But we must not overlook two things. First, the tone on the upbeat, which minimizes the effect of the parallel octaves, must approach the cantus firmus only in contrary motion, although, for reasons given under 1, it cannot mean this, for example:

Example 280.

Second, because of the skip, we are not permitted to place any tone on the upbeat except one that is consonant with the cantus firmus. Therefore, we must not write the following:

Example 281.
The extent to which parallel fifths on the upbeat can or may be used to minimize parallel octaves on the downbeat as shown in the following example:

Example 282.

\[\text{\textbf{Example 282.}}\]

\[\text{\textbf{Example 282.}}\]

will be discussed under item 3.

Finally, since the prohibition of parallel successions only pertains to the special circumstances of the relationship from downbeat to downbeat and must, in principle, depend on the permissibility of such successions (because of \[267\] the nonapplicability of the prohibition in more remote relationships), it is obvious that nonparallel direct successions from downbeat to downbeat are permitted without ado.

3. In the relationship of upbeat to upbeat (bracket 3), which does not represent a direct succession of tones, parallel octaves, fifths, and unisons strike the ear as being unpleasant only when several follow one another. Without such blatant provocation to the ear, the parallel successions in this bracket—we call them "afterbeat" [nach-schlagenden] octave, fifth, and unison successions—are otherwise easy to tolerate, a fact which quite assuredly frees nonparallel direct successions from all restrictions.

However, when using "afterbeat successions," let us not forget that it is to our advantage to keep at least the downbeats free of parallel successions, for this in turn would defy the prohibition.\(^+\)

\(^+\text{Cf. Example 282, above.}\)
Continuing with the thoughts mentioned in Section II, Chapter 1, § 14, if I now illuminate with examples the practice of free composition regarding parallel and nonparallel direct progressions, then I do it without detriment to a still more precise presentation in one of the following sections.

First, an introductory remark. To be sure, it is understood that ideas in free composition are most often expressed in more than one voice. Nevertheless, we might bear in mind that contained in each multi-linear structure is a two-voice structure. Because of this, the two-voice structure of the highest and lowest voices, in itself, justifies the citing of examples of free composition, even within the study of two-part writing. Thus, if the content of the following example:

Example 283. Brahms, Handel Variations, Variation XXIII.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Example 283. Brahms, Handel Variations, Variation XXIII.}
\end{align*}
\]

can be traced back to a decisive two-part structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Example 283. Brahms, Handel Variations, Variation XXIII.}
\end{align*}
\]

*Let us not overlook the fact that multi-linear writing warrants licenses ever so much more than two-part writing!
Example 284.

then the real connection between free composition and strict counterpoint can be found in similar derivations.

I must emphasize that with free composition the brackets shown above on page 264 do not find such exact expression anymore. This is obviously due to the nature of free composition.

But now to some examples.

Schubert writes:


[269] Since these octaves follow one another directly, we might speak of them as taking place in the first bracket. In this case, free composition justifies the parallel octaves by the strict coincidence of the bass movement with the degree progression, that is, the lowest tones D-G represent the scale-degrees themselves so strongly that their character, as the essential movement of the bass, recedes
into the background. From this it follows that a voice which expresses the degree-progression is in the position to consent to parallels under certain circumstances.

The same reasoning is applicable with regard to the parallel fifths in this example:

Example 286. Mozart, Piano Trio in G major.

Here, too, we may speak of a direct succession of fifths (bracket 1) although we have the right to disregard them due to the unfolding of the harmonies as presented by the eighth-note motive of the violin. But it is the weight of the scale-degrees that tells us the parallel fifths are necessities. In order to better understand the succession of scale-degrees, we may clarify them for ourselves by adopting an ellipsis as follows:

G major: $\text{I}^\text{IV}-\text{II}-\text{V}(\text{I})-\text{IV}\text{-V}^6_4-\frac{5}{3}$, etc.

But if we want to avoid the parallels, such as those shown to be necessary in the Schubert example, we must use the antiparallels: **

---

*Cf. Harmonielehre, Example 226.

**Cf. Example 212 in addition to Example 287.
Example 287.  a) Chopin, Prelude No. 3.  
b) Beethoven, Piano Sonata, Op. 27, No. 2.

[270]

If we consider the following examples, which seem to exhibit parallel octaves in direct succession:

Example 288. Mendelssohn, Piano Concerto in G minor.

and:

Example 289. Mozart, Piano Concerto in E-flat major.
we find justification for them not only in the circumstance that the bass represents the scale-degree, but also in the factor of "unfolding" that carries the decisive weight here. In the two examples, the last eighth note of the highest voice can be assigned only to the "unfolding"; it therefore represents a melodic detour that may be ignored without hesitation. After the elimination of the detour, only the nonparallel direct progressions remain, here from the first eighth note of the fourth quarter to the first quarter of the next measure:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\{ a^1 - g^1 \} \quad \text{and} \quad \{ a^b_2 - b^b_2 \} \\
&\{ d - G \} \quad \text{and} \quad \{ f - b^b \}
\end{align*}
\]

These are progressions, whose justification is established without ado in free composition, particularly in multi-linear textures.+++ 

In addition, a fundamental principle appears in the Mozart example showing that a voice in free composition may leave its essential role and adopt the role of a mere reinforcement, whereby it conforms to a second voice and assists with a parallel octave!

A similar situation to the one at the second bracket (downbeat to downbeat) is offered in the Chopin example in Harmonielehre, Example 370, meas. 8-9. The fact that the bass represents the scale-degree is the reason for justifying the parallel octaves. The fact that, in addition, the melody makes a skip of a fourth—which already served as a "mini-

---

+Particularly in Example 288.
++Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 18.
+++Cf. the Wagner example, Example 182, and also Example 285.
mizer" in strict counterpoint—'' might be considered less important than the principal reason.

In the following two examples of antiparallels:

Example 290. a) Brahms, Symphony IV, First movement.

![Example 290. a) Brahms, Symphony IV, First movement.](image)

b) Beethoven, Piano Sonata, Op. 27, No. 2.

![Example 290. b) Beethoven, Piano Sonata, Op. 27, No. 2.](image)

we should not only think of the scale-degree and the second bracket relationship, but we should also adopt the viewpoint explained in the remark concerning Example 288. It is clear, as we see, that antiparallels can occur in the middle of an idea and that they are not exclusively found in cadences as it is usually assumed.

In order to avoid neighboring tones, the masters themselves even write parallel octaves in free composition. They write, for example:

---

*See page 266.
Example 291. a) J. S. Bach, Invention, No. 1.
    b) Handel, Leon.

that is, in Example 291a, on the second eighth note in the bass, a appears instead of C, and in 291b, Bb appears instead of Eb.

But then, with respect to the same neighboring tone situation, they write—permit me to discuss this point here—harmless nonparallel direct fifths, as for example:

[273]

Example 292. Handel, Leon.

However, with regard to nonparallel direct progressions, their justification is much more obvious in free composition, because there the unfolding of harmonic concepts and the interpretation of a hidden polyphony lead to them by necessity. Here are two examples:

+Compare to that, Harmonielehre, Example 265, where at the places marked with an *, the neighboring tone was excluded for the same reason as here in Example 291 and the path to tonic had to be taken.

++Cf. pages 86 and 90.
Example 293.  a) J. S. Bach, English Suite, in D minor.
   b) Handel, Air in B-flat Major, Variation 3.

Afterbeat octaves (bracket 3) enjoy complete liberty in free composition. If we add, as in the following examples, the unifying spirit of the scale-degrees, then we will not be forced to criticize such afterbeat octaves when they occupy the upbeats with thirds or sixths:


[274]  Another example:

Example 295.  Brahms, Piano Sonata in F minor.

+Here, the harmony: A-C-E.
Fux teaches (p. 75):

Notice that the skip of a third cannot obviate a succession of two fifths or two octaves. Since the intervening note on the upbeat is viewed as if it were not there (due to its short duration and the smallness of the interval), it cannot compensate enough to prevent the ear from noticing the two succeeding fifths or octaves . . . (*80)

The situation is different with a larger skip, for example, the fourth, fifth, or sixth. Since there is more distance from the first note to the next, the ear forgets the first note on the downbeat by the time the next note on the downbeat occurs. . . (*81)

Fux also speaks of nonparallel direct motion, for example 6--5, which is rectified by the skip of a fourth. To mention this was really superfluous since it is self-evident.

In the same vein as Fux, Albrechtsberger speaks of the present problem on pages 36-38. The explanation about the so-called afterbeat octave, fifth, and unison finishes with the sentence: "I advise the beginner against using numerous afterbeat fifths or octaves because in two-part writing many find them insulting to the ear."

Cherubini expresses himself more emphatically than either Fux or Albrechtsberger. To be sure, he ultimately arrives at the same conclusion, but he is inclined to totally forbid all parallel octaves and fifths from downbeat to downbeat, as we can see in this quotation (Rule 3, pp. 13-14):

I notice that these methods for avoiding fifths and octaves were regarded by the older, strict masters as reprehensible licenses in two-part counterpoint. I share this opinion. I do not believe that two octaves or fifths on the downbeat can be counteracted by using notes in-between on the weak beat (no matter what type they may be), unless the tempo should be so slow that we might assume all the beats to be strong. Yet, even this limitation may not be satisfactory in every case; it therefore should not be considered a rule.

From this I conclude that we should use these methods only when we write for more than two voices

+Cf. Table III, Figure 8. (*82)
or when we encounter rare cases for which no other solution can be found.

I have made these remarks and proofs concerning the evasion of octaves and fifths not to prove that we can avoid them but to prove the inadequateness of the rule which I consider to be one that may have been added to those of the older theorists. Nevertheless, the rule is not without value and can even be useful at times.

The basic mistake that causes Cherubini to be so strict is, once again, the fatal mixing of counterpoint and free composition. What role does tempo perform in strict writing? Is it not much more important to investigate the tonal effects in conjunction with their causes independently of tempo and rhythm!? And is it not enough when the ear becomes alerted to the fact that there is a difference between two octaves on the downbeats, according to whether or not the note inserted on the upbeat skipped a third or fourth, etc.? Cherubini could demand no more from the teaching of counterpoint. Cherubini errs further when he considers that the rule also prohibits parallel octaves or fifths on the upbeat. This is not appropriate. The extending of the prohibition to tones that do not directly follow one another remains an exception created by the special circumstance of the skip of a third. Where the latter does not appear, the rule does not apply and everything returns to normal. Tones that do not directly follow one another cannot fall under this prohibition. But, that conclusion stands in opposition to those that Cherubini expressed in the settings above.

§ 12. The So-called Ottava Battuta.

While it is not only permissible but in fact mandatory to approach an octave in contrary motion, there is an exceptional case of an octave that can create a poor impression even though it is approached in contrary motion, and this has led to its prohibition. When the lower voice moves from the upbeat to the downbeat by step while at the same time the upper voice has a large skip and then both voices suddenly unite in an octave on the downbeat, this circumstance results in the bad effect of the so-called ottava battuta.

Consider the following examples of octaves that have been brought about in contrary motion:
Immediately, we discover a distinction in the effects of these examples. While in Examples 296a and b we can perhaps confirm a sensation of emptiness on the downbeat that is produced by the octave (especially in two-part writing), in Examples 296c and d we perceive, in contrast, that the emptiness of the octave is much stronger and that the reason for this can be traced more to the voice leading than to the octave itself. In 296c the flaw is lessened by the fact that the upper voice moves stepwise from the upbeat to the downbeat; but in 296d it is much stronger because the upper voice moves by a large skip.

The flaw in 296d can be explained as follows: we hear the skip A to D in the soprano as an all-too-distinct and individual melodic movement.

First of all, any half-way musical person can detect that there is a simpler and more natural way to arrive at the same goal than the one chosen in 296d: it is this:

Example 297.

Nevertheless, two-part composition—let me emphasize this—is incapable of revealing why the more natural way (shown in Example 297), was overlooked and the one in 296d was used.

Second, the melodic skip is overly prominent because the lower voice strongly contrasts it through its own quiet,
stepwise movement. Our instinct seems to demand—and not without justification—that the lower voice should be given the larger skip while the upper voice, since it attracts our ear, should preserve the naturalness of the melody by moving in small, flowing, singable intervals.

Third, the shortness of the upbeat causes the unpleasantness to show up more drastically. It is as if the overextension in the individual melodic line takes place without regard to the shortness of time in which it occurs.

Fourth, the fact that the effect of the anticipation (A to D) cannot be ignored intensifies the flaw.

Thus, we comprehend why, in view of the many intrusions upon the natural effect, the voice leading in 296d must be absolutely forbidden.

I have already remarked that in 296c any bad consequences that are traceable to the skip alone are eliminated in any case. To the emptiness of the octave, only one disturbing factor is added: the lower voice lacks the large skip which the emptiness of the next octave demands as a counter-balance. We must ask ourselves, therefore, whether this shortcoming alone warrants the prohibition of such voice leading. I prefer to make this decision according to the given situation; under certain circumstances, at least in two-part writing, an octave such as that in Example 296c will sound too empty, whereas, now and then, especially in multi-linear writing and in favorable circumstances, its effect may be good. Thus, within the ottava battuta prohibition, we must make more precise distinctions in situations like those in 296c and d, and, in general, limit the prohibition in these cases to those in which the upper voice makes a large skip.

In the ottava battuta, we deal with the transition from upbeat to downbeat, which in itself brings the flaw to the fore. Because in first species counterpoint there is no distinction between upbeat and downbeat it follows that the
prohibition should be taught first in second species—as it is
done here—where these categories (resembling the strong and
weak beats of free composition) appear for the first time—
even if, in general, the ottava battuta problem should not be
treated at all in strict counterpoint but only in free compo-
sition.

On the same grounds as those in the ottava battuta,
it seems similarly wrong to me to move to a unison or fifth
(instead of an octave) in such a way that the lower voice
[279] moves by step and the upper voice skips. We may be-
come acquainted with the effect of such voice leading by
means of the following examples:

Example 298. a) Albrechtsberger, p. 90.
   b) Fux, Table IX, Fig. 1.

In Example 298b we especially notice the individual nature of
the soprano skip above the modest second in the lower voice.

I would like to cite examples of the ottava battuta
in free composition:
Example 299. a) Mendelssohn, Piano Concerto in G minor.

b) J. S. Bach, St. Matthew Passion, Soprano aria, score p. 35.

c) Mozart, Piano Trio in G major.

Example 300. Brahms, Piano Quartet in G minor, First movement.

And when Brahms writes this passage in his song "Auf dem Kirchhofe":

[280] The following example illustrates a *quinta battuta*:

\[\text{Example 302}^*\]

we should be aware that a \textit{quinta battuta} has been avoided in an interesting fashion, recognizing that the bass could also have been written:

Example 302:

\[\text{Example 302}^*\]

Fux's discussions of the \textit{ottava battuta} have become the most standard. I therefore quote them verbatim (pp. 72-73):

\[\text{[Aloys.] From the tenth note to the eleventh note you have gone from a tenth to an octave: the lower voice ascends by one step, the upper voice descends by one step. This octave, which is called \textit{thesis} by the Greeks and \textit{battuta} by the Italians (because it occurs at the beginning of the measure), is forbidden. I have often contemplated this matter, but I can find neither the reason for the prohibition nor the distinction that makes the following octave acceptable:}\]

Example 303. Table II, Fig. 18.
whereas this one is forbidden:

Example 304. Table II, Fig. 19.

\[\text{Example 304} \]

After all, both octaves are approached by contrary motion. It is another matter when the unison originates in this way, i.e., a third to a unison; for example:

Example 305. Table II, Fig. 20.

\[\text{Example 305} \]

In this case the unison (whose ratio is 1:1) is hardly heard and seems, as it were, to be inextricably dissipated and lost. For this reason, the unison is forbidden in this species of counterpoint except at the beginning and at the end. To return to the above-mentioned octave, which is called "battuta," I leave it to your discretion whether you should use it or avoid it, because it matters little. However, if the octave is such that the lower voice ascends by one step and the upper voice skips downward by several steps, then, in my opinion, such movement is not permissible, not even in composition for many voices:

Example 306. Table II, Fig. 14.

\[\text{Example 306} \]

This is also true with reference to the unison:
[282] In eight-part composition such skips in the basses (and in parts which take their place), can hardly be avoided as I will discuss at the proper place.

Fux discusses this in first species which in itself is a misunderstanding of the ottava battuta. In first species we lack that element which clearly shows the emptiness of the battuta, namely, the contrast between downbeat and upbeat. Thus, the effect of the ottava battuta can be expressed, in general, only in free composition where the role of strong and weak beats is so eminently profiled.†

Nowhere in Fux's works do we discover why the ottava battuta prohibition applies when the upper voice skips instead of the lower voice. He simply "holds the opinion" that such a voice leading is not permissible, not even in multi-linear composition.

Concerning the ottava battuta, Albrechtsberger expresses himself as follows (pp. 28-29):

We must add that, according to old musical instruction, the ottava battuta was prohibited in two-part composition and multi-linear composition, alike. I want to apply this prohibition to both strict and free two-part composition. In three-part composition it can be tolerated; in four-part composition it is somewhat better especially when double counterpoint at the octave takes place. The ottava battuta (or "beaten" octave) is one that occurs on the strong division or beat. . .++. Therefore, when the upper voice skips a fourth, fifth, or sixth from a weak beat to a perfect octave on the strong beat, and when the lower voice ascends in contrary motion by a half or whole step, we call this the ottava battuta.

It can appear in the following ways:

†See the above-cited examples, Examples 299-300.

++.He follows this with an explanation of strong beats in all meters. (§83).
Example 308. 
a) First species, strict counterpoint.
b) Free composition.

Example 309. 
a) Second species, strict counterpoint.
b) Free composition.

The reason for the prohibition may be the following:
It has a vague effect and closely resembles a unison;
for example:

Example 310.

As we see, neither Albrechtsberger nor Fux knew the true reason for the prohibition. Albrechtsberger, too, overlooks the extent to which the bad effect is created by the large skip in conjunction with the downbeat, and therefore makes the emptiness of the octave all the more responsible. To be sure, he formulates the prohibition more clearly by establishing the hypothesis that the upper voice must skip at least a fourth. Thus, for him, our Example 296c does

*Examples follow in third species and in free composition. (*84)
not at all signify an ottava battuta. But in this alone, in contrast to Fux, there is a significant advancement in the understanding of the ottava battuta problem.

Cherubini appears to ignore the prohibition of the ottava battuta. He neither mentions the term nor bothers with the traditional prohibition in practice. On the contrary, he writes this in his Example 40 (p. 14):

Example 311.

Since he believes that he has avoided the open octave on the downbeat more effectively by using the skip of a sixth rather than, for example, the fourth or fifth, he does not permit himself to be frightened off by the reprehensible effect of the ottava battuta!

[284] Bellermann follows in the footsteps of the old master Fux when he cites examples.† Nevertheless, on page 205 we find the following voice leading:

Example 312.

which, according to Fux and Bellermann, should have been avoided. In a footnote Bellermann adds the following thought [p. 137]:

I find this rule somewhat too strict. Nevertheless, we must admit that it was created by virtue of a very correct observation. For example, in four-part composition when we connect the two following triads with one another:

†Pages 136-137. (*85)
we notice that in Example a) the second triad sounds thinner, almost empty in comparison to the first one. In free composition where we are not bound to a cantus firmus, this movement is not recommended on the strong beat. However, the same triads reversed, as in Example b) provide an exceptionally beautiful effect.

Unfortunately, everything in this remark misses the point. The question of whether the approach into an octave from the tenth, as in Example 313a, makes a strong, "struck" effect in contrast to an empty one can only be decided by the special circumstances of the composition in question. I must remind the reader that neither Fux nor Albrechtsberger considers such motion into the octave, as in 313a, a forbidden ottava battuta. That the problem of the battuta is still present even in free composition should have been proven by Bellermann by means of clearer examples and well-aimed arguments. That Example 313b has nothing to do with that problem needs no further comment.

More recent theorists show little concern for the effect of the ottava battuta, yet its existence cannot be denied or ignored in theory.


The second beat, the upbeat, may provide the opportunity for a harmonic change.

To be sure, this happens only when the fifth follows a sixth or vice versa; for example:

Example 314.
This leads to the following consideration: Passing dissonances must be excluded from the present problem; they are totally incapable of creating a new harmony (consonance) because of the dissonant nature. On the other hand, any other consonance would simply compliment or continue the harmony of the downbeat. For example:

Example 315:

\[ \text{Example 315} \]

In contrast to free composition where unlimited freedom of harmonic change remains available to the composer, the change of harmony mentioned above is the only one permitted in strict counterpoint. Even in its uniqueness it forms, so to speak, the entrance or gateway, to the problem of harmonic change in general.

Of necessity it follows that the key should be defined at the beginning of a lesson; caution dictates that a harmonic change should not be used on the first or second measure since it would lead too quickly away from the key.

In order to make this point clearer, I refer the reader to Albrechtsberger's (analogous) correction of the beginning of a lesson in triple time by Beethoven (Nottebohm, p. 49, No. 4):

---

*There, the change of harmony can be carried out within the same measure or division of the measure, and in addition, by means other than the 5--6 or 6--5 succession.
Thus, even further on in the exercise one must think of the unrolling of the intended key--according to Albrechtsberger:

In his Fourth Rule, Cherubini writes (p. 15):

In counterpoint of this type we have the freedom to introduce one or two accords in each measure. Accordingly, if a single accord is introduced, each half note must form a different consonance but both must belong to the same accord.

Example 317.

In case we want to set two accords, the weak beat as well as the strong beat must be consonant, though not part of the same accord.
As skillful as these words are, they surely remain misleading and questionable, an irreparable contradiction of the spirit of counterpoint. What is the meaning of the idea of a harmony (see Example 41 [317]) in terms of the actual teaching of real harmony? How dare we think about a so-called six-chord in connection with counterpoint, and how can we permit the voice leading to be influenced by an intellectual preconception? Must not, rather, the voice leading in the counterpoint lesson be the result of its own laws according to the proportion of the line, the flowing melody, etc.? Moreover, it seems that Cherubini—in spite of the second part of the rule and in spite of Example 42 [318]—is not conscious of the fact that in strict counterpoint a harmonic change can mean only the direct succession of the intervals of 5 and 6.

§ 14. The Prohibition of Tone Repetition Reappears.

Tone repetition is excluded from second species. Here, we return to the original prohibition established for the cantus firmus and explain this return relative to first species which did allow a tone repetition in this way. In second species, with its richer means of two half notes, we can now produce a beautiful line without license, so that an exception from the ordinarily prevailing prohibition of tone repetition must seem totally superfluous here.

While Fux and Albrechtsberger are silent about this problem and assume the prohibition of tone repetition as a
matter of course, Cherubini uses the words "a different consonance" in his Fourth Rule.†

Bellermann speaks of it explicitly on page 150.

§ 15. Mistakes Made Possible by the Increase in the Number of Tones.

The mistakes resulting from the increase in the number of tones in this species could cause—even more than in the cantus firmus and in first species—certain offenses against the leading of the counterpoint and the postulate of the flowing melody. For this reason, we must particularly avoid outlining with three or four tones a triad, a major or minor seventh-chord, or even a ninth-chord. Likewise, we must not forget to change direction after a large skip.

Cf. Albrechtsberger's quote cited in Section I, Chapter 2, § 19 and 20. I remind the reader again of the result gained there: In strict counterpoint only the construction of the cantus firmus and the course of the counterpoint may decide whether some tones can form a unity or not. In the first cases, it is unimportant whether or not the unity itself creates a triad since such a unity is to be strictly excluded from the lesson. On page 42 Albrechtsberger writes, justifiably:

Example 319.

and explains the voice leading thus:

The second significance is that this C (i.e., the final C) sanctions and justifies the previous four notes C-E-G-B, an arpeggiated major seventh-chord, because it allows the leading tone, B, to resolve to C, an octave to the preceding C, and by doing so creates a good melody in the last three measures of the counterpoint.

†Cited above in § 13.
And when he similarly approves of the following voice leading in a Beethoven lesson:

Example 320.

and decides at this point to remark: "It is wrong if the two notes that form a seventh fall on the downbeats," as for example:

Example 321.

then, in such cases, it may still mean a risk of prejudicing reality, which could defy this rule under more favorable circumstances. One has said everything that needs to be said when one directs the learner to avoid unities regardless of how they may occur.

According to our strict application, it is self-evident that he leaves the realm of strict counterpoint when he writes (p. 99, Fourth species):

Example 322.

In the quarter-note counterpoint he outlines a diminished triad and, as a result, even a diminished fifth:

+Cf. Beethoven-Studien, Nottebohm, p. 49.
§ 16. The Prohibition of So-called Monotony.

Here, the increase in the number of tones can bring about the danger of a motivic, melodic-thematic unity even more than in the first species. Therefore, we must warn against such uses.

Cf., Albrechtsberger's quote cited on page 141.

But, unconcerned, Fux writes:

Example 323. Table IX, Fig. 2.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{EXAMPLE 323}
\end{array}
\]

CLOSING

§ 17. The Closing Formulas.

The demand for both leading tones at cadences in strict counterpoint can be realized in the exercises of the present species only by the use of 5--6|8 in the upper counterpoint or 5--3|1 in the lower counterpoint:

Example 324.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{EXAMPLE 324}
\end{array}
\]

*Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 23.*
Moreover, it is necessary to mention that the leading tone must indeed be the penultimate tone of the counterpoint but never the next-to-last tone from the end. Therefore, we must never write:

Example 325.

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{Only in exceptional cases is it permissible to draw upon the closing formulas of first species, (that is, to use a whole note in the penultimate measure), and then only when the previously discussed formulas are totally impossible for some reason (e.g., because of an odd construction of the cantus firmus).}

In reference to first species Fux remarks (p. 66):++
"With the penultimate note, the major sixth is used if the cantus firmus stands below the counterpoint; however, if the cantus firmus stands above, the minor third is used." With that Fux finds it necessary to raise the leading tones in Dorian, Mixolydian, and Aeolian modes.+++ 

At this point, it is worth mentioning that Beethoven also dealt with the problem of raising the leading tone in Dorian in an individual way.++++ In one of his sketch books that is housed in the archives of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde in Vienna, we find a curious and ingenious idea casually written in Beethoven's own hand at the margin of a page—which, so far as I know, no one has previously mentioned—that circumvents the C# in the Dorian cadence:

---

++Cf. pages 67, 69, 74, 76, etc.
+++C to C#, F to F#, and G to G#.
++++Cf. to that Harmonielehre, p. 77ff.
Example 326.

That is to say, instead of 5--6--8⁺ he uses 6--5--8, a kind of plagal idiom, as though it were III-I. Beethoven overlooked the fact that the cadence in Dorian needs both leading tones in uninterrupted succession, thus: C--D. There is only one solution for the "flaw" that tormented him: to disavow Dorian!

Albrechtsberger (p. 36) treats the various cadence formulas that often belong only to free composition. He [291] adheres to the rule of letting the leading tone directly precede the final tone. To prove that he does, we must not only point to the cadences cited later (p. 93f.), but also to the following correction of one of Beethoven's mistakes (Nottebohm, p. 52):

Example 327.

Bellermann (on page 153) speaks of the exception of the whole note in the penultimate measure.

Concerning Cherubini's absurd error on this question, see Rule 7, page 31, and later, quotes in Section III, Chapter 2, § 7.

⁺Cf., Example 324 above.
Example 328.

Lessons

Fux, Table III, Figure 3, and Table III, Figure 12.

Fux, Table III, Figure 15, and Table III, Figure 16.
Fux, Table IV, Figures 4 and 5.

Albrechtsberger, page 42.
Soprano

Alto, C.f.

Tenor

Alto [C.f.]
Remarks Concerning These Lessons

About 1. The line of the counterpoint stays almost too monotonously around the tone d\textsuperscript{2} as it winds itself back \cite[p.297]{Bellermann} and forth in a confused and unskilled way within a fourth, a\textsuperscript{1}-d\textsuperscript{2}.

About 2. In measures 2 and 3, the two a's in the tenor seem somewhat disturbing because they are set in succession. In the last three measures notice the effect that seems more appropriate to free composition.

About 3. The line is beautiful. It is disturbed only by the effect of a\textsuperscript{1} being sounded twice (measures 7 and 10). Mistakenly and with little luck Bellermann "corrects" this lesson--in both the cantus firmus and the counterpoint (measures 7-8)--as follows:

Example 329.

About 4. This is more instrumental in behavior. (Cf. above, \S 9). Bellermann also includes this exercise. He tempers it, at least the skips in measures 7-8, by setting the counterpoint in the following way:

Example 330.

About 5. The counterpoint is a most beautiful line. Notice the successful positioning of the high point, e\textsuperscript{2}.

About 6. In measures 8-9 a bad effect occurs, like the one in the second lesson, measures 2-3.
About 7. Measures 5-6 and 7-8 show an impermissible repetition (Cf. § 16).

About 8. In measures 6-7 there is a modulation to F major. Regarding the last three measures see § 15.

About 9. In the penultimate measure the sixth and seventh scale degrees of E minor are both raised. (Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, § 23, Example 140.)

About 10. This one is entirely instrumental. The intervals are not set as real ones but are derived mostly from the higher octave of the counterpoint. The unity of the spacing has been totally ignored here (cf. § 9).

About 12. This one is instrumental with regard to the distance of the voices. There is a neighboring tone in measure 3! Concerning measures 9-10, see above, § 5.

About 14. Good, flowing, beautiful line. However, notice that Bellermann has used the B♭ in measures 4 and 5 in spite of the fact that he conceived it in Dorian.
CHAPTER 3

THIRD SPECIES: FOUR NOTES AGAINST ONE

GENERAL COMMENTS

§ 1. The Principle of Passing Dissonance Applied to Four Quarter Notes.

The use of four quarter notes in the counterpoint against one whole note in the cantus firmus makes it possible for a passing dissonance to stand at three places in the measure, namely, on the second, third, or fourth quarter note.

No matter where and when they occur, the dissonant notes must appear between two consonances in stepwise motion except, perhaps in one conceivable instance where— for reasons linked to the fourth D-G in the counterpoint and the B in the cantus firmus—the diminished fifth adopts the character of a consonance so that the dissonant fourth then appears in passing motion between it and the third, as for example:

Example 331.

The effect of a dissonance being applied on the third quarter note must be given special consideration. Initially, the third quarter note is simply heard as an upbeat. However, inasmuch as the ear is alerted by the further division of the half note into quarter notes, the third quarter note (in
contrast to the second or the fourth quarter notes) now appears relatively strong, as a kind of downbeat. Thus, a peculiar side effect interrupts the initial effect as if the dissonance had been applied to a strong, "first beat" of the measure:

Example 332.

\[ \text{[299]} \]

\[ \text{In this side effect, we can trace the origin of the accented passing tone in free composition which must be understood as only a passing dissonance,}^+ \text{ but one, to be sure, which has been placed on a strong beat.}

Besides, here in third species it is the artistic principle of variety, already expressed in Section II, Chapter 2, § 8, that requires us to seek—for the sake of having aesthetic contrasts—a varied application of dissonant passing tones. Therefore, let us strive, as far as voice leading permits, to apply passing tones in various orders, that is, on the second and fourth quarter notes and, without hesitation, also on the third quarter note.

If we maintain the law of the passing second, it follows that to skip away from a fourth, for example:

\[ \text{\underline{Cf. Harmonielehre, § 167; here, Section II, Chapter 2, § 5.}} \]
Example 333.

is permissible no matter how far the harmonic concepts expressed through the counterpoint* have been extended by the use of four tones or how they appear in our perception almost as an unfolding harmony of the kind found in free composition.**

The previously mentioned exception of a fourth which, although it follows a diminished fifth, has, never-the less, the effect of a passing dissonance between two consonances was taken from a lesson by Albrechtsberger, page 52. I doubt whether Albrechtsberger himself was [300] conscious of any peculiarity in this case. He accepted it as totally natural in spite of the fact that (on page 43) he demands that, even in this species, each dissonance "must stand between two consonances." On page 53 he deliberately constructs this mistake:

Example 334.

in order to remark:

The [ninth] mistake is the B in the same measure because it does not ascend to the next C. In two-part writing, if the perfect fourth on the third note does not ascend or descend stepwise through three pitches but moves only between two like tones, the listener hears a dissonant accord and that is just as bad as if we were to skip to it in half notes in second species. For example:

---

*Here, the chord F-A-C.

**Cf. below, § 8.
Example 335.

\[ \text{\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{example335.png}} \]

From this it is clear that he knew the risk of the present species very well, namely, the temptation to create a harmony by means of these four quarter notes, even at the expense of the rules—as if we were in the midst of a free composition where such a maneuver might be carried out without restriction. Albrechtsberger judges Beethoven's voice leading in this example to be bad: +

Example 336.

\[ \text{\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{example336.png}} \]

and justly corrects it as follows:

Example 337.

\[ \text{\includegraphics[width=0.2\textwidth]{example337.png}} \]

[301] We may consider the following instruction by Bellermann to be excessive (p. 158):

\[ \ldots \text{(*86) Thus we notice here that the first and third quarter notes are consonant with the cantus firmus. In contrast, however, we can put a passing dissonance on the second and fourth quarter notes.}^{++} \]

If we have practiced this rule with dedication and

---

+Found in Nottebohm, page 53, No. 15.

++Example follows. (*87)
diligence from the start, then we may occasionally take the liberty, in view of the flowing melody in the counterpoint, of setting a passing dissonance on the third quarter note—*but the second and fourth quarter notes must then be consonant.*

Bellermann seems not to be aware of the fact that the principle of variety prevails in counterpoint lessons.

§ 2. Application of the Neighboring Tone.

In third species, too, we must remember what has been said in second species about the neighboring tone.** In reference to this problem, however, we must consider something that is easily overlooked: the neighboring tone—like any other dissonance, and similarly the *nota cambiata*—can be placed at the turn of the measure, that is, from the fourth quarter note to the first quarter note of the next measure.

Because of the increased number of tones in the counterpoint, the application of the neighboring tone becomes more critical than in the previous species. Nevertheless, it is desirable to have the strictest viewpoint dominate the lessons for the sake of practice, so that it is possible to learn how to solve the difficult problem of the flowing and beautiful melody without using the neighboring tone.

It seems that Fux still wants to avoid the neighboring tone*** and only in dire need does he deign to use it now and then. Thus, we find in a lesson in fifth species:

---

*Example follows. (*88)*

**Cf. Section II, Chapter 2, § 5.

***For his viewpoint, c.f. Section II, Chapter 2, § 5.
Example 338. Table VI, Fig. 11.

![Example 338](image)

or:

Example 339. a) Table X, Fig. 3. b) Table XVIII, Fig. 1.

![Example 339](image)

But, a voice leading like the following:

Example 340. Table XVIII, Fig. 2.

![Example 340](image)

even uses the anticipation (the would-be "neighboring tone" of Bellermann). This occurs in his work only once.

Like Fux, Bellermann embraces the stricter viewpoint (p. 158):

Although in this species it can be found now and again with composers of the sixteenth century, the neighboring tone is not permitted in exercises since, without difficulty, one can preserve quarter-note motion without it.

His reference to composers of the sixteenth century is misleading since it certainly does not relate to the problem of the neighboring tone itself.
3. The License of the Quarter Rest.

If we place a rest at the beginning similar to the one in second species, then it must be a quarter rest, because only such a rest is capable of proclaiming the upcoming quarter notes used in the counterpoint.

In lessons in triple meter (\(\frac{6}{8}\)), the eighth rest must be used for similar reasons.

4. Extended Use of the Unison.

In third species the unison finds more favorable conditions than in second species. For, aside from the possibility of contrary motion—which the unison retains here in third species when it appears on the fourth quarter note—when it is used on the second or third quarter notes, it further enjoys an advantage not possible in second species—oblique motion:

Example 341.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c} \\
\hline \begin{array}{cccccccc}
\frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{1}{4} \\
\end{array} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

5. Further Expansions of the Prohibition of Parallel and Nonparallel Direct Successions.

To determine the scope of the prohibition of both parallel and nonparallel direct successions, we can sort out and classify four relationships among the four quarter notes of the present species. As in the previous species, the relationships are illustrated here by means of brackets:
1. In bracket 1, which involves the immediate succession of two tones, the prohibition is entirely valid and grants no exceptions.+

2. The relationship between upbeat and downbeat (bracket 2) is analogous to the second bracket in second species+++ except that there (in second species) the relationship from downbeat to downbeat is already given. In this analogous sense it is permissible here, as there, to apply the rule without restriction, that is, parallel successions are in principle more often forbidden than permitted.+++ However, nonparallel direct successions are not prohibited.

3. In the relationship of downbeat to downbeat in this species (bracket 3) where three additional tones in the counterpoint intervene and call attention to themselves, parallel successions can be tolerated, at least in principle. We have to remember that if there is an awkward leading of the counterpoint, even in this bracket (thus in the most distant designation) the ear sometimes perceives parallel

---

+Cf. Section II, Chapter 1, § 6, and Section II, Chapter 2, § 11, bracket 1, at 1.

+++Cf. Section II, Chapter 2, § 11, at 2.

+++Even if here, as in second species, the possibility of restoration by means of a skip larger than a third is granted.
successions as being unpleasant. Thus, the prohibition, since it manages to retain its validity even in this situation, constitutes a further advance beyond what it already acquired in second species—it has expanded beyond the first stage (the immediate succession of two tones)\(^+\) by managing to subjugate tones that are distant from each other:

That the parallel successions are so strikingly audible despite the intervention of three quarter notes in the counterpoint, is related to the fact that the rhythm of the cantus firmus itself sharply emphasizes the downbeat. Expressed in another way, if the cantus firmus had another subdivision—perhaps in half notes—then, without a doubt, the impression of the downbeat would probably be very much weakened at such a distance.

In consideration of this fact, it is advisable to avoid parallel successes in the middle of a lesson so that one may possibly incorporate them, with a good conscience, at the cadence formula or in a \textit{nota cambiata} \(\text{**}\) because of this or that difficulty connected with them. Finally, it is quite obvious that nonparallel direct successions may be used without limitation, just as in bracket 2.

4. In bracket 4—from upbeat to upbeat—we are to use only the so-called after beat octaves and fifths.

I want to state here that with reference to the afterbeat octaves and fifths, neither Fux nor Albrechtsberger shows any sensitivity; they simply use them in their lessons.\(\text{***}\)

\(\text{**}\) Cf. Section II, Chapter 1, § 6.
\(\text{***}\) About which I shall soon comment.

\(\text{****}\) Cf. in Fux, Table VI, Fig. 6; Table VI, Fig. 9; Table XIII, Fig. 5; in Albrechtsberger, page 112 (meas. 11-12). (*89)
Cherubini expresses himself in the following way (p. 20, Rule 3):

We can neither avoid a forbidden octave or fifth in two-part counterpoint by means of one, two, or even three quarter-notes, nor can we eliminate its effect even by introducing contrary motion or skips larger than a third:

Example 342.

To a certain degree this is the same excessive, benumbed, and illogical strictness that we found him expounding with reference to the same problem in second species. And when he even goes so far as to advocate a new domain for the prohibition in the relationship of the second quarter note to the next downbeat, we then can sanction such sensitivity of the ear only with reservation. Under certain circumstances a parallel succession, even in this relationship, could be very unpleasant, but, it remains an exaggeration to adhere to the prohibition with such strictness even if only for lessons in strict counterpoint.

---

*Cf. the comments in Section II, Chapter 2, §11.*
§ 6. An Incorrect Skip of a Third.

Albrechtsberger is the only one of these counterpoint teachers who draws attention to the following "mistake against a good melody." He remarks (p. 44):

It would be unmelodious if one were to skip upward by a third into the next measure, after one containing three or four notes ascending stepwise. The reverse is also true: it would be unmelodious if one were to skip downward by a third into the next measure, after one containing three or four notes descending stepwise; for example:

Example 343.

Furthermore, he says: "Also, larger skips after such progressions are seldom good. For example:"
Example 344.

[307] Albrechtsberger is certainly correct in this prohibition. However, he unfortunately fails to give a reason for this bad effect. This might be said: after a strong and incessant succession of seconds, even the smallest skip obviously must attract attention as being melodically too peculiar and individual. But sometimes when the interval of the skip is added harmonically to the preceding tones, an unwelcome diminished chord, seventh-chord, or ninth-chord suddenly results. We must observe that the skip is not forbidden in the middle of a measure but only when it leads "into the next measure." Thus, it is ultimately the measure-boundary itself which blatantly exposes the bad effect of the skip that is being censured for both melodic and rhythmic reasons.

Whether we can consider contrary motion as the best solution in such a case depends upon the situation. If we maintain that neutrality and even balance of the tones of the counterpoint is the unchangeable, ultimate goal, then other means by which we can circumvent such a "mistake against a good melody" can certainly be found.
The following example of free composition:

Example 345. J. S. Bach, Prelude and Fugue in A minor.

[308] shows us--disregarding the need here to emphasize the six-four chord--the danger of the mistake described in these paragraphs. If we wish to be convinced of the terrible effect of the latter, we need only to set at the bracket the tone B where the G♯ is (as it was the first time); thereby the skip of a third, b-e♯, will come to the fore.

§ 7. The So-called Nota Cambiata (Changing Note).

Traditionally, the nota cambiata is taught in third species. The nota cambiata is an organic unity of five tones whose execution is unalterably fixed; for example:

Example 346.

In this example we immediately recognize a transgres-
sion against the rule of passing dissonance: after the dissonance of the seventh at the second quarter note, which is approached regularly (i.e., by step), there is an irregular departure (i.e., by skip) to the third quarter note.

In the last analysis, however, the transgression is only an apparent one because it refers to the movement of the second quarter note (in our example, d\textsuperscript{2}) beyond the inserted third quarter note to the fourth quarter note (c\textsuperscript{2}), whereby the law of the passing second, nevertheless, finds its full and proper fulfillment even if through a detour.

But the detour has its own further consequences: for, like a punishment for the fact that the immediate fulfillment of the seventh, which in the process of passing, has been impeded, the guilty third quarter note must now seek its own support in an unconditional, consonant relationship with the cantus firmus. In other words, it must be covered and supported by the consonant character of the cantus firmus if it wants to successfully play the role of an impeding intruder. In addition, the abnormal third quarter note creates a new basis for a second, normal passing tone. A situation is now created in which the fourth quarter note (c\textsuperscript{2}) represents the terminal point of the first passing figure (according to the psychological concept above), and also functions as a passing tone between the third quarter note of the first measure and the downbeat of the next.

In other words, the nota cambiata represents two interwoven tones, two genuine and complete passing tones. One can see this in the following example at the bracketed succession at a) and b):

\[\text{I.e., the first, second, and fourth quarter notes.}\]
\[\text{I.e., between the third and fifth note of the figure in our example.}\]
Each passing tone shows an otherwise perfect and normal structure by having the dissonance placed in stepwise movement. However, the middle tone of the second passing figure is to be understood as the last tone of the first figure. This arrangement accounts for its interwoven and seemingly irregular appearance.

We must consider these factors as preconditions of the nota cambiata:

a) the first quarter note of the group must be consonant;
b) the second quarter note brings the dissonance by regular, stepwise movement;
c) the third quarter note that introduces the seemingly erroneous skip of a third must be consonant with the cantus firmus;
d) the fourth quarter note moves stepwise in the direction in which the second one appeared to stop and can be heard, therefore, both as the end of the first and as the middle of the second passing figure.
e) the fifth and final quarter note of the group is consonant with the cantus firmus.

Therefore, it is possible that:

1. A true nota cambiata consisting of five tones can stretch from upbeat to upbeat; for example:
Example 348.

2. A nota cambiata can be constructed ascending as well as descending, for example:

Example 349.

Under no circumstance, however, may we consider the next example to be a nota cambiata:

Example 350.

because here the second quarter note is a genuine consonance from which we can skip according to our desire; or this one:

Example 351.

whose third quarter note is not consonant with the cantus firmus; or here:
[311] where the majority of the prerequisites for the nota cambiata seem fulfilled but where the group begins with the second quarter note, whereby, in contrast to the true nota cambiata, a certain lack of precision and lucidity makes itself felt; or this:

Example 353.

![Example 353](image)

a figure which digresses from the true nota cambiata in that the dissonance on the second quarter note is approached by a skip rather than by step—later we shall see in remarks from secondary sources what it really is; or this one:

Example 354.

![Example 354](image)

where two further tones are required to complete the nota cambiata. This example illustrates a "harmonic anticipation" as it is frequently used at the end of a recitative.+

+Cf. Harmonielehre, § 167.
In summing up all of these preconditions, we must conclude that the *nota cambiata*, as a far-reaching unity of five tones, actually stands in contradiction to strict counterpoint. The latter, as we know, postulates an even balance throughout and, therefore, the *nota cambiata*—in the narrowest sense—can hardly be regarded as part of strict counterpoint.

That the older theorists have taken this compositional phenomenon of free composition and transferred it to strict counterpoint only proves again how unclear their conceptions were, and how carelessly they sensed the boundary between strict and free composition.
Since the nota cambiata exhibits the space of a fourth (from the first to the third tone), it is not only necessary but also instructive to learn to distinguish it from the passing tone in the space of a fourth as I have presented it above (p. 248 ff.).

With regard to the passing tone, there are, fundamentally, two possibilities in the space of a fourth, and the order of the intervals to and from the passing tone distinguishes the two forms. In the one, the smaller interval of the second is immediately followed by the larger interval of the third, while in the other the succession is reversed: the third precedes the second. The latter form yields the more natural effect. The psychological reason for this is that the wider, more strenuous skip of a third marks the direction more precisely and brings us closer to the goal than the stepwise movement does. The latter leaves open the possibility that perhaps the very next step is the goal of the passing figure and not, therefore, the tone of the fourth (standing a third higher). Accordingly, we have the choice of two possible descending passing tones:

Example 355.

![Example 355](image)

The passing tone in Example 355a has the advantage of naturalness in contrast to the one in 355b. It is self-evident that, under certain circumstances, the less-natural form can produce the more exotic effect. This is demonstrated in an ascending fourth context by Examples 250–252. For the passing tone in descending direction the following example

---

*As Example 249 shows.*
The intrinsic difference between such passing tones and the nota cambiata lies in the fact that passing tones within the space of a fourth, regardless of the direction, conform to the postulate of naturalness by having the skip of the third precede the movement by step; whereas, in the case of the nota cambiata, there is the demand to use the reverse succession exclusively. Thus, from this vantage point, we can see more clearly and deeply into the essence of the nota cambiata: it adheres without fail to the succession of movement by step followed by skip of a third. Only in this way can it express the intended normal passing motion which begins with the step that achieves its end only on the fourth quarter note through the aid of a second passing figure. The nota cambiata thus emerges also as a type of passing figure, but one having a strange and awkward character not otherwise present in a passing tone in the space of a fourth.

The intensified recognition of the existence of such distinct effects brought about by the many forms of the passing tone--I want to remind the reader that up to now we have learned about the following: the neighboring tone, the accented passing tone, the passing tone in the space of a fourth, and now the nota cambiata--finally gives me the opportunity to explain in more detail the manifold phenomena
of those passing tones involving skips for which we already have had some illustrations in Examples 248, 253, 257, etc.

[314] While strict counterpoint lacks the strength to predict for us the forthcoming harmony, free composition, by contrast, offers us such guideposts into the future in the form of the scale-degrees and through the help of the harmonic logic. Just as we anticipate with the composer—except for some surprises—the coming harmony, we also immediately understand, in free composition, the function of those tones that present themselves as neighboring tones or accented passing tones to the upcoming harmony. Added to this is the fact that free composition is capable of enlivening in our perception all aspects of harmony stretching beyond the immediate and present picture of the composition, and that this takes place in every possible arrangement and octave. Thus, for example, when we find at a place which we foresee as a cadence the following configuration:

Example 357. Handel, Chaconne in G major, Variation 2.

![Example notation]

we understand the second eighth note of the bass (c) to be, above all, in the service of the expected V-degree, as a neighboring tone to the coming root-tone D. In addition, it provides us our conception that before the G there properly

+ Since the force of voice leading inherent in it is not conducive to this.

+++ Similarly, as we think ahead when we read and hear written and spoken language.
belongs a component of the preceding triad on G, i.e.,
either B or D:

Example 358.

through which--this is precisely the result missed by superfi-
cial perception--even in the second eighth note (therefore
in the passing tone approached by skip), the very archetype of
 \[315\] the passing tone itself is expressed! We see, there-
fore, that one and the same original phenomenon can manifest
itself in many forms and yet not disappear in any of them.
Even if, at first, the momentary deviation does not permit
us to recognize the archetype, it is the latter, alone, which
brings the new phenomenon to manifestation and fruition. To
show the archetype with all its variants and to expose the
prolongation of an original concept even where contradictions
against it seem to surface, this alone is the task of counter-
point:

From this it is now self-evident that at the bracket
in the following example we are confronted with a passing
tone in the space of a fourth:

Example 359. J. S. Bach, Well-Tempered Clavier,
Prelude in C-sharp minor.
This is totally different from a nota cambiata and it deviates in other ways from the usual passing tone in the space of a fourth so that the effect of an anticipation is very evident.

A true nota cambiata is presented by Bellermann in an example from a chorus in Handel's Messiah (p. 162):+

Example 360.

\[\text{Sop.} \quad \text{Alto} \quad \text{Tenor} \quad \text{Bass} \]

\[\text{etc.}\]

\[\text{Example 360. Table IV, Fig. 10.}\]

Actually, this skip of a third from the second to the third note should occur from the first to the second note, since the second note would then form a consonant sixth:

---

+["Through His stripes we are healed."
Example 362. Table IV, Fig. 11.

If we should fill in the skip from the first to the second note, the following situation would result:

Example 363. Table IV, Fig. 12.

However, since eighth notes are not allowed in this species of counterpoint, the old masters have approved the first example where the second note forms a seventh—possibly because it is easier to sing.

What a beautiful endeavour to solve the problem. Alas!—note particularly the last words—how modest the attempted solution sounds. If I reject it here, it is only for the reason described above and because Fux's words do not seem to match the feeling he must have had when he wrote a nota cambiata in the middle of a composition. In addition, my own explanation presents a much broader overview of several other phenomena similar to the nota cambiata, and it provides the means to distinguish and differentiate them.

[317] Albrechtsberger quotes Fux and adds more examples (p. 48):
But he further states [49]:

We find that other good masters use the two changing notes, the seventh above, and the fourth below inverted, although, in three or four-part writing, these inversions produce hidden fifths, as for example:

Example 365.
[318]

"in three parts, good"

"hidden fifths"

\[ \text{Example} \]

or, in the following way, in which they produce, in addition, an unprepared six-four chord which is allowed only in free composition:

Example 366.
Albrechtsberger's criticism of these newly added "changing notes" cannot be taken lightly. One has only to remember that they can be found in the "good masters," as he has said. However, does this not mean that they can be found only in free compositions and, in the narrow sense only exclusively in them? What they have in common with the nota cambiata is, at best, the five-tone pattern. On the other hand, the fact that the skip of a third precedes the stepwise motion is related, ever-so-much closer, to the passing tone in the space of a fourth. Being truly characteristic of free composition, we can best recognize them as simply composed-out seventh-chords, which indeed are only fitting in free composition, never in strict counterpoint. And there again we find a connection with regard to the alleged "license" of the apparent six-four chord in four-part writing as presented by Albrechtsberger in Example 366—which, in reality, is a six-four-two chord: Nevertheless, Albrechtsberger does use such "changing notes" of free composition in his strict-counterpoint lessons.*

Cherubini bows most respectfully before this use by the "classical composers"—as if its use in its most primitive version had everything in common with strict counterpoint—but he opposed the rule concerning the nota cambiata and says (p. 19):

At any rate, I would not know how to justify such a serious infraction of the rule, and tradition has not handed down to us the reasons upon which this faulty method of our old masters could be based. I cannot explain why, instead of the following way:

Example 367.

\[ \text{Example 52.} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Example 367.} \\
\text{Example 52.}
\end{align*} \]

it would not be preferable to do it:

Example 368.

\[ \text{Example 368.} \]

\[ \text{Example 53.} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Example 368.} \\
\text{Example 53.}
\end{align*} \]

*Cf. pages 68, 69, 95, 96, 97, 119, 133.
just as in this case:

Example 369.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 54.}
\end{array} \]

[320] it could have been written this way:

Example 370.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 55.}
\end{array} \]

In the last example there are two dissonances that follow one another and violate the rule. This is sometimes permissible when the dissonances follow one another by step. At times we are forced into this situation by circumstance. How the classical composers can justify many dissonances in skips I do not understand, unless it was for greater variety, or, considering the short duration of the quarter note, because the third is a small skip and therefore moderately easy to sing.

With this curious thought process, Cherubini actually soothes us by confessing that he does not understand the reason for justifying the nota cambiata—that statement should take the sting out of all criticism! However, it would have been better had Cherubini rejected the nota cambiata by virtue of his understanding rather than through ignorance, because then he would have saved himself an even more serious mistake of permitting cases like Example 55 [= Ex. 370] even if only occasionally. In the latter, the licenses are piled upon one another and, even though in free composition we might recommend a similar construction, it is, nevertheless, delusive and blind not to recognize that this is alien to strict counterpoint. Above all, we deal with a combination of species in Cherubini's Example 55, which at best can be
used only on the way to free composition. Furthermore, the most primary law of the neighboring tone has been infringed upon, according to strict counterpoint, inasmuch as the third quarter note is not consonant. Finally, the dissonance on the third quarter note is not located between two consonances, a fact that must be considered a mistake. By the way, Cherubini's explanation of Example 55 is unsatisfactory. For, if it only depended on the fact that "dissonances follow one another by step," what faultiness in the voice leading would then have to be permitted even in exercises? Why Example 55, nevertheless, has value—to be sure, only for free composition—is that the figure represents two, normal acts that have been compressed into one; indeed, the illustration of the first act appears as follows:

[321] Example 371.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{C} & \text{D} & \text{E} & \text{F} \\
\text{G} & \text{A} & \text{B} & \text{C} \\
\end{array}
\]

This indicates that against one tone of the cantus firmus the counterpoint consists of four quarter notes with a regular neighboring tone appearing on the second quarter note. The second act takes place—as we shall see later with reference to combined species—when a lower voice does not wait for the completion of all four notes but progresses to the next tone before these notes are finished. It counts on the fact that our sensibility will be attuned to the true facts. The case is similar in the resolution of a syncopation, as for example:

Example 372.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{G} & \text{A} & \text{B} & \text{C} \\
\text{D} & \text{E} & \text{F} & \text{G} \\
\end{array}
\]

where our sensibility is so naturally acquainted with the need for resolution of the syncopation that we can burden the ear with the progression of the lower voice without fear

\[+\text{Cf. Section VI below.}\]
of confusing it regarding the origin of the figure at b), i.e., that it comes from the one at a), the first act of the process. That Cherubini's quarrel with the "classical composers" is totally unjustifiable on this occasion is evident. So is the fact that it is only the result of the folly which conceives counterpoint and composition as completely identical concepts!

Bellermann gives an extensive explanation of the nota cambiata, some excerpts of which will be reproduced here (p. 159):

The older composers adhered to the following: They conceived the skip in faster-note species (quarter notes) from the weak beat to the strong beat as easier than the reverse possibility. . . (90) This skip was preferred from the second to the third quarter notes, rather than from the first to the second even if it caused the second quarter note to enter into a dissonant relationship with the other voices so that according to the rule it would have to progress by step. (91)

And still more can be read on p. 160.

This explanation is irrelevant for the very reason that, at best, it would be capable of explaining only the succession of the first three tones of the nota cambiata and not the complete phenomenon with its full range of five tones! To be sure, Bellermann tries to get out of his predicament with this naive and confused statement (p. 160):

Almost without exception, we find that the three notes [322] which follow the skip ascend stepwise so that through the application of the changing note the following constellation is nearly always created:

Example 373.

\[ \text{Example 373} \]

But how can he defend himself from the extensive reproach that, indeed, with his explanation he proclaims a general principle that finds no application outside of the nota cambiata? Since we should pay close attention in the counterpoint--Bellermann's viewpoint demands it--to the "emphasized and less emphasized" notes (p. 160), then it is not understandable why, as in the nota cambiata, a skip from a strong to a weak beat should not be avoided elsewhere! In addition, I want to remind the reader of the skip of a third
that was forbidden when going from one measure into another;+ Thus, in Bellermann, we see a curious spectacle—although by instinct he is on the right track, he is, nevertheless, incapable of explaining and defending the figure. Due to his lack of penetrating insight, he yields to the temptation of expressing totally false concepts. He grants, for example, "that it is just as good to use the changing note on the fourth quarter note of a measure as on the second." On the other hand, he excuses the ascending changing note with no more than these words [p. 161]:

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries we find the changing note applied descending only. In modern compositions it can be used quite well ascending, for example:

Example 374.

\[ \text{Example image here} \]

And he has more to say about the changing note [p. 160]:

The changing note was treated in the same fashion as a consonance, and even in multi-linear composition in which one or several voices sing passing tones no attention was paid to their dissonant relationship.++

Later he writes (p. 450, Sub 4.): "The use of the changing note must come only in melismas; it therefore may never be divided by melismas." Bellermann's thoughts reveal here that he conceived the nota cambiata only as a closed five-tone unity. And yet he counters in a quite misconceived polemic against Cherubini with the following thoughts (p. 161):

[323] And does not newer music exhibit similar expressions which, though correct according to Cherubini, would sound awkward? I include here the use appearing frequently in recitatives, for example:

---

+ See § 6 above.

++ A quote from a Palestrina motet follows. (*92).
Thus he, himself, takes into consideration only the first three tones of the nota cambiata, as if these alone were a nota cambiata, or perhaps, as if the above-quoted recitative passage were a true nota cambiata.+


In reference to the outlining of harmonies, we must continue, all the more, to adhere to the prohibition++ already known to us because the increased number of tones appearing here in a measure makes it both easy and tempting to produce such outlinings.

Note particularly that we must never skip from a dissonance—the fourth plays a dangerous role in this as I have already indicated in § 1. In a pinch, when nothing else is possible, we can write these figures:

Example 376.

but never this one:

*Cf., the previously given explanation of such a phenomenon as an anticipation.

**Cf., Section I, Chapter 1, § 3; Section I, Chapter 2, § 19; Section II, Chapter 2, § 15.
Here, under the pretext of the composing-out process (which is still completely inadmissible in strict counterpoint), the fourth that is set on the third quarter note is approached and left by skip instead of appearing as a passing tone.

With regard to monotony, be especially cautious here because in using four quarter notes the danger of creating unities is even greater than in the previous species.

Through its four quarter notes, third species can reveal the effect of chord change much more clearly than second species can. Since the harmonies are stated more explicitly in third species, their change can also be observed more clearly. Of course, it makes a significant difference whether the chord change takes place only from measure to measure or within the same measure. Therefore, the teaching of counterpoint has the task of pointing out the differences in effect between these two cases. Nevertheless, when it declares that for the time being it is better and more natural to use one chord per measure, then this advice must rest on the notion that before splitting the cantus firmus tone harmonically, that is, assigning to it two different harmonies, it would be more suitable to exhibit the one tone in a single, harmonic unity. To be

\[\text{Example 377.}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textbf{Example 377.}} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textbf{Example 377.}} \\
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{[324] Here, under the pretext of the composing-out process (which is still completely inadmissible in strict counterpoint), the fourth that is set on the third quarter note is approached and left by skip instead of appearing as a passing tone.}\]

\[\text{With regard to monotony, be especially cautious here because in using four quarter notes the danger of creating unities is even greater than in the previous species.}\]

\[\text{Through its four quarter notes, third species can reveal the effect of chord change much more clearly than second species can. Since the harmonies are stated more explicitly in third species, their change can also be observed more clearly. Of course, it makes a significant difference whether the chord change takes place only from measure to measure or within the same measure. Therefore, the teaching of counterpoint has the task of pointing out the differences in effect between these two cases. Nevertheless, when it declares that for the time being it is better and more natural to use one chord per measure, then this advice must rest on the notion that before splitting the cantus firmus tone harmonically, that is, assigning to it two different harmonies, it would be more suitable to exhibit the one tone in a single, harmonic unity. To be}\]

\[\text{\textbf{Cf. Section II, Chapter 2, \S 13.}}\]

\[\text{\textbf{Often enough it is precisely the neighboring tone that helps to accomplish the task of maintaining the same harmony during an entire measure.}}\]
sure, it is permissible to have a chord change with the succession of 5 and 6. However, we must preclude this possibility in the first measure because its undivided harmonic impression, as mentioned previously in regard to second species, is simply a fundamental requirement for the comprehension of the key.

It is self-evident that because of the tendency and necessity for free composition to compose-out the harmony in order to gain content, in that situation all kinds of triads and seventh-chords may be outlined. By the same token, it is permissible, in connection with the composing-out process and the establishment of the root-tones, to skip from such a fourth (a merely apparent one!) without further ado; for example:

Example 378.

Albrechtsberger writes explicitly (p. 53):

In this species, the best counterpoints in two, three, or more parts are those in which each measure has a single accord throughout because they are more durable and solemn (as required by church style) and can even be performed in quicker times, if need be. It is permissible to use a different accord on each beat provided that both the first and last accords are perfect. It is also preferable to retain the perfect accord throughout the first measure so that
the listener will be instructed and prepared for the main key. . . (*93)

Here, it would have sufficed if Albrechtsberger, instead of mistakenly using the "church style" as an argument, had merely sought to describe the effect itself which seems to differ according to whether the harmony is held a full measure or is changed within the measure. Finally, it is a pity that in the exercise on page 106 he departs from the usually observed principle of establishing the key at the beginning by modulating to G major in the second and third measures while the cantus firmus remains in C major.

I wish to point out here that Albrechtsberger hastily explains the conclusion of a three-part composition by saying (p. 113, 114):

[326] The N.B. (in the following example) points out that the D in the bass is not wrong on the weak beat even though it indicates a six-four chord:

Example 379.

If we were to set this measure in four parts or were obligated to accompany it on the organ, the octave would be added to the first note, G. Thus, the second note, D, would properly bear a passing, or, to say it better, an onward-skipping six-four chord, as in No. 1. Also here [in fifth species] when four notes are used, as in third species, it is permissible to place the six-four chord on the third or fourth note if the bass totally outlines a root position or first inversion triad. However, unless it is tied, the six-four chord is forbidden on the first note (see Nos. 2 and 3).
That his confusion has led him to such drastic mixing of strict and free composition is obvious. Still, I should not like to pass up this opportunity to explain that the above-mentioned octave, which the accompanying organ player may add in the bass (indeed, he has the duty to do so), is none other than the scale-degree, or root-tone, which is recognized only in free composition, and which, due to its proper causality in that context, is complimentary and justified.

CLOSING


If we bear in mind that the other leading tone may occupy only the fourth quarter, we find that these closing formulas, among others, are possible:
As we can see, Albrechtsberger labels the following formulas "bad" because of the parallel unison or octave successions in the upbeat to downbeat relationship (p. 51):

Example 382.
Example 383.

Fux, Table IV, Figure 15, and Table IV, Figure 16.

1. Alto

2. Tenor

3. C.f.

4. Bass

Fux, Table V, Figure 2, and Table V, Figure 3.
Remarks Concerning These Lessons

About 1. Notice that the original $B_\flat$ is used in measures 4 and 5 in spite of the Dorian mode. In contrast, Fux avoids it in measures 7 and 8, obviously because of the proximity of the cadence. However, this causes him to make the mistake of setting two major thirds in measures 8-9. We have discussed this mistake in Section II, Chapter 1, §18. It is ironic to see that Bellermann, who cites these lessons of Fux on page 165, sets a $B_\flat$ instead of a $B$ in measures 7 and 8. What happened to the Dorian mode he so espoused? (cf. p. 49).

About 3. The $B_\flat$ in measure 3 is original even though the mode is Lydian. Bellermann, who also reproduces this lesson on page 160 omits the $B_\flat$, thereby reversing the procedure he adopted in the first lesson. In measure 9, Fux's counterpoint can hardly be called flowing and good. Justifiably, therefore, Bellermann changes it as follows:

Example 384.
About 5. In measure 6 the outlining of the C triad is bad. Measure 8 shows the figure about which we spoke in detail in § 7. Because of the circumstances, the succession of fifths in measures 8-9 on the downbeats should not be criticized.

About 6. A fatal, totally unacceptable monotony is created in measures 1-2 in relation to measures 3-4. In measure 5 the note F is not a neighboring tone. Neither is the D in measure 6 nor the G in measure 9. Measure 12 contains a chord outline—cf. No. 5.

About 7. This lesson exhibits modulation in measures 6 and 9; a neighboring tone in measure 3.
GENERAL COMMENTS

1. The Concept of the Syncopation.

In the realm of strict counterpoint, if a consonant note on the upbeat is continued on the downbeat by means of a tie, then the phenomenon called "syncopation" results; for example:

Example 385.

However, strict counterpoint particularly stresses the fact that the note on the upbeat must always be consonant with the cantus firmus. Therefore, from the outset it excludes from its realm the situation in which a dissonant note on the upbeat becomes a syncopation by means of a tie even though it might seem, initially, to be only a passing tone; for example:

---

+ Considered here on the basis of two beats per measure; cf., second species.

++ The reason for this will be discussed later.
Example 386.

or, to show the same thing, an example in free composition:


Later, we shall investigate the conditions under which strict counterpoint, venturing a first step toward free composition, allows, nevertheless, a dissonant $4 \frac{5}{3}$ on the upbeat.

Fux defines the syncopation as (p. 80): [Aloys.]
"Two half notes (in exchange for a whole note) which have the same pitch and are tied together. The first must occur on the upbeat, the second on the downbeat."

Albrechtsberger's correction of a mistake by Beethoven affirms the requirement in strict counterpoint that the consonance must fall on the upbeat (Nottebohm, p. 50):

Example 388.
Cherubini writes (p. 22):

Syncopation refers to a whole note whose first half falls on a weak beat and whose second half falls on the downbeat of the next measure:

Example 389.

Bellermann erroneously encroaches upon the further development of the concept of syncopation by talking about dissonant syncopation in his introductory paragraph on page 171; from that he formulates his general concept of syncopation. Later, he casually corrects his mistake (p. 174): "The note tied on the arsis (=downbeat!) is either a consonance or a dissonance. . . (**94)

§ 2. The Classification of Syncopations.

While the principle of syncopation, that is, the sustaining of the consonant note of the upbeat on the following downbeat, remains constant, the material content of syncopation allows for a further distinction. Despite the tie and the consonance on the upbeat, the interval that appears on the downbeat may be consonant or dissonant. That is the reason why one speaks of consonant and dissonant syncopations (ligatura consonans, dissonans):

Example 390.
Strict counterpoint permits both types. If, in spite of its outer appearance, the consonant syncopation is similar to the previously discussed consonant phenomena in strict counterpoint, the dissonant syncopation offers, in contrast, a totally new, technical and psychological principle. Whereas, up to this point, passing dissonance was permitted between two consonances only on the upbeat, now, at last, a dissonance may appear on the downbeat—even in strict counterpoint. What kind of preconditions and effects this latter brings about will be discussed a bit later.

§ 3. The Consonant Syncopation.

Since the mechanism of a consonant syncopation seems to have been unalterably defined,—consonance on the upbeat as well as the downbeat,—naturally the next task is to clarify the further path. This path is easy to describe within strict counterpoint, for if, according to the principle of the present species, a consonance must always be set on the upbeat, we will have to follow the consonant syncopation with another consonance either by step or skip.

[334] Aside from the fact that it becomes the basis for the next syncopation, the new consonance on the upbeat will have to express either by third the same harmony as both the cantus firmus and the note on the previous downbeat, or, by second a harmonic change with respect to the cantus firmus. The latter alternative, as we already know, is only possible in the succession 5--6 or 6--5:

+Cf. Section II, Chapter 1, § 13.
Example 391.

When consonant syncopations are used successively, we should honor, as much as possible, the old principle that an imperfect consonance is more welcome on the downbeat than a perfect one.+

Finally, we must note that a unison can also be found in a series of consonant syncopations. We will speak of this later.

While Fux does not explicitly speak of it, Albrechtsberger states (pp. 57-58):

In their resolution (sic!), consonant syncopations can skip or move by step to another consonance. The latter case can occur only with the perfect fifth and the two permitted sixths; for example:

Example 392.++

Let us not overlook the fact that by allowing three fifths to follow one another (in Example 392a on the downbeat, and in 392b on the upbeat), he has not paid attention to the successive fifths in the above example.

+Cf. Section II, Chapter 1, § 22.
++Examples of skipping progressions follow this example. (*95)

[335] If we compare the dissonant syncopation with the phenomenon of the passing dissonance, known to us since the discussion of second species, we will be surprised to find that they share a common characteristic; in both of them the dissonant element is set only between two consonances.

This characteristic makes these phenomena of strict counterpoint seem more alike than circumstance indicates. In the syncopation, the two consonances (with the dissonance in the middle) are placed on the upbeat, while in the passing dissonance, the consonances are placed on the downbeat:

Example 393.

And, just as little may their similarity be counteracted by the fact that the dissonant note on the downbeat is identical in pitch with the "preparing" consonant note on the upbeat, while in the case of the passing dissonance, upbeat and downbeat must exhibit different tones.

In both of these phenomena the essential course is the same: consonance-dissonance-consonance:†

†Cf. Section II, Chapter 1, § 2, and Section II, Chapter 2, § 6.
In this sense, the dissonant syncopation is essentially nothing other than a type of passing dissonance, a part of the general problem of dissonance that can be understood in strict counterpoint either as a passing dissonance on the weak divisions of the measure or as a passing dissonance on the strong beat of the measure, that is, the dissonant syncopation (fourth species).

Although he is primarily exploring another problem, Fux is the only theorist who concerns himself with the inner essence of the dissonant syncopation (p. 80):

[Alloys.] Since the dissonances stand here not by chance or by virtue of being filler material (by diminution) as in previous species, but functionally and on the downbeat, and since they cannot please by themselves, being offensive to the ear, they must get their euphony from the immediately following consonance into which they resolve. Therefore, we must discuss the resolution of dissonances.

Thus, we find here, a slight indication that also the dissonance in the syncopation, like that of the passing tone on the upbeat, can be understood only from the standpoint of consonance.


In strict counterpoint, the dissonant syncopation may only resolve downward by step into the next consonance.

The following outline explains all of the possible syncopations:

---

*See second and third species.

**Cf. the quote made in § 5 below.
Example 394.

A) Counterpoint in the upper part—

a) resolution downward by step:

1. 2. 3. N.B. 4. 5. N.B.

b) resolution upward by step:

1. 2. 3. 4.

B) Counterpoint in the lower part—

a) resolution downward by step:

1. 2. N.B. 3. 4. N.B.

b) resolution upward by step:

1. 2. 3. 4.

From the outset, all syncopations, in categories A, b and B, b are eliminated from use in strict counterpoint.

The N.B.'s in categories A, a, 3 and B, a, 2 point out that the augmented fourth in the upper as well as in the lower counterpoint will be present throughout the exercises even in strict counterpoint if the path of the syncopation should not be repeatedly cut off in the strictly preserved
diatonicism. With regard to this question, we have to observe, even if reluctantly, the artistic nature of diatonicism mentioned in Section II, Chapter 1, § 3.

The N.B. in category A, a, 5 refers to the fact that it might be possible to consider the diminished fifth as a dissonant syncopation if the law of downward resolution did not directly draw attention to the impossibility of a resolution to the dissonant fourth.

Now we get to the difficulty of the matter, namely the basis for the rule which permits only a descending resolution of the dissonant syncopation in strict counterpoint.

If we look at an example of free composition such as the following:


\[ \text{Example 395 Beethoven, Piano Sonata, Op. 13.} \]

then the presence of scale-degrees\(^+\) along with the composing-out conditions resulting from them as well as the development of richer means of the multi-linear texture, causes us, indeed from the beginning (i.e., in conformity with the logic of the harmonies) to expect the chord on C (in six-three position),

\[^+\text{Cf. Harmonielehre, § 84.}\]
given on the third quarter of measure two, so that within the distinctness of the total situation we must then correctly perceive, in addition, the function of the subsequent tones that are contained in the suspensions \( \text{b} - \text{c}^1, \text{d}^1 - \text{e}^\flat \), and \( \text{a}^\flat - \text{g}^1 \). From the standpoint of the scale-degree \( \text{C} \), these tones represent either the suspensions \( 7-8, 2-3 \), and \( 6-5 \), or from the standpoint of \( \text{E}^\flat \) as the bass of the six-three chord, \( 5-6, 7-8 \), and \( 4-3 \).

In contrast, the two-part texture in strict counterpoint can not possibly offer us a similarly desirable clarity concerning the function of syncopations within their environment because of the absence of scale-degrees, and the considerable reduction of other means. But the fact that the downward resolution of dissonant syncopations was practiced very early and supported theoretically long before we had learned to influence the horizontal direction with harmonies, to elevate the harmonies to scale-degrees, and, finally, to tie them to the diatonic system,—precisely that fact causes us even now to seek out the basis for this rule still deeper within the causes and effects of strict counterpoint itself:

[339] Let us compare with Example 395 the following examples:

Example 396. a) J. S. Bach, French Suite in D minor.  
    b) J. S. Bach, English Suite in G minor.
In each of these cases we also fully expect the tonic in the second measure to follow the preceding V-degree. For this reason the contribution of the harmonic components of the I-degree are welcome and understandable, regardless of whether the suspensions are brought about, ascending or descending.

This example is similar:


On the other hand, if, in the course of a two-part lesson, we were to select a given tone of the cantus firmus, for example, $g^1$, strict counterpoint would not be able to indicate what it really is, whether a scale-degree itself, a harmonic component of a scale-degree, or perhaps merely a passing tone within a scale-degree, etc. Therefore, dissonant phenomena such as these:


whose derivation and meaning are completely explained by a particular context in free composition, must remain insolvable puzzles in strict counterpoint, where there are no means to

*Cf., Example 396a, meas. 1; 396b, meas. 1.
help us toward a solution. Strict counterpoint, therefore, reaches for the only means available to explain the tone, namely, consonance. Since it obviously cannot prove the dissonance independently, it provides the proper consonance required by each respective tone!

At this point I wish to remind the reader of a thought expressed on page 153: Consonance is the a priori principle in the world of tones [Tonwelt]. Strictly speaking, consonance only reproduces that which a tone already carries in its "body" naturally in the form of the overtone series, regardless of whether it is the question of an octave, fifth, third, or only their artificial inversions (unison, fourth, sixth).

To come back to our example, the tone $c^1$ must, in every instance, support its consonance before a dissonance (e.g., 7, 9, 4, 2) can be used above or below it. In the original sense of strict counterpoint, we can, then, only have passing tones:

Example 399.
A) In the upper counterpoint--
1. The seventh:

2. The fourth:

---

+Cf. Section II, Chapter 1, ¶ 2.

++See Example 398.
3. The ninth:

4. The second:

B) In the lower counterpoint--

5. The second:

6. The fourth:

7. The seventh:
Let me restate, most emphatically, that in strict counterpoint there cannot logically be an original and proper way of placing a dissonance on the downbeat, that is, on the "attack" of the cantus firmus.

Nevertheless, strict counterpoint through an arbitrary act of force [Gewaltaktes] ventures to set a dissonance on the downbeat when a consonance precedes it. This arbitrary act involves the combination of two situations that were originally distinct.

In the first act of this process let us think of the following sketch:

Example 400.

Here the consonance that introduces the passing tone, is deleted because our instinct is able spontaneously to supply the necessary consonance on the downbeat. Thus, the passing dissonance can now move over to the vacated downbeat so that the passing tone, as such, seems to have disappeared.

However, in the second act of this process the sacrificed consonance on the downbeat is at least replaced by a consonance on the upbeat of the previous measure. As a sign for this substitution the tie is used—which, to be sure, assumes the pitch identity of the latter with the dissonant tone—whereby, finally, the so-called syncopation of a seventh comes into being:

---

*See the parentheses.

++See arrow.
This phenomenon exhibits a stricter form than the accented passing tone or free suspension which will be discussed later.

If we conceive the phenomenon of syncopation as the result of abbreviation—the first elliptical process in strict counterpoint!—then it becomes possible to find out why the dissonant syncopation may only be resolved in a downward direction. Because the tied dissonance is by its very nature only a passing dissonance, the basic rule of passing dissonance remains in effect, namely, that it must continue the direction from which it came. Thus, the answer to the question ultimately depends on the direction of passing that we must assume with regard to the seventh, fourth, ninth, etc. For example, if we plead for the passing seventh dissonance as seen in Example 399A.1.a., the seventh, due to the approach from above, must descend further. However, if we express a preference for the passing figure shown in 399A.1.b., the seventh will have to continue to ascend. So it is, mutatis mutandis, for all the rest of these dissonant syncopations.

But nothing is simpler than to solve this last basic and preliminary question if we proceed from the only logical viewpoint that, because we lack a more precise orientation toward the meaning of the cantus firmus tone, we must give it the fullest, "most characteristic" measure of consonance in order to create, at least for the moment, the most satisfactory consonant effect for the tone.

+Cf. Section II, Chapter 2, § 4.
Thus, with regard to the suspension in the upper
counterpoint, our instinct prefers the octave to the sixth as
the starting interval for a passing seventh (399A.1.a and b)
simply because the octave is more natural than the sixth.

The sixth is the product of an inversion; in the last analysis
it points to a different root-tone:

Example 402.

\[ \text{Example 402.} \]

\[ \text{Example 402.} \]

[344] In the case of the passing fourth (399A.2.a and b) the
fifth is certainly a more suitable starting interval than the
third because it defines the consonant boundary of the root-
tone more clearly.

If, in the case of a ninth (399A.3.a and b) we have
to choose between the third [=tenth] and octave, then we
should decide in favor of the third because it adds more har­
mony to the root-tone than the octave. For similar reasons,
with regard to the second we should prefer the third to the
unison (399A.4.a and b).

In the lower counterpoint, the preliminary question
about the starting interval of the passing second should be
decided in favor of the unison (399B.5.a and b) because the
unison at least resolves into the harmony of the tone \( \text{c}_{1} \)
whereas, the under-third, \( \text{a} \), denies \( \text{c}_{1} \) its character as a
root-tone by reducing it to a third.

Even more drastically than the under-third, the under-
fifth expresses the total denial of the root character of the

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{+} Cf. Section I, Chapter 2, \$11.} \]
given note \( \text{c}^1 \). Therefore, in the case of the passing fourth in the lower counterpoint, we should prefer the third to the fifth (399B.6.a and b).

From the standpoint of the harmonic quantity, the passing seventh (399B.7.a and b) would probably be viewed as starting better with the under-sixth than the octave. The under-sixth is at least an inversion of the upper-third!^+

Now if we have finally selected the starting intervals for the passing tones on the basis of the absolute reasons discussed above—8 before 7, 5 before 4, 10 before 9, and 3 before 2 in the upper counterpoint; 1 before 2, 3 before 4 and 6 before 7 in the lower counterpoint—then the direction of the passing tone is thereby determined, and as we have seen, this direction is descending.

^[345] Conversely, had the choice of the other starting points caused us to decide for an ascending direction of the passing tone, we would have to reject it here in strict counterpoint even if it is feasible. For, it is clear that dissonant syncopations with ascending resolutions do not belong in the forefront of the present problem, and that strict counterpoint must only point to them as distant offshoots that find a place only in free composition. There, under the protection of all the relationships in the elucidating scale-steps, they can express all the more effectively and clearly their individual passing-effects and affective values.

But, if the postulate of descending resolution for the dissonant syncopations predetermines the path of three tones, then we have to see in it at the same time the basis++ for our

---

^+In the case of the seventh in the upper counterpoint, the upper-sixth was rejected only because it is the inversion of the under-third.

++To find, at last, definitive solution of this matter from the standpoint of strict counterpoint.
demand that the note on the upbeat must be consonant. For, if in strict counterpoint, the passing dissonance were allowed on the upbeat, then, in such a case, we would then have to arrive at a unity comprised of two full measures. Thus, without regard to the dissonance of the passing tone, the dissonant syncopation would also require an obligatory further path. But would not such an extensive unity, incomprehensible in its lack of motivation, stand in contrast to the main postulate of strict counterpoint which demands the highest degree of neutrality of tones? If, wishing to avoid such a danger, we attempted to convert the dissonant syncopation into a consonant one, would we not then be guilty of ignoring another urgent commandment by suddenly and without reason diverting the dissonance (in the very act of passing) from its proper and natural descending path?

Of all the teachers, Fux was the only one who at least admits to the student the problem of the prohibition of the ascending resolution. We read (p. 80):

[Aloys.] Before I begin to explain how dissonances are resolved, I must first state that a tied note is nothing but a retardation of the following note, which then, as if released from captivity, finds itself free again. Therefore, dissonances are always resolved downward by step into the next consonance, as shown in the following example:

Example 403. Table V, Fig. 6.

If the retardations are deleted, the example appears as follows:

+ As I observed in § 1, above.
++ Cf., Example 386a.
+++ As in Example 386b.
This makes it easy to perceive the sort of consonance into which any dissonance must resolve; it must be resolved to the consonance that would occur on the downbeat of the following measure if the retardation were abolished. Hence it happens that if the cantus firmus is in the lower part, the second must be resolved to the unison, the fourth to the third, the seventh to the sixth, and the ninth to the octave.

We also read (p. 81):

Joseph . . . (*96) with your permission may I ask whether the retardation or dissonant ligature also takes place ascending? The following examples seem to be much the same:

Aloysius You raise a question here which is more difficult to solve than the Gordian knot. It is a question that you as a beginner in this science cannot understand and therefore one that will be discussed at a later place. Although thirds remain after the resolution of the retardation, regardless of the direction, ascending or descending, there are some differences, as I shall explain at another time. For the time being, you must believe me, your teacher, that all dissonances are to be resolved downward to the next consonance.

On this question, Albrechtsberger does not even try to explain either the demand for the descending resolution or the prohibition of the ascending resolution. He decrees the rule simply as being self-evident and merely adds (p. 57):

To be sure, it is a well-known fact that in all compositions the diminished fifth resolves very well downward to the third. Yet it cannot directly take place here [in fourth species], especially in the upper
part. If it is to be tied in the upper part, we must interpolate the minor third or the minor sixth on the afterbeat; for example:

Example 406.

```
\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{In two parts} \\
&\text{N.B.} \\
&\text{bad without downward resolution}
\end{align*} \]
```

Compare to that the following voice leading in a lesson in three-part writing (p. 103):

Example 407.

```
\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{license}
\end{align*} \]
```

and finally, a place he explicitly permitted as a "license" (in a Beethoven lesson) where the diminished fifth seems to be resolved in a different voice (Nottebohm, p. 52):

Example 408.

```
\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{license}
\end{align*} \]
```

As we can see from this, Albrechtsberger admits the diminished fifth as a dissonant syncopation even though its resolution requires two, full measures. Let this be precisely the reason why we banish this syncopation (that leads to such a broad unity) from strict counterpoint and assign it to only free composition.

On pages 75-78 and 100 f., he illustrates—casually, as an aside—the ascending resolution of the dissonant syncopation in free composition: \( \sim 2--3, \sim 7--8, \sim 7--6, \sim 9--8. \)

Concerning the augmented fourth, see the quotation in \S 9 below.
Bellermann's remarks concerning the augmented fourth are given in §§ 9 and 10.

§ 6. Some Syncopations That Are Either Totally Forbidden or Only Tolerated Despite Their Descending Resolutions.

The use of downward resolving syncopations* is even further reduced in strict counterpoint because, despite their downward resolutions, one of them is totally forbidden and several others are only tolerated. Indeed, 7--8 in the lower counterpoint is forbidden while 2--1 and 9--8 in the upper counterpoint and 4--5 in the lower counterpoint are more or less tolerated. The reasons for this reduction will be explained in detail.

§ 7. The Absolute Prohibition of the 7--8 Syncopation in the Lower Counterpoint.

The prohibition of the 7--8 syncopation in the lower counterpoint is based upon the fact that the passing figure, whose middle tone forms the seventh,++ begins with the under-sixth.

Of the consonances capable of introducing the passing figure,+++ the under-sixth is without a doubt the least favorable as a beginning interval. If we consider that the under-sixth is derived only by means of the inversion of the third,++++ and that in strict counterpoint there is

---

+Cf., Example 394.A,a. and B,a.
++Cf., § 5 above.
+++In the upper counterpoint they are the octave, fifth, and third or tenth before the seventh, fourth, and second or ninth; in the lower counterpoint they are the unison, under-third, under-sixth before the [under-] second, under-fourth, and under-seventh.
++++A fact that alone shows clearly the dubious value of the derived interval.
a greater danger of confusing the under-seventh syncopation with the upper-seventh syncopation than vice versa (since, with the latter, we easily presume the comfortable octave as the beginning point of the passing figure), then we will discover in these reasons the basis for our instinctive refusal to follow the path of inversion, that is, to prefer the under-sixth to the octave. In other words: if we want to determine the direction of the passing tone (a factor that remains essential for the syncopation\(^*\)), it is difficult for us, yes, even impossible, to presume the under-sixth without ado. Thus, strict counterpoint totally lacks the means to require us to recognize the under-sixth in the first place, and as a result the \( \sim 7-\sim 8 \) syncopation in the lower counterpoint falls by the wayside.

---

In free composition, this syncopation finds a different and more favorable situation. There, through instinct, we follow the logic of the degree-progression and since we can correctly expect this or that harmony, we can, under certain circumstances, understand very quickly the seventh resolving downward in the lower voice as only a suspension of the octave of the expected harmony. And more than that, in free composition such syncopations can even involve a middle and a higher, outside voice without being misunderstood, regardless of the fact that the intervals measured from the root-tone are different:

\[ \sim 7-\sim 8 \]

\(^*\)According to § 5.
Thus, in this Schubert example the syncopation represents either $\frac{9}{4}-\frac{8}{3}$, if the root $C$ (I-degree) is assumed, or $\frac{7}{5}-\frac{6}{4}$, if the six-four position of the harmony is assumed.

Fux devotes the following passage to this difficult question (p. 81 f.):

Aloysius I must confess I have intentionally omitted the seventh. Hardly any reason can be given here except the authority of the great masters to whom one must look in practice. Scarcely any of them would have used the seventh resolving to an octave in the following way:

Example 410. Table V, Fig. 13.

Perhaps we could say that the seventh resolved in this way may not be tolerated because it moves into the octave, a perfect consonance that does not provide much euphony. But in the work of these masters, one frequently finds the second, the inversion of the seventh, resolved to a unison from which a dissonance gains even less euphony since the unison is the most perfect consonance. I believe that in this matter we must take our cue from the practice of the great masters. Here is an example of the inverted seventh (the second):
Example 411. Table V, Fig. 14.

To call upon the practice of the masters in free composition as the arbiter of problems in strict counterpoint is, as I have said repeatedly, a grievous mistake. But it is all the more surprising that Fux in one of his lessons uses the authentic syncopation $7\rightarrow 8$ in the lower counterpoint, obviously in order to avoid doing violence to the beautiful line.

Albrechtsberger, probably unconsciously, comes closer to the truth than Fux by saying:

[351] That he (Fux)** prohibits the resolution of the seventh to an octave in the lower counterpoint is, to be sure, a reasonable prohibition for a two-part composition. But that it has frequently been used by other famous composers as a suspension of the perfect accord in compositions of many parts is not hard to understand; for example:

Example 412.

With that, Albrechtsberger expresses his misgiving that, obviously, the two-part texture alone might be the basis for this prohibition, but without being able to be more precise in his thoughts.

Although Fux and Albrechtsberger permit the use of the $7\rightarrow 8$ syncopation in the lower counterpoint in free

---

*Table VI, Tab. 1--see Lesson 4 below.

**On the same page.
composition, Bellermann makes the most grievous mistake that can be made by a theorist by also extending the prohibition to free composition (p. 216):

The inversion of the ninth (that is, a seventh prepared in the lower voice) whose resolution should be to an octave is, because of its "raw sound," totally forbidden not only in a cappella music but also in properly regulated multi-linear music:

Example 413.

Likewise, the relationship of the seventh described here must not take place between two middle voices, although this sort of thing can be found now and again in works of the best masters when faster note values are used. See measure 16 in the four-voice motet "Dies sanctificatus" by Palestrina.++ Such random exceptions should not in the least influence the stricter standard.

What an alarming misuse of theory. It is all the more reprehensible because the author's sensitivity has not been sufficient to discover that the effect of the forbidden syncopation in free composition is good and beautiful. Thus his opinion is a step backwards with regard to the undeniable facts of the living tones, which already have their proof in the beautiful effect attained. I fear that Bellermann talks himself into conceiving the "raw sound" in order to justify the prohibition.

++No. 1 in the first book of four-voice motets.

---

*Even if they were unable to explain the reason for the permissibility in free composition and the prohibition in strict counterpoint.
§ 8. The Need to Limit the Use of the \( 2\text{-}1 \) and \( 9\text{-}8 \) Syncopations in the Upper Counterpoint.

In strict counterpoint it is better to limit the use of the \( 2\text{-}1 \) and \( 9\text{-}8 \) syncopations for the following reasons:

First, in strict counterpoint the resolution leads to the less useful perfect consonances: 1 and 8.

Second, because of this factor, greater foresight is required in the voice leading,\(^+\) which, after all, represents a noticeably inconvenient procedure in the practical usage of lessons.

But now it is important to affirm that precisely in these syncopations, even though they are used only in moderation, a significant law finds its origin: the law of the identity of the resolution tone. Since the unison and the octave are identical to the tone of the cantus firmus, these syncopations, in essence, lead back again (to be sure, by way of a dissonance) to the tone of the cantus firmus. Later, in Sections III and IV, I shall discuss the disadvantages this fact entails in more difficult circumstances.

Nevertheless, disregarding the limitation of their use in strict counterpoint, we are obliged to differentiate these two syncopations as being entirely distinct. In strict counterpoint a \( 2\text{-}1 \) syncopation must not be regarded as merely a \( 9\text{-}8 \) set an octave lower. The voice leading in the lesson is responsible for the distinction: the intervals \( 2\text{-}1 \) and \( 9\text{-}8 \) must be taken literally as they are shown to us by the voice leading:

Later we shall see that most theorists tend to conceive the \( 2\text{-}1 \) as included within the \( 9\text{-}8 \), that is, they tend always to deny the independence of a \( 2\text{-}1 \) syncopation.

\(^+\)Cf., § 15 below.
It seems to me that the reason for this divergence of opinion rests in the fact that the theorists, in their introductions, promise to base their lessons in strict counterpoint on a purely vocal point of view and, accordingly, prescribe a proper distance between the voices; but, then, they give up their original, quite correctly conceived intent in order to identify strict writing with free composition. Under the suggestion of the latter, they use in their lessons distances that are no longer vocal; distances that can only be understood as instrumental. If, for example, we go beyond the tenth and excuse ourselves by suggesting to the student (and ourselves) that larger intervals, such as 11, 12, 13, and 14 are actually smaller than they appear to be (therefore only 4, 5, 6, and 7 set an octave higher), or, to put it another way, if we take the distance between the two voices figuratively and not realistically, then a theoretical vacillation must certainly arise regarding the two syncopations 9--8 and 2--1. We must ask ourselves, is 9--8 really 9--8, or is it only 2--1, and inversely, is 2--1 something other than 2--1? The fact that, in the face of this dilemma, misinformed teachers prefer to accept the proposition of a unified 9--8 syncopation while sacrificing 2--1, can be traced to two causes. The first cause stems from the fact that in strict counterpoint, they consider the octave to be a more usable consonance than the unison. If this single notion which belongs to strict counterpoint cannot be denied, we must reject even more energetically the second point, which is unjustifiably drawn from free composition. The conception of the triads, i.e., those confronting us all of the time in the name of scale-degrees in free composition, leads us naturally to accept the octave as a further reinforcement of the unison. That is to say, we reflect when we

^Particularly in three and four-part composition where it brings about better harmony than the unison.
are in the midst of free composition, and expect the harmony, for example C-E-G, to appear as in Example 414a rather than as in 414b:

Example 414:

For our inclination, the octave is, even in this case, the better interval because of its quality proven in the overtone series. But that does not give us the right to carry this feeling into strict counterpoint where voice leading alone is the deciding factor—not scale-degrees or other reinforcement tendencies. Thus, it is only in the given case—that is to say, when the voice leading is conducted in such a way that we must use 2--1, and when, according to the principles of strict counterpoint alone, there is no question that here the unison is inferior to the octave and therefore the syncopation whose resolution leads to it is also inferior—it is only from this that we will be able to extract the consequence of a distinction between "better" and "poorer" in the purely contrapuntal sense. And yet we will not be able to negate, for that reason alone, the "poorer" syncopation in its contrapuntal independence. In other words, anyone who adheres as strictly [355] as possible to a strict vocal distance between the voices in the lessons and consequently usually regards this an immutable reality, must consider the 9--8 syncopation as having a value materially different from the 2--1, despite the fact that, in light of the reasons given, he should prefer the first syncopation to the latter and will find it advisable to limit the use of both syncopations as much as possible.

Since free composition does not reject the principles of voice leading (in spite of the scale-degrees), we must
maintain here that 2--1 and 9--8 clearly represent different values depending on whether or not they function as suspensions to the root-tone or to the octave; for example:


The 2--1 (at *) is not at all impaired by the continuing movement of the lower voice** during the resolution of the syncopation.

From Fux's discussion of the 7--8 syncopation (quoted above in § 7), we can at least understand that he seems to recognize 2--1 as a unique syncopation, not one to be lumped together with the 9--8.

Albrechtsberger, however, emphatically denies the independence of the 2--1 syncopation in the upper counterpoint, permitting it to be merged with the 9--8 syncopation. [356] Thus, on page 57 he writes: "Seconds always resolve downward by half or whole step to a third when they are in the lower counterpoint." From this we conclude that he does not recognize the syncopation of a second in the upper voice. In addition, on page 58 we find the following figuration:

Example 416.

+Again only in the sense of a pure voice leading!

++Cf. Section VI.
Thus, one figuration is given for a \( 9--8 \) and \( 2--1 \) with a N.B. entry that becomes clear to us only when we read his explanation on page 161:

\[
\ldots (\text{*97}) \text{ in the lower voice the second [resolves]}
\]

to a third and in the upper voice to a unison. The latter figuration is always faulty in compositions for three or more voices, for example:

Example 417.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{"instead" 9 8 } \\
\text{4 3}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
9 8 \text{ or: 9 8 "badly figured" } \\
4 3 \text{ 4 3}
\end{array}
\]

I repeat this point about the second which I have touched upon with a N.B. in two-part, fourth-species counterpoint,\(^+\) so that future composers will not be tempted by false figuration. They must remember that the ligature of the second can never be notated when an upper voice is the delayed voice and makes the tie, but only when the bass delays and is tied. Being placed a half or whole step below, it resolves downward \([357]\) to a minor or major third. The ninth is literally the same as the elevated second, but it is not the same in its accompaniment and resolution.\(^++\)

\(^+\)With regard to dissonant ligatures in the upper voice.

\(^++\)Cf. also, p. 104 ff.
In a similar vein, we read in Bellermann (who this time ignores Fux's clue): "Accordingly, the ninth is a second which resolves into an octave or unison depending on the distance of the parts. . . " (*) 98 And when he remarks right after that: "The ninth has not been used as frequently as other dissonant relationships; in two-part composition we should avoid it totally," then we can hardly accept such a reference to practice as sufficient justification for his opinion concerning the alleged identity of 2--1 and 9--8.

§ 9. The Need to Limit the Use of the 4--5 Syncopation in the Upper Counterpoint.

As in the case of the paired syncopations discussed above, 4--5 in the lower counterpoint has only a modest value; for, if the passing figure 3-4-5 is the basis for this syncopation whereby the third is, unfortunately, the under-third, then it is easy to realize that our instinct always prefers instead the syncopation of the fourth in the upper counterpoint because it originates from a more favorably endowed passing figure: 5-4-3. If we consider also that in the 4--5 syncopation the interval of resolution is simply a fifth, an interval that always entails inconvenience for the voice leading, then we must place a lesser value on this syncopation as one that is technically risky for composition. Therefore, it is a good idea to limit the use of this syncopation.

Concerning the augmented fourth, see § 5 above.

Fux uses 4--5 quite frequently. One can only conclude from this that he had no scruple whatsoever against using it.

Albrechtsberger, in contrast, expresses the following thought without further proof (p. 59): "These tied fourths of the lower counterpoint are not genuine fourth-ligatures but merely accompaniments to the second-ligatures which must be added in compositions of three or more parts." This statement alone tells us that he places little value on these syncopations.

See p. 173; cf., in addition, p. 215.
With respect to an augmented fourth that he included in a lesson, he remarks (p. 63): "The second N.B., below at f to b, excuses the otherwise faulty mi-contra-fa because in the following measure it leads to A minor, rather than C major. In addition to these, many other exceptions are also justified by the strictness and the constraints of this species."++

Bellermann also expresses the opinion that \( ^4--3 \) is more frequently used than \( ^4--5 \) in the lower counterpoint (p. 172 f). If the fourth happens to be augmented, then it is not permitted, at least as a syncopation in the lower counterpoint in two-part composition. Concerning the augmented fourth in the upper counterpoint, see the citation in §10.

§10. The Resulting Formulas.

Accordingly, we can now conclude that in the upper counterpoint preference should be given to \( ^7--6 \) and \( ^4--3 \); in the lower counterpoint only \( ^2--3 \) should be used.

The altogether positive character of the syncopations named here can be explained quite simply by the fact that the intervals of resolution are 3 and 6--intervals that are always welcome in composition for they usually create no voice-leading problems.

The \( ^2--3 \) syncopation has the added feature of being the inversion of the \( ^7--6 \), which is the original one (since it comes from the passing figure 8-7-6). Thus it shares with the \( ^7--6 \) its particularly high value. This is also the reason that the \( ^2--3 \) syncopation in the lower counterpoint seems so much more plausible than the \( ^2--1 \) in the upper counterpoint.

See Lesson 6, measure 10.

Cf. also the example on page 105 with the text on page 106 that is quoted in Section III, Chapter 4, §10.
I mentioned earlier that it contradicts the essence and history of the rule under discussion when its bases are sought only in free composition.+

Furthermore, free composition in most cases exhibits prolongations of the prototype. But how will we grasp this in its essentials, let alone systematize it, before we come to a clear understanding, through the prototype itself, of what can only appear in strict counterpoint? With the following modest summary I will attempt to explain to the novice the enormous world of variety present in syncopation forms. We must begin with exactly that prototype which I have established in the previous series of paragraphs. It goes without saying, however, that in regard to most of the categories, a more detailed explanation and description will have to be reserved for the next sections.

1. First of all, I want to cite the upward resolution of the dissonant syncopations which have already been mentioned frequently in § 5.++ The scale-degrees in free composition not only permit us to use ascending passing figures, but require us to do so. Contrary to strict counterpoint, free composition accepts in the upper counterpoint the syncopations 7, 4, 2, 9, and in the lower counterpoint: 2, 4, 7, all of which may also resolve upward. Yet, in relation to the prototype of the dissonant syncopation in strict counterpoint, none of them represents an "exception" (as it is unfortunately taught in manuals and textbooks and in the oral tradition); they merely represent new solutions to new situations that are foreign to strict counterpoint. On the other hand, we must take care not to conceive them as coordinated from the outset

+Unfortunately, Riemann, for example, does precisely that. At a suitable occasion I shall dispute his theories which are so contradictory to the art.

++Cf. Examples 395-397, and page 345.
with the descending resolution, as, for example, Riemann does. The situations have a mutual ranking, and no one can deny that the situations intentionally constructed for instructional purposes in a syncopation lesson of strict counterpoint are certainly more primitive than those of free composition. Psychologically, the descending resolution in strict counterpoint must be granted the precedence of a prototype in the face of the ascending resolution in free composition! I wish that teachers would quit talking about "rules" and "exceptions" or at least recognize both phenomena as two branches growing from the same tree—the passing motion!—one of which is younger than the other.

2. In free composition, if the harmony of the triads or seventh-chords is understood to include their inversions, i.e.: \( \frac{6}{3}, \frac{4}{5} \), or else \( \frac{6}{3}, \frac{4}{5} \), or \( \frac{4}{2} \), then it is self-evident that the material content of the dissonant syncopation is better understood as a suspension to a \( \frac{6}{3}, \frac{4}{5}, \frac{6}{3} \), or \( \frac{4}{2} \) chord. If we add to this the possibilities of the ascending resolution and chromatic motion, we acquire new intervals useful for preparations which have not been permitted in strict counterpoint, for example, \( \frac{4}{5} \) before \( \frac{6}{7} \), etc. There will be more discussion of this in the later sections.

In order to survey the varieties of dissonant syncopations more effectively, it is advisable to conceptualize the prototype as comprising three elements. The first constitutes the tone on the upbeat, which serves as the preparation for the suspension; the second represents the same tone at the moment when it is continued (tied over) on the downbeat; the third element constitutes the resolution on the weak part of the measure. The spirit of variety enters into these elements in order to change them in this way or that, individually or collectively.

---

+Cf. Harmonielehre, §§ 98 and 106.
3. I shall begin with "time" as the basis for variety. Because free composition has relinquished the rhythmical rigor of the cantus firmus, it is possible to use other, diverse time values arbitrarily in the place of the half-note prototype: $d\underline{\ddot{j}}\underline{\ddot{d}}$. As usual, only those values will be adopted that can be felt as artistically correct and--what is particularly important in free composition--that can be properly explained when we are artistically conscious of their respective derivations from the original norm of equal half notes.

4. Another basis for variety, which, like "time," can transform the syncopation, is the harmonic character within the individual elements. The application of this new basis for variety to the individual elements leads us to the following results:

a) In contrast to strict counterpoint where the preparation absolutely must be consonant, in free composition it may assume a dissonant character. One such dissonance usually stems from the passing tone which derives its necessity and justification from the scale-degree, if, indeed, it is not based on an ellipsis. Here also belong those cases that Em. Bach speaks of as "pushing [rückende] notes" which he clarifies in the following manner (§ 1):

"Through syncopations [pushings] chordal tones are either anticipated or retarded." Here are a few of his examples:

---

*The next chapter will present a detailed discussion of this.

++Cf. above, Example 389; Harmonielehre, Example 249, meas. 1-2, Example 251, meas. 9-10.

+++See point number 5 below.

++++Lehre vom Accompagnement, Chapter XXVI. (*99)
b) In free composition, the tone on the downbeat may be consonant in a sense totally different from that in the case of the consonant syncopation in strict counterpoint. Since the former, in contrast to the latter, recognizes clearly definable suspensions to the seventh-chord, it offers, under certain circumstances, also an octave as a suspension before the seventh, or, as the basis of the ascending resolution, a sixth before the seventh, etc. With regard to this, another example from Em. Bach's work should be cited here:

Example 419. Chapter XXV, § 8.

We must also mention the phenomenon of the sixth suspended before the fifth of the triad in the double suspension of free composition. However, in a case such as this, 

+See point number 2 above.

++See Example 418.
we must not speak of a sixth "turned dissonant"+ or of an "apparent consonance."

In reality, it is only the awareness and expectation of the scale-degree itself (or of the subsequent harmony) which so emphatically delimits the suspension type in question. But just because we conceive in $\frac{6}{4} - \frac{5}{3}$ the consonant sixth-suspension--on instruction of the presupposed harmony--as clearly as the dissonant fourth-suspension and at the same time experience both suspensions, as such, more clearly than is possible in strict counterpoint, we have no right to deduce the shocking, theoretical consequence that we should accept the consonant sixth as a dissonance merely for the sake of the enhanced meaning that is natural in free composition! [363] If we were to do so, would we not be obliged to include all possible consonances and instantly label them as dissonances whenever they are called upon to function as suspensions, as in the following example?

Example 420. Haydn, Sonata in A-flat major.

\[\text{Example 420. Haydn, Sonata in A-flat major.}\]

\[\text{See page 173 above.}\]

\[\text{**According to Riemann.}\]
Therefore, in regard to the suspended sixth, I believe we must always be satisfied just with the perception of a suspension whose consonant character, as such, is left undisturbed. Otherwise, we will find ourselves on the precipitous path of Riemann's theories. Through misunderstanding and exaggeration of a basic idea that is correct in itself (i.e., that "in general, dissonance is the disturbance of the unity of the clang-sense by foreign elements"), he unfortunately ends up with a total misconception and falsification of sonorous values that the artist always considers independent and consonant, and he simply declares them to be dissonant. For example, he writes: "Only in its relationship to another, that is, in its logical context, is a chord understood to be consonant or dissonant. We should understand that it may be possible or even necessary [364] to interpret a major or minor chord as a dissonance." He also writes: "If a harmony receives its full aesthetic value only through its relationship to a tonic, that is, if the distinctions of plain-fourth and contra-fourth clang are not empty names, but brief formulas for certain functions of the harmonies in the musical complex, then any clang that is not a tonic itself is heard only in relation to the clang that is tonic. Strictly speaking, only the tonic chord itself is an absolute consonance." But where, I ask, must it lead us if we declare each "relationship," as such (that is, as long as there really is a relationship), the sufficient cause for bringing about dissonance? Logically speaking, would we not have to declare the fifth of the root-tone to be a dissonance because of the unquestionable "relationship" sufficiently demonstrated by the overtone series? And finally, is it not the case that a "relationship" is nothing more than a mental

---

++Ibid., p. 139.
+++Ibid., p. 140.
formulation (like "time" and "space") and in no way, therefore, an objective reality? How, then, is a "mental formulation" supposed to exert enough power over the natural occurrence of consonance to transform its innermost essence? Let me warn most emphatically against yielding to the rigid idea of the "relationship" (as we find it in Riemann) and against hearing dissonant chords where only consonant ones prevail—chords which, like everything else, also sustain their "relationships."

c) Finally, a dissonance may appear even on the up-beat, where the consonant resolution of the dissonant syncopation should appear. How this phenomenon usually relates to an ellipsis will be shown under point 5, below.

If we add to the varieties just mentioned in a), b), and c), the freedom of ascending resolution, chromatic movement, modulation in general, etc., then the number of hybrid [365] combinations are innumerable. An example will illustrate this fact. Instead of this:

Example 421. Brahms, Symphony I, "Introduction."

Brahms writes the following syncopated passage:
We observe that $c^2$, the root of the I-degree itself, functions as a suspension to $c^2 \sharp$ (last eighth-note of the first measure), which, as the root of the $\#1$-degree, introduces a chromatic step. In turn, this chromatic step serves as a suspension to the following root of the II-degree, $\underline{d}^2$, indeed, as a consonant $\sim 5--6$ suspension. The next suspension (first quarter-note of the third measure) sounds $\overline{3} \sim 4--5$; this is followed by $5 \overline{6}^\flat --6 \overline{\flat}^3$, $6 \overline{7}--8$, etc., that is to say, by syncopations with ascending resolutions and chromatic movements.+

5. The syncopation is subject to further changes by means of elision:

a) The preparation may be elided and the dissonance placed unprepared on the strong part of the measure. In this way, dissonant accordes are formed for which, under certain circumstances, an implied preparation may be assumed during the previous harmony.++ In other cases however, what seems to be a freely occurring dissonance can only be interpreted

---

+Cf. point 2, above.
++Cf. Harmonielehre, Example 351.
as a clearly fixed middle element of a latent passing figure. In the latter case, the harmony itself determines and supplies the consonance that initiates the passing figure. In this way we obtain the so-called free suspensions, and perhaps we can also explain most properly the ultimate origin of seventh-chords by means of the elision of a preparation or of a consonance introducing the passing figure.

When Brahms writes this in his Symphony IV, last movement:

Example 423.

we see one root after another supplied with its seventh-chord (E, F#, G, A), for which we may assume not only an implied preparation but also a passing figure whose consonant opening interval has been elided. (To be sure, the resolutions proceed quite regularly.)

b) In free composition the resolution may be intertwined with another independent act in such a way that it is prevented from appearing as distinctly as it does in strict counterpoint.

If, in such a case, another voice progresses at the same time, the consonant character of the resolution can be preserved. The details of this will be presented in the

---

+Cf. Example 399, above.

++ Cf. Harmonielehre, § 99.

+++ Cf. Example 415, above.
section about Combinations.

Or: the resolution may be apparently deprived of its consonant character because it is allowed to proceed abruptly to a second dissonance. In the latter case, we often speak of a "preparation of dissonance by dissonance," although, in reality, the act of consonant resolution of the first is implicit in the second dissonance even though the rhythm of the prototype becomes confused thereby, and at the same time (for the sake of explanation) a reduction of a multi-linear composition to a basic three-part texture takes place. Thus, we find behind the chain of seventh-chords in Example 296 of Harmonielehre (*100) (measures 2-3) the following, basic voice leading (parentheses mark the elided resolutions):

Example 424.

Moreover, the scale-degrees available to free composition clarify the elision of the consonant resolution even in cases where we seemingly should not speak of such a preparation. When Beethoven writes this:
we must imagine implicitly the II-degree\(^+\) after the VI\(^7\)--observe the chromatic alteration of the third:\(--\)++ which must be interpreted both as bearer of the consonant reso-
lution (G to F) and as the preparation of the next seventh
(V\(^7\)).+++ 

6. The eliding of the preparation or resolution of a dissonant syncopation on the strong part of a measure or the changing of the harmonic character in each of the elements of the syncopation are possibilities that quite logically lead to reducing the prototype to a linkage of weak and strong divisions and, therefore, to a bare rhythmical form similar to that of the consonant syncopation in strict counterpoint. +++

This reduction to a bare rhythmical core may now be regarded--to the extent that a system can be brought into such a com-
plexity--as the final transformation of the prototype.

\(^{+}\text{Cf. Harmonielehre, }\S\ 127.\)

\(^{++}\text{Cf. Harmonielehre, }\S\ 139.\)

\(^{+++}\text{Cf. above, Examples 35-38 and the explanation, particularly page 75:}\)

\(^{++++}\text{Cf. Example 391, above.}\)
Here, I would include, for example:


Without doubt, the bare rhythmical effect of the syncopation form stands in the foreground and, if you will, with it also the effect of the anticipation, which, in the last analysis, is derived from the passing motion F-G♭, that is, the "pushing notes" of Em. Bach. As for the scale-degrees in this example, their progression is I-V-I, unless we ultimately choose to disregard the A♭ (the fifth of the I-degree) in order to arrive at this:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{I-II-V-I} \\
\text{[measures]} & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4
\end{array}
\]

Then the A♭ can be considered an organ point.

The following example is even more revealing:

---

*See the third quarter of the first measure (G♭).  
**See page 361.  
***See meas. one, in the left hand.

In measures 6 and 8, we find genuine syncopations that are prepared by a consonance and resolved downward. In contrast, the rest of the syncopations exhibit a modification of the prototype which we can understand only by paying attention to the degree-progression. For if it is basically the case that each third quarter must be related both to the harmony and to the downbeat (see the dotted lines), then the prototype is seemingly preserved, at least in the sense that, on the upbeat, the resolution tone also completes the harmony appropriate to the cantus firmus. But with even more justification, we can relate these syncopations to those resting purely on a rhythmical foundation if we bear in mind that only the roots of the seventh-chords \( (B^b-E^b-A^b-D^b-G^b) \) are syncopated.

\[ + \text{Measure 6: } \begin{array}{c} 7 \rightarrow 6 \text{ to the bass note } A^b \ 6 , \ or \ 4 \rightarrow 3 \\
\text{to the scale-degree } B^b \end{array} \]

Measure 8: \( \begin{array}{c} 4 \rightarrow 3 \text{ to the bass note } G^b \end{array} \)
pated here, not the real dissonances, which, according to the rule, should have been syncopated instead.++

However, in places where the syncopation reveals only its rhythmical core, it is not always strictly necessary to express the tying of a weak to a strong division by means of a written arc. On the contrary, the context itself makes up for the deficiency. Thus, Haydn writes:

[371]
Example 428. Haydn, Andante con Variazioni.

\[
\text{Example 429.}
\]

\[
\text{Example 429.}
\]

in order to express the following melody:

Example 429.

*See the left hand, the sevenths of the seventh-chords: \(\text{Ab-Db-Gb-Cb}\).

++Concerning this type of succession but with the dissonances, see page 367, Example 424.
Now, the restoration of the writing style through tyings shows us that the rhythmical disposition of the tones is actually quite different:

Furthermore, the following example demonstrates that there can even be rests (quite unlike genuine pauses) which actually convey the effect of ligatures:


[372] Measured by the scale-degrees, the initial sixteenth-note chords of the respective triple groups in the bass represent syncopations that sometimes resolve upward, sometimes downward. Thus, we have to realize that, even in the rests, the preceding tone of the melody must be conceived as continuing to sound, or, to express, it differently, as linked by syncopation. This is very clearly demonstrated in those places where the melody repeats the preceding tone even after
a rest, as for example, at the $b_1$ and the $e_{b2}$. Despite the rests that are written, the performer must pay particular attention to the task of expressing the hidden meaning of the syncopations.

As far as rhythm alone is concerned, it is necessary to observe that, in duple or quadruple time, figures such as $\frac{3}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$ must be considered syncopations. However, in triple time, the tying of the second and third quarters, for example $\frac{1}{4}$, must not be considered a syncopation because, in contrast to the first quarter, the latter two together represent the weak part of the measure. This example offers genuine syncopation:

Example 431. Haydn, String Quartet in D major (Payne, No. 155).

By contrast, the tying of the second and third quarters ($\frac{1}{4}$) does not represent syncopation:
Example 432. Haydn, String Quartet in D major, "Minuet alla Zingarese" (Payne No. 93).

[374] In addition, compare the rhythm maintained with inimitable virtuosity: \( \frac{6}{8} \) in Schubert's "Des Fischers Liebesglück" which does not represent syncopation. Concerning "hemiola" (for example in \( \frac{3}{2} \)) see the dictionaries of Koch-Dommer, or Riemann.

When at last we summarize the results, the dissonant syncopation in strict counterpoint represents the prototype of all possible forms of dissonance in free composition that occur on the strong part of the measure, and many other derived phenomena as well. If the prototype, conforming to the milieu of the cantus firmus, is permitted at first to appear only bound by the strictest provisions, free composition does not contradict it for all that, when, for stronger reasons, it softens the provisions and, if need be, retains just the essence of this phenomenon.\(^{14}\)

\(^{14}\) By the way, this is precisely the meaning of Brahms's technical suggestion passed on by Henschell: "Please! Don't use strong dissonances on the unaccented parts of the
How the accented passing tone differs from the dissonant syncopation can be easily seen in Examples 243 and 332. Since the accented passing tone has the dissonance set on the downbeat, its similarity to the dissonant syncopation is clearly evident. On the other hand, since the accented passing tone has different consonances before and after the dissonance, and there is no tie, it more closely resembles the simple passing dissonance.

Cherubini goes too far when he decrees, without a supporting argument (p. 24, Rule 4):

[375] In two-part counterpoint of the present species, we must avoid the fourth and ninth as much as possible. We must prefer the seventh when the counterpoint is in the upper voice—the second, when the counterpoint is in the lower voice.

To be sure, that is correct; but, for purely artistic reasons, closer attention should be paid to a problem that is probably one of the most difficult and important in our art.

Bellermann's remark about the $4-3$ in the upper counterpoint is appropos (p. 130):

The tritone and its inversion, the diminished fifth, have rarely been used as effective dissonances on the upbeat by the older composers. Its application, according to the rules (two-part counterpoint, fourth species), would be:

a) In two-part counterpoint:

Example 433.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\underline{\text{measure}}.\text{ That is poor. I, myself, have a penchant for dissonance, but on the accented, strong parts of the measure, and then I resolve them gently and gradually.} \end{array} \]
b) in a multi-linear texture, that is, with accompanying voices:

Example 434.

![Example 434](image)

In the strict ecclesiastical masterworks of the sixteenth century, this type is rarely found.

For the sake of comparison, see what was said on page 337.

BEGINNING


As in lessons of second species, we may also use a half rest in the first measure in fourth species. However, the upbeat must be consonant because of the syncopation.

Two exercises by Fux will enable us to illustrate the useful extensions this basic rule can undergo when the same problem comes up in three-part composition.

[MIDDLE]

§ 12. The Dissonant Syncopations Are Preferable to the Consonant Syncopations.

In general, dissonant syncopations are to be given preference to the consonant ones.

The reason for this is not so much the specific attraction of the dissonant ligature but rather its special technical value for the voice leading of the counterpoint,
which, through its more frequent and skillful application can only gain in flowing and smooth character. *+

In this way the student is offered the opportunity to become acquainted with a new source of significant effects for the voice leading.

Since, without doubt, the inevitability of the tie makes the voice leading more difficult, we must make it our business to keep the beautiful line of the counterpoint in mind.

If we wish to unravel the secret meaning of the unfolding history of our art, then we are advised to see precisely in the dissonant syncopation, a technical means of pure musical causality. One so well suited for the composition of the vocal epoch could hardly be found again. During the instinctive search for technical means that could enable the composer to extend the length of a composition ** and in the midst of a voice-leading practice, which, apart from its own laws, did not otherwise manifest any higher necessity, a most welcome means was offered the artistic sense in the obligation of the preparation and resolution of a dissonance—a means capable of stimulating, at least from harmony to harmony, a type of musical causality and necessity. Similarly, [377] because we found in the simplest passing figure an embryo of such an obligation for progression—let us always remember the problem of extending the length when we explore the essence and history of our art—it is clear that the

*Just as with the use of the passing dissonance in second species; cf. Section II, Chapter 2, § 8.

**Concerning this see the remarks in Harmonielehre, p. 209ff.
obligation of the dissonant syncopation must be perceived as an incomparably stronger and more powerful effect!

The dissonant syncopation naturally retains this effect of musical causality in instrumental music also. In instrumental music, indeed, even in the most advanced kind, the harmonies appear to be all the more intimately and seemingly inevitably linked the more drastically and peculiarly a tone of one harmony hooks into the body of the following tone, so to speak. The scale-degrees and the form attend to the higher necessities of composition and to the length. If we consider that the artist was in a position to receive only the major triad from nature's hand, then we must be astonished by the creative ability of those who were able to erect on this modest base such a proud structure of musical art and to impart to it such strong, lofty necessities. In these special necessities, music possesses "logic" no less than speech or the other arts! Therefore, we have good reason to elevate musical art to the highest place among the arts, a fact that testifies proudly to the independence of human creation:

A remark of Fux is appropriate here (p. 83):

[Alloys.] Since music obtains much charm through the use of ligatures, I exhort you not only to set the three remaining cantus firmi in this way, but also others in this species in order to gain as much experience as you can. One can never be industrious enough in matters like this.

And on page 136 he writes:

+And what comes from them: tonality, chromaticism, modulation, etc:

++Cf. Harmonielehre, § 8 ff.
Moreover, you should assiduously distribute ligatures among the voices because the charm imparted to the melody by this means is remarkable. In addition, this causes almost every note that has a special affect to be intelligible to the ear. This comment applies not only to this type of composition but to all other types as well.

With regard to three-part composition in the same species, Albrechtsberger writes (p. 103): "On downbeats, the remaining measures may have a consonant or dissonant ligature (the latter being better if it is used frequently)." In addition, he does not neglect to demand (p. 62): "Good melody writing must be observed here also."

With Cherubini the wind blows from a different direction (p. 23, Ex. 72): "If we do not use dissonances, we run the danger of writing octave and fifth successions." We shall soon see what is wrong with this rule. At any rate, it adds a technical reason for valuing the dissonant syncopation higher than the consonant in strict counterpoint.


As in all lessons in strict counterpoint, here [in fourth species] the imperfect consonances have a better effect than the perfect consonances.

As I already stated, it is for this reason that the ~2--1, ~9--8, and ~4--5 syncopations are for the most part neglected in contrast to the ~7--6, ~4--3, and ~2--3.

§ 14. The Use of the Unison on the Downbeat.

Due to the advantage of oblique motion, which now for the first time the ligature makes possible on the downbeat in strict counterpoint, the unison may be used on the downbeat. As we know, this was not permitted in either second or third species.

---

+Cf. § 15, below.

++Cf. § 10, above.
That the unison may appear on the upbeat, however, is self-evident (indeed, for the same reason).

Cf. Albrechtsberger, page 58.

Bellermann adds this (p. 175): "To set it [the unison] several times in succession (on the arsis as well as the thesis) is forbidden according to the rules about the use of perfect consonances." As we shall soon see, the unison (a perfect consonance) requires the same caution as the rest of the perfect consonances.

§ 15. Parallel and Nonparallel Direct Successions in This Species.

Of the three relationships that we had to distinguish regarding this problem in second species, only two remain to be discussed in the present species since the one that was strongest, that from upbeat to downbeat, has been swallowed up by the ligature. Here is an illustration of possible relationships:

Bracket 2. \[\text{\_\_\_\_\_}\]
Bracket 1. \[\text{\_\_\_}\]
Counterpoint $d\quad d\quad d\quad d$
Cantus firmus $\circ\quad \circ$

1. Due to the peculiarity of the present situation, the erstwhile afterbeat successions advance to first place (bracket 1).

Moreover, it makes an essential difference whether the syncopations in these relationships are a) dissonant or b) consonant, and also whether in both instances they are used according to the strictest standards or less strictly.

\[+\text{Cf. Section II, Chapter 2, \S 11.}\]
About a). From the strictest standpoint, the dissonant syncopations that we must consider here (i.e., 8\(^9\)--8, 7\(^2\)--1 in the upper counterpoint and 5\(^4\)--5 in the lower) sanction neither parallel nor nonparallel direct successions in the relationship of upbeat to upbeat (bracket 1). Therefore, we must not write:

Example 435.

![Example 435 image]

This prohibition originates from the nature of the dissonant syncopation itself as well as from the necessity for its downward resolution. Entirely constrained by the latter, the dissonant syncopation appears only as a retardation of the resolution tone—the cited examples are nothing other than delayed parallel or nonparallel, direct progressions:

Example 436.

![Example 436 image]

Thus, the unpleasant result of the direct progressions hits our perception much too strongly.
Next we have to consider, as before with regard to the same progression in first species, the psychologically impeding circumstance that, at the outset, the compulsion and necessity for a downward resolution announce the danger of the forbidden, direct progressions. These must be regarded as the truly treacherous cause of the fault. Since we know that the dissonant syncopation must resolve downward, why should we knowingly seek out the fault that menaces there? Without doubt, the truth of this state of affairs is unerringly shown to us by our ears. Incidentally, from this we can understand all the more clearly why it is advisable to limit the use of $9--8$ and $4--5$.++

On the other hand, the obligation to syncopate, entailed in the lesson as such, also requires us to mollify somewhat the absolute strictness of the prohibition of dissonant, parallel syncopations, if we wish to avoid making every voice leading in the lessons impracticable. In this precarious situation, the close assessment of the perfect consonances helps, and since we must prefer the fifth over the octave in our writing, for the reasons discussed previously, we may therefore permit, under certain circumstances, $4--5$ in the lower counterpoint, whereas we may never grant an exception to $9--8$.

About b). In contrast, the consonant syncopation, in as much as it can be called a retardation of the subsequent tone on the upbeat, is freed at least from the obligation of

---

+Concerning the extent of the fault, see Section II, Chapter 1, §2 8-11.
++Cf. § 8 and § 9.
+++Known to us from Section II, Chapter 1, § 4.
++++To be sure, only in a more distant sense.
a downward resolution. Although this does not mean the total liberation of the forbidden steps, it, nevertheless, means that, even from the strictest standpoint, a certain liberality regarding parallel (not to mention nonparallel) direct successions may be advisable, as for example:

Example 437:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
6 & 5 & 8 & 5 & 8 & 8 \\
\end{array}
\]

etc.

This is especially the case since possibly no better way could be found. Perhaps it is all the more advisable since we have to deal here only with indirect successions involving afterbeats.

Let me remind the reader that in such a case, the more we attend to setting the downbeats with imperfect consonances, the more tolerable will be the parallel successions themselves. Therefore, \(6--8\rightarrow6--8\) is better than \(5--8\rightarrow5--8\).^+

According to the same principle, strictly speaking, the consonant syncopation succession in the upper counterpoint, \(6--5\rightarrow6--5\)--which entails a change of harmony—would be taken care of: for example:

Example 438.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
6 & 5 & 6 & 5 \\
\end{array}
\]

^+Cf. Section II, Chapter 2, §11, item 3; also point 2 below.

^{++}Cf. Section II, Chapter 2, §13, and Section II, Chapter 3, §8.
On the other hand, our ear, through the strong illusion of a presumably necessary descending resolution, is tricked by the step movement contained in the falling succession 6—5 so that psychologically, this syncopation is brought close to a real dissonant syncopation. Consequently, our ear is involuntarily irritated about as much by this succession as by a genuine, parallel succession of dissonant syncopations—evidently because of the descending seconds. Thus, it may be advisable here to exclude 6—5 6—5 from the liberality already granted the consonant syncopation and to place it again under the prohibition found in a). In other words: the falling succession of consonant syncopations, 6—5 6—5, occupies a middle position and we are therefore advised to include it under the prohibition of dissonant, parallel syncopations despite the fundamental lack of the need for a descending resolution. On the other hand, that illusion disappears in the ascending syncopation succession 6—5 6—5, and its relatively free application returns.

But we must not forget what was said in a) above, that, from a more liberal standpoint, the fifth once again provokes less strictness from the prohibition than the octave does.

In summing up the discussions under a) and b), let us remember that an exception can probably never be permitted with regard to a dissonant, direct succession of octaves. But, because of the lesser perfection of the fifth itself, a dispensation of the rule may permit parallel successions of fifths (ascending or descending), consonant or dissonant in origin, in the upper or lower counterpoint) provided this dispensation is not abused by the use of crass and unnecessary repetitions of the fifth successions.

2. In the relationship of downbeat to downbeat

+See under a).
(bracket 2), we may, as a matter of course, tolerate more liberality than could ever be granted in the relationships of the consonant syncopation successions described earlier. However, since the repeated placing of perfect consonances on the downbeat would cause the composition to sound entirely too empty, a natural restraint of that liberality is inevitable even in the present relationship.

The constraint of uninterrupted syncopations, required in strict counterpoint for teaching purposes, is, a priori, quite foreign to free composition. If this diminishes the dangers regarding forbidden steps which the syncopations bring with them, then add to that the explanatory power of the scale-degree that strings into a single unity a chain of suspensions even longer than those strict counterpoint can produce or demonstrate. For an example, see Harmonielehre, Example 259, (*101) where, solely on the VI-degree in B major, a chain of seven syncopations is produced: 6— 5™ 6— 5™ 6— 5™ 6— 5™ 6— 5™ 6— 5™. It is obvious that the repetition of the fifth as a sixth found there is equivalent to the tie in strict counterpoint, even though the articulation expressed by the legato slurs seems, outwardly, to express something else.

[384] The remark of J. J. Quantz is appropriate here; in it refers to the setting of cadenzas in two parts (§ 22 ff.).

In the rhythm of [14] sixteenth notes set against seven eighth notes.

In a passage in sixths where we do not wish to include any dissonances, one of the parts must take a note in advance, whether ascending or descending, so that the other note may take its direction from it:

Example 439.

Here, the lower part has the movement and indicates that the upper part should ascend (in the first measure) and then descend again.

How artfully the effect of the anticipation, as it appears here in the form of the syncopation 6--5--6--5, etc., is made to serve improvisation in two-part cadenzas, and how charming are the words with which Quantz expresses this: How our collective level has gone down since then--in spite of the artistic heroes who have come and gone! Typically today's musicians cannot even improvise preludes and modulations, or enlarge on cadences and fermatas--not even at their leisure! And which present-day teacher would be capable of explaining lucidly a technique like the just-mentioned cadenza setting and make its necessity clear to the learner?

In two-part counterpoint, Fux treats all these problems only in passing. He touches upon the principal thought by linking it to the theory described above in § 4: 81.

[Aloys.] For this reason it is not permissible to proceed either from the unison to the second or from the octave to the ninth using a ligature, as the following examples illustrate. For if the retardations are eliminated here, two unisons follow one

+Examples follow, Table V, Figure 8. (*103)
another in the first example, and two octaves follow one another in the second. However, it is permissible to proceed from the third to the second or from the tenth to the ninth:

Example 440. Table V, Fig. 10.

These passages contain no error because they sound all right when the retardations are eliminated.

This is all he saw fit to say about this in two-part counterpoint.

However, he elaborates the omitted items all the more thoroughly when he discusses fourth species, three-part texture. Note the surprisingly well-differentiated train of thought (p. 101):

[Aloys.] In order to discuss the matter more thoroughly, we must repeat what was said elsewhere about the perfection of the consonances: the fifth is a perfect consonance, the octave a more perfect one, and the unison the most perfect of all; and the more perfect the consonance, the less harmony it has. Experience teaches us that dissonances have no grace or harmonic beauty in and of themselves; anything about them that is perceived as full and satisfying is only the product of the consonances to which they are resolved. From this we can see that a dissonance that proceeds to a fifth will be more satisfying than one that resolves to an octave. Therefore, it is not surprising that great masters consider this example to be wrong:

+See Table V, Figure 9 (*104).

++Table V, Figure 11 (*105).
Example 441. Table XI, Fig. 6.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Notation} \\
\end{array} \]

but the next example to conform to the rules of counterpoint:

Example 442. Table XI, Fig. 6.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Notation} \\
\end{array} \]

Finally, a resolution will be more easily tolerated and excused the more the perfect consonance, to which the dissonance resolves, approaches the character of an imperfect consonance.

[386] From this we can deduce that he distinguishes $8-9-8$ and $5-6-5$ at the outset in order to reject the parallel $8-9-8$ succession in all circumstances. Notice that he does not mention a consonant $8-10-8$ syncopation, and yet he recommends tolerance of the $5-6-5$. Accordingly, it remains questionable whether $5-4-5$ in the lower counterpoint should be tolerated as readily as the fifth-succession in the upper counterpoint. In order to aid this principle of granting, a priori, a greater freedom to the syncopated fifth-successions than to the octave-successions, Fux uses this argument [p. 101]:

[Aloys.] In order to answer your objection, one must realize that much is forbidden in the upper register that is tolerated in the lower register. The high tones are more distinct and apparent than the low tones which are darker because of their lowness and their weaker impression on the ear—highness accentuates, and lowness subdues.

Even though this remark—as may be gleaned from the context—does not directly apply to the $5-4-5$ syncopation, it lets us conclude, nevertheless, that, because the latter appears

*See p. 382 above.*
in the low register, it must seem to be less reprehensible than 8\-9--8 in the upper counterpoint--irrespective of the more acceptable value of the fifth which remains Fux's main argument.+

And, as though this explanation were not enough, he accompanies these examples:

Example 443. Table XI, Fig. 3.

Example 444. Table XI, Fig. 4.

with such characteristic thoughts as these regarding the nature of the ligatures (cf. above, §12) [p. 100] :

[Aloys.] In addition to respecting the authority of great masters who permit the first example but reject [387] the other, you must know that my words "the ligatures change nothing" refer only to the nature of the concordance, which is identical in both examples. Who can deny that ligatures have a great effect--and the power to avoid mistakes and improve composition. How nicely the double effect of the syncopation has been expressed here in words: on the one hand, to point out only the retardation of the resolution tone, so that the suspended tone could simply be ignored and by-passed, and on the other, to express, nevertheless, a certain quietly

+Cf. above, the quote from page 101 [Fux].
transforming power because of which the syncopation adds, of itself, purpose and beauty.+

In his own lessons Fux adheres strictly to the theories mentioned above. He does not avoid parallel successions in connection with consonant syncopations, for example 8-10-8,** not even in the succession 5—4—5 which he uses frequently and without hesitation.+++ That he also offers no objection to a nonparallel succession such as 6—4—5 is easy to understand. The relationship of downbeat to downbeat is not mentioned at all by Fux, and without further ado he writes, for example:

Example 445. Table XII, Fig. 5, meas. 5-7.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{5} \\
\text{4} \\
\text{3} \\
\text{5} \\
\text{4} \\
\text{5} \\
\text{4} \\
\text{5} \
\end{array} \]

Frequently Albrechtsberger's theories appear to be different. I have recorded them here for the sake of clarity. According to Albrechtsberger:

1. In the relationship of upbeat to upbeat, the following rules are valid:

   a) \( 8—9—8 \), "in which the tied ninth is prepared by the octave, is forbidden even when it appears only once because it sounds almost like two, plain octaves."++++

---

+Let us compare to this the following, charming definition of the appoggiatura given in Em. Bach's Versuch über die wahre Art das Klavier zu spielen, II, 2, § 1: "Appoggiatures are among the most essential embellishments. They enhance harmony as well as melody. With respect to the melody, they join notes smoothly together, shortening notes which might be unpleasant because of their length while, at the same time, filling the ear with sound. With respect to harmony, they modify chords that would be too simple without them. We can trace all ties and dissonances back to these appoggiaturas. What is harmony without these elements?" (Cf. also, my Beitrag zur Ornamentik, p. 25, § 1).

++Cf. Table V., Fig. 18, or Table V, Fig. 20 (*106).

+++Cf. Table V, Fig. 19, Table VI, Fig. 1, etc. (*107).

++++See p. 61, Example no. 4 (*108).
b) Octave successions in connection with consonant syncopations are usually "good—although they seem to resemble equal octaves and fifths—especially in three and four-part compositions." We will probably learn from the above explanation that some caution is necessary in two-part writing!

c) Concerning 5\textsuperscript{4}--5 in the lower counterpoint, he writes on p. 60 f.: "When the following three kinds of ligatures\textsuperscript{4}--4--5 are used successively, they are forbidden in pieces in two or more voices, both in strict counterpoint and free composition; they sound too much like fifths." Thus one observes that while he forbids 8\textsuperscript{4}--8 without exception, he permits 5\textsuperscript{4}--5, to be sure, with the limitation of a single occurrence. He does not give any reasons for his various opinions and contradicts himself on page 61, when he presents this succession and declares it to be "good":

Example 446.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example446.png}
\end{center}

\begin{itemize}
\item[d)] In reference to parallel fifth successions in connection with consonant syncopations, he makes the following distinctions:
\begin{enumerate}
\item They are good when they ascend either by step or by a large interval (see b) above).\textsuperscript{+++}
\item When they descend, however, those that descend by step are forbidden: 5\textsuperscript{6}--5\textsuperscript{6}--5 in the upper counterpoint;\textsuperscript{++++} the others are unrestricted, as for example:
\end{enumerate}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{1}See pp. 59-60; the examples illustrate 8\textsuperscript{10}--8 in the upper part, 8\textsuperscript{3}--8 and 8\textsuperscript{6}--8 in the lower (*109). Cf., also page 103.

\textsuperscript{2}One of which is 5\textsuperscript{4}--5; for the other two see d) (2) and 2. a) below (*110).

\textsuperscript{3}Cf. the example on page 58: 5\textsuperscript{6}--5\textsuperscript{6}--5 6; or on page 60: 5\textsuperscript{3}--5\textsuperscript{3}--5, either above or below (*111).

\textsuperscript{4}Cf., c) above.
In a certain sense, Albrechtsberger's teaching is more detailed than that of Fux. It contrasts with Fux's teaching regarding points c) and d) (2). However, it lacks the oriented viewpoint and deeper insight without which the teaching of counterpoint must remain a collection of standard rules, prohibitions, and exhortations of obscure origin.

2. In the relationship of downbeat to downbeat the following rules are valid:
   a) Descending fifth successions in the lower counterpoint are forbidden according to the same limitations as $5\rightarrow 4\rightarrow 5$; for example:
   
   Example 448.
   
   b) All other possible types are permitted.++

Unfortunately, Albrechtsberger does not append any explanation to his rules.

Regarding this question, Cherubini maintains the strictest point of view, one which has almost stultified into a stupid lack of principle. On page 23, Example 70, he prohibits $5\rightarrow 4\rightarrow 5\rightarrow 4\rightarrow 5$ without any distinction and under all circumstances. Furthermore, in Example 72 he prohibits $8\rightarrow 5\rightarrow 8\rightarrow 3\rightarrow 8$ etc., and at the same place $5\rightarrow 6\rightarrow 5\rightarrow 6\rightarrow 5\rightarrow 3\rightarrow 5$ etc. However, we see him particularly at odds with himself with $5\rightarrow 6\rightarrow 5\rightarrow 6\rightarrow 5$ at the same place. Strangely enough, Cherubini does not speak at all about parallel successions in the relationship of downbeat to downbeat. From this strictness we can better understand the sentences cited in § 12

---

+Cf., 1. c) above.

++Cf. for example, page 58: $6\rightarrow 5\rightarrow 6\rightarrow 5\rightarrow 6$ ascending; page 60: $5\rightarrow 3\rightarrow 5\rightarrow 3$ descending; page 100, etc. (*)112).
where Cherubini advises more frequent application of the dissonant syncopation. Finally, I wish to state that he cites the examples written by Fux (shown above as Examples 443 and 444), and adds a brief, naive polemic that one may read on pages 36-37 (*113).

For the time being, Bellermann seems to follow the teaching of Albrechtsberger. We read on p. 175:

Since we regard the tying of the note on the arsis as a retardation of the preceding one on the thesis, it is not good practice to place the same perfect interval on the weak division several times in a row.

He, therefore, designates 8\(\text{6}\rightarrow\text{8}\rightarrow\text{8}\) as "bad," and 5\(\text{6}\rightarrow\text{5}\rightarrow\text{6}\rightarrow\text{5}\) descending as "less good." Out of this he draws a daring conclusion:

Fundamentally this accounts also for the fact that the fifths in the following phrase, with ascending motion in both voices, are not unpleasant to the ear even though they appear on the strong beats.

He allows, therefore, with the designation "good," 6\(\text{5}\rightarrow\text{6}\rightarrow\text{5}\rightarrow\text{6}\) (ascending) and revokes it immediately when he admits: "The student must not repeat such phrases too frequently; rather he must always strive for graceful variation of intervals." Should we conclude that from the outset he wishes to apply less strict principles from downbeat to downbeat, and should we assume then, in spite of his talk about fifth successions, the implicit permissibility of octave successions as well?

How we are to avoid the threatening, forbidden octave-succession appearing at \(\text{9}\rightarrow\text{8}\), he teaches only in three-part composition (p. 214):

It is necessary to observe that the ninth should be prepared with a tenth or some other interval from which the bass voice must ascend if it is to form a ninth with the voice in question on the next strong division of the measure. The voices would thus sing in contrary motion if, instead of the ninth, we chose to set the resolution immediately. The preparation by an octave is entirely unsatisfactory since it causes a very ugly-sounding hidden octave to appear:
Riemann deals with this question in his Grosse Kompositionlehre. First of all, however, he shifts his point of departure, by speaking of "ligature chains" which find their application only in free composition--instead of stating the effect of the forbidden steps in connection with the phenomenon of syncopation in strict counterpoint. A critique of this inadmissible procedure follows later.

§ 16. The Possible Interruption of the Ligatures.

Although the preservation of the syncopations is a rule that logically retains its validity for the duration of a lesson, we may, in exceptional cases, interrupt the syncopations and pass by two untied beats--which may also be represented by a half rest and half note. Specifically, we may do this if it is necessary to avoid a repetition (monotonia) or give a new stimulus to the line when its continuation becomes impossible for some reason arising from the situation.

[391] Fux explicitly points to the cause of the monotony (pp. 81-82):

+Volume II, Chapter IX, § 3 (*114).
[Joseph.] Now, I could have applied a ligature here but I intentionally omitted it in order not to produce a tasteless repetition. I had just applied the same ligatures immediately before in the third and fourth measures.

Aloysius Your remark is prudent, for we must pay heed to the melodic line and the progressions.

That he regards the elimination of the ligature merely as a concession to the needs of a difficult situation we can recognize from the following thought offered in connection with three-part composition [p. 104]:

Here, the ligatures constitute the chief purpose about which one can acquire a thorough understanding through such practice.

Albrechtsberger writes (p. 62):++

Finally, we must realize that if the continuous use of ligatures does not seem to work well, we may, out of need, use a freely struck consonance on the downbeat once or at the most two times in the counterpoint.

In addition, however, let us remember that to him (and to him alone) the use of the diminished fifth as a syncopation in the upper counterpoint produces another and quite unique resolution of the ligature:+++ Cherubini is more precise in this matter (Rule 5, p. 24):

The decree to syncopate shall be applied in each measure. If, however, this rule makes it too difficult to maintain the melody in the middle register because the syncopation would carry it too high or low, or it would cause similar phrases to come too close to one another,++++ or because the phrases would become confused, then one should avoid syncopation for one or at the most two measures. However, one should take advantage of this expedient only when there is no other possibility.

For Böllermann's thought, see page 175 f.

---

+Cf. quote in § 12.
++Cf. also, page 103.
+++See § 5 above.
++++See Fux's statement above.
§ 17. The Prohibition of Tone Repetition.

We must explicitly mention that here, as in second and third species, tone repetition is totally forbidden.

§ 18. The Closing Formulas.

Without exception, one must use ~7--6|8 in the upper counterpoint and ~2--3|1 in the lower counterpoint. This automatically ensues from the necessity of the two leading tones:

Example 450.

A different cadence formula—one in a Beethoven lesson (Nottebohm, p. 50):

Example 451.

is criticized by Albrechtsberger with the remark: "N.B., not often," and he places the correction ("better") with ~2--3|1 close by.*

Still, we have to realize that if the cantus firmus has the following close:

*Cf., the same case on p. 52 in Nottebohm, and on pp. 105-6 in Albrechtsberger's treatise.
Example 452.

![Example 452](image)

the cadence formula $2--3|1$ is not at all possible. Would we not be better off, since we are not allowed to ignore the leading tone $B$, to set:

Example 453.

![Example 453](image)

instead of this?

Example 454.

![Example 454](image)


Let me emphasize the fact that the instruction about the syncopations presented here deals with the same subject that is taught in ordinary harmony textbooks—in chapters concerned with the preparation of the seventh and the other dissonances and with their resolutions. I hope that the treatment given here to this problem will make it abundantly clear that the syncopation should have its actual home in counterpoint instruction and not in the teaching of harmony.
Example 455.

LESSONS

Fux, Table V, Figure 16, and Table V, Figure 17.

Fux, Table V, Figure 20, and Table VI, Figure 1.
Soprano

Albrechtsberger, page 63.

or: 2 3 2 3

Alto, C.f.

Bass

[396]

Soprano

Albrechtsberger, page 74.

Tenor, C.f.
Soprano

Alto, C.F.

Tenor

Belleman, page 176.
(Cantus firmus by Fux)
Remarks Concerning These Lessons

About 1. With regard to the avoidance of the ligature in measure 5, see § 16. Bellermann, who adopts the same lesson (page 176), pays little attention to the monotony and changes it as follows:
though certainly not for the better.

Concerning the succession of two major thirds in measures 5-6, B-A, see above, Section II, Chapter 1, § 18.

About 2. This lesson (used by Bellermann also) shows basically only third-successions if the ligatures are eliminated. If, in a certain sense, that is to be called a mistake in the counterpoint, perhaps partially excused by [399] the principal need for ligatures and the difficulties resulting from them, then we must not overlook the octave, sixth, and fifth on the downbeats in measures 2, 5, and 7, which here, at any rate, improve the effect.

About 3. In measure 5 the counterpoint transgresses the boundary of a tenth. The result is that the intervals in the next measures, 6 and 7, are ambiguous: Do we take them as really 11-10 and 9-8 or only 4-3 and 2-1 (see page 353)? Concerning the parallel octaves from upbeat to upbeat in measures 9-10, see above, page 381—note that, at best, the downbeats in these measures show the intervals 5 and 10. Concerning the fifth successions on the downbeats of measures 3 and 4, see page 383. We are not dealing with dissonant syncopations in these two instances and therefore Bellermann’s precaution is excessive. He changes measures 9-10 into this (p. 177):

Example 457.

obviously in order to soften the parallel octaves, unless perhaps, he only wanted to shun the repetition of the tone a.

About 4. In measures 3-5 there are fifth-successions skipping by thirds; see above, page 381. Concerning the strange appearance of the 2-1 syncopation in measure 7,
see above, page 346, and pages 353-355. In order to avoid these syncopations, Bellermann makes the following changes (p. 177):

Example 458.

\[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
    3 & 4 & 5 & 2 & 3 \\
\end{array} \]

About 5. Concerning the ascending fifth-successions on the downbeats: 5--6<5--6<5--6 in measures 7-10, see page 383, and especially the commentary in connection with Albrechtsberger under 2. b). However, as far as the syncopation of the diminished fifth and its resolution in measures 10-11 is concerned, see § 5 (comment under Albrechtsberger).

About 6. For the N.B. on the tenth tone, which concerns the augmented fourth in the lower counterpoint, see § 5 and § 9 (quotation from Albrechtsberger).

About 7. In measures 5-7 the duplicate figuration is an original one by Albrechtsberger. Anyone, like him, who does not consider the distance between voices to be actual (cf. above, § 8), can suppose a higher octave and, as a consequence, imagine the 7--6 syncopation instead of the 2--3.

About 8. Without hesitation, Albrechtsberger uses the raised sixth and seventh tones of the minor scale in the middle of a lesson (in measures 2 and 4). This is a consequence of his manner of viewing minor. (Concerning the ascending fifth-succession from upbeat to upbeat in measures 7-10, see page 388, 1.d (1).) Unfortunately, the lesson is misleading in a certain sense because it is apparently set for instruments. Let us only try to write the counterpoint one octave higher in order to convince ourselves that we do not have to transcend the tenth. We are dealing here with an all-too-lazy way of writing.
CHAPTER 5

FIFTH SPECIES: MIXED COUNTERPOINT

GENERAL COMMENTS

§ 1. The Lesson in Fifth Species.

Fifth species represents a free mixture of all the species previously known to us. Accordingly, the lessons to be written in this species fortuitously approach free composition itself with which they already share the highest principle of "free variety."

Here, for the first time, the student has the opportunity to observe the manifestations of variety in their embryonic states to distinguish them from one another; at the same time, he is able also to gain insight into the means that will enable him to achieve a greater variety. And even though the constraint of the cantus firmus as well as the short length of, at most, fifteen measures are still prerequisites for these lessons, one will find in them, nevertheless, the first steps into variety. In this small sphere one often finds results that are exemplary in the large, and because of that one secures for himself a deeper insight into the large world of free composition.

Fux's definition is as follows (p. 83 f.):

401] [Aloys.] This species is called florid counterpoint (contrapunctum floridum) because in it all sorts of adornments, flowing movements, and variations of the melodic line should exist, as in a flower garden. . . . (*115)

Albrechtsberger writes (p. 64): . . . (*116)"because here all sorts of notes may be mixed together." And on page 109: " . . . (*117) in which one can use alternately the preceding three species and, in addition, a few fast notes faster than those in third species.
For Cherubini's comments, see page 26; for Bellermann's, see page 179.

§ 2. The Inclusion of Eighth Notes in the Exercises of This Species.

To accommodate the tendency toward mixture, the lessons of mixed counterpoint will include, for the first time, eighth notes which we must think of as representative of an assumed final species, namely an imagined species of eighth-note values.

Nevertheless, how strict counterpoint, confronted by the displacement of the quarter note, + is able to confirm that, in the lessons, the quarter note rather than the eighth will continue (in the sense of the third species) to be valid as the smallest rhythmical unity will be demonstrated in detail later. ++

For Albrechtsberger's definition, see § 1 above. To be sure, the teachers fail to explain the actual meaning of the eighth note in mixed counterpoint.

BEGINNING

§ 3. Construction of the Beginning.

As a rule, the first measure contains a half rest followed by a half note that, in most cases, forms a syncopation tied to the next measure.

Fux observes (p. 84):

+I.e., the smallest unit value accepted up to this point.

++Cf. § 10.
... (*118) and at the beginning you have mostly used oblique motion or a tie into the thesis. I should like to recommend this to you further because it brings so much grace to the counterpoint."

But Fux also writes this:*

[402] Example 459.

\[ \text{Example Diagram} \]

Albrechtsberger begins principally with a half rest—see page 66—in order then to bring about a syncopation. Note, however, a non-syncopating half note on page 69.**

MIDDLE

§ 4. The Postulate of Balance among the Individual Species Combined in Mixed Counterpoint.

It is clear that if the mixture is to preserve its character, as such, none of the species may be given undue preference over the others. Thus, a strict balance is postulated among all the species as a matter of course.

If we keep in mind a limit of, at the most, fifteen measures within which the lesson must develop its variety, then the postulated balance must be sought in relation to this number of measures. It is also clear, in view of the modest extent of the lesson, that the individual species will have to limit their egoism to a great extent.

The mixture must also promote the constancy of rhythmical movement; it must be successfully carried out in such a

*See Table VI, Fig. 7; Cf. also Table VI, Fig. 11. (*119)

**Cf. Lesson 5, below.
way that there is never a sudden stop anywhere. The upbeat and downbeat must always exhibit an "articulation" so that their rhythm is audible at all times. In this regard, no "dead spot" may be allowed to obstruct the flow of the whole in an undesirable way. This is a demand which yields, in the furthest extension, a fruitful glimpse into the forms of free composition in which one must avoid dead spots in the action (in the higher sense of the word)—a task that challenges the total artistic capabilities of the composer.

In a certain sense, we may count the caesuras with which we will soon become acquainted+ among the forbidden disturbances to the balance of the mixture. From what follows we intend to establish, species by species, the extent of the employment of each individual species within the mixture.

Only in the teaching of fugue does Albrechtsberger express the basic principle of the rhythmic presence of every part of the measure in the course of a mixture lesson (p. 199):

In concluding the rules concerning the fugue, I wish to remind the reader that in every type of measure, a struck note must appear on each beat in at least one voice, so that we do not hear lifeless melody but always the graceful counterpoint.

We also find in Nottebohm the following correction in Albrechtsberger's handwriting concerning Beethoven's infringement of the rule (p. 53):

Example 460.

---

*See § 8, p. 407 below.
and this comment on page 77:

Example 461.

§ 5. The Extent of the Application of: A) The First Species in Mixed Counterpoint.

The whole note intended here is always to be understood in the sense of first species, that is, as a note which stretches from downbeat to downbeat. It will not include the syncopation, which, if we add two half notes, equals the value of a whole note.

With this in mind, we realize that such a whole note at the beginning of the mixture (in the first measure) must be disorienting to the expected character of the mixture. Therefore, in the first measure we will use only a half rest followed by a half note.†

Used in the middle of a lesson, the whole note must entirely paralyze any variegated movement of the counterpoint. Indeed, the imbalance to the surrounding movement of an abrupt, imperious note appearing there will strike the ear all the more unpleasantly and disagreeably. Therefore, we must not use a whole note either at the beginning or in the middle of a lesson but must reserve it for the end, that is, for the very last measure.

Albrechtsberger writes (p. 64): "The first (species) has no place until the last measure." And on page 109 he writes: "Avoid first species until the last measure." And as it arises in Nottebohm's Beethoven-Studien—see page 76—he pursues such an error with his pupil even into the fugal lessons.

†Cf. § 3, above.
Bellermann says much the same thing (p. 182):

In this species, it is better to avoid beginning the first measure with a whole note (consisting of arsis and thesis) since the counterpoint would easily appear halting in its movement. However, two tied half notes which together have the value of a whole note (inversely consisting of thesis and arsis) always have a pleasant effect.

§ 6.—B) The Second Species in Mixed Counterpoint.

The single half note is of course an indispensable value in second species. But later it will become apparent that, here, such a single half note is feasible only under certain provisions, since it, like the whole note in the middle of a lesson, must evoke a displeasing effect when conditions are unfavorable.

In the search for the maximum extension, we find that, within the framework of the lesson and the limits of the remaining species to be applied therein, an uninterrupted series of four half notes creates the impression of a quantitative predominance of second species and that the intended effect of a mixture is thereby endangered. From this we conclude [405] that an uninterrupted succession of only three half notes (whereby stress is given equally to the continuousness and the triple figure) must signify the maximum extension of second species in the mixture. Yet, I want to emphasize that it does not mean that the maximum extension is surpassed when after three half notes a tied fourth half note follows; with this syncopation the last one is transferred to the status of fourth species:

---

*See § 5, above.*
Example 462.

"good"

\[ \text{\begin{music}
\谱例462 - "good"
\end{music}} \]

"bad"

\[ \text{\begin{music}
\谱例462 - "bad"
\end{music}} \]

Albrechtsberger writes (p. 64):

In order to avoid writing a weak and boring melodic line, one should use second species for no longer than four beats, whereby, the last of these must be tied to the fifth beat; for example:*

Example 463.

"good"

\[ \text{\begin{music}
\谱例463 - "good"
\end{music}} \]

"bad"

\[ \text{\begin{music}
\谱例463 - "bad"
\end{music}} \]

"worse"

\[ \text{\begin{music}
\谱例463 - "worse"
\end{music}} \]

\[ \text{\begin{music}
\谱例463 - "worse"
\end{music}} \]

§ 7.---C) The Third Species in Mixed Counterpoint.

As in the previous case, a complete symmetry of four measures must be avoided in third species (if we do not wish to disturb the balance of all the species in favor of third species). Therefore, in the lessons, we may retain again a maximum extension of only three measures.

[406] How we will have to deal with a single quarter note or a group of two will be shown later.

*In addition, see p. 67.
Albrechtsberger remarks on page 64: "Likewise, the third species should never extend over six beats." Unfortunately, however, he then writes (on page 68):

Example 464.

where surely we have a transgression of the given maximum extension if we do not regard the eighth notes as a sufficient interruption of the third species—perhaps even in the sense of Albrechtsberger(?). In any case, the monotony must be criticized in this example—see the brackets that I have placed over the part in question. Compare a similar contradiction found on page 146 with respect to a four-part composition.

§ 8. The Three Possible Configurations of a Half Note and Two Quarter Notes in the Same Measure.

If we want to mix a half note with two quarter notes in the same measure, we have three possibilities, each with a totally different effect:

1. The First Configuration: \( \text{\textbf{\textit{d}}} \text{\textbf{\textit{d}}} \)

This is the first and most natural arrangement in as much as a certain psychological congruity exists between the stronger value of the downbeat and the half note and between the weaker value of the upbeat and the two quarter notes; to the downbeat we apply the note of greater value, to the upbeat notes of lesser value!

Only two possibilities can be specified here:

a) both the downbeat and upbeat form consonances to begin with; for example:
Example 465.

b) the upbeat forms a passing dissonance such as permitted in third species--but, to be sure, in its own context; for example:

Example 466.

That the type at a) takes precedence over that at b) is quite obvious according to the principles of strict counterpoint, that is, to the extent that naturalness should be obeyed.

Fux applies only the type at a) in his lessons. Did the lessons give him no occasion to use b)?

In contrast, Albrechtsberger also writes about the type at b); for example:

Example 467.

He also mentions it on page 69.

With Bellermann we also find the b) form written on page 186.
2. The Second Configuration: \[ \text{\textbackslash m \textbackslash m \textbackslash m} \]

The psychology of this pattern may be understood in the following way: since it constitutes a retrograde of the first pattern, it creates a less-natural effect by virtue of the reason described in No. 1 above. In this situation, the downbeat has the lesser values of quarter notes; they suggest that we should also expect quarter notes during the upbeat. But since, instead of the expected quarter notes, a half note appears, we experience a kind of cessation in the rhythmic movement—after all, our ear misses the pulsation of the four quarter notes! This contention will be designated by the term caesura.

The error of such a caesura can be avoided in the above configuration only by syncopating the half note that produces the cessation. The syncopation creates the following two effects which remedy the malaise: 1) by means of it, the half note of the upbeat "recaptures" the downbeat, a place more suitable to it as a note of greater value; 2) on the upcoming downbeat, the cantus firmus is articulated against this note. Psychologically speaking, we thus receive a natural, rhythmic satisfaction that would be lacking in the pattern \[ \text{\textbackslash m \textbackslash m \textbackslash m} \] if the syncopation were not used.

Accordingly, strict counterpoint properly admits this configuration only in connection with the syncopation that alleviates the unsatisfactory effect. Therefore only: \[ \text{\textbackslash d \textbackslash d \textbackslash d} \], or \[ \text{\textbackslash d \textbackslash d \textbackslash d \textbackslash d} \] are used.

In contrast, free composition has at its disposal innumerable reasons for justifying the use of such a pattern and adopts it without reservation for its own particular effect; for example:
Example 468. Haydn, Symphony in D major (Payne, No. 9).

\[ \begin{align*} &\text{G, D, F, A, G, D, G, A,} \\ &\text{G, D, F, A, G, D, G, A.} \end{align*} \]

If we eliminate the appoggiaturas in measures 1 and 2, we end up with only two half notes: \( g^1-e^1 \) and \( f^#-d^1 \). Since we are consciously aware of this, such a configuration may be readily used in free composition.

Often, a voice distribution indirectly brings two such rhythms together in a progression of four quarter notes that, as we can see, is entirely normal even in the sense of strict counterpoint:

\[ \begin{align*} &\text{C, E, A, G,} \\ &\text{F, B, E, A,} \end{align*} \]

We read in Fux (p. 84 ff.):

Now I want to give you not so much a law, but, rather some good advice. If at the beginning of a measure you set two successive quarter notes without a ligature following immediately, then the melody will seem to lag. Therefore, if we need to use two quarter notes at the beginning of a measure, it is advisable to apply the ligature next, or to facilitate the continuation by adding two more quarter notes, as for example:

---

*See Section 1, Chapter 2, \#1 in the chorale of J. S. Bach, Example 13a, measures 1, 2, etc., and the same in Bellermann's setting, Example 13c, measure 4.*
Example 469. Table VI, Fig. 16.

But, the words "good advice" certainly indicate that Fux has not mastered the problem. Albrechtsberger expresses himself as follows (p. 68):

The sixth mistake is the static half note, C, on the upbeat after two quarter notes, e and d, in the ninth measure. (*120) These half-note caesuras are not permitted on the upbeats! Such an error can only be remedied by an ensuing ligature or else by additional notes in the following manner.+

Not without interest is another of his comments related to the point above:

But the sections ending with a half note on the downbeat (and also, those half notes that do not end a section) are permissible and sometimes necessary here and there for singers and wind instrument players so that they can breathe after an untied note. Nevertheless, we see that Albrechtsberger himself occasionally transgresses,++ as for example when he writes the following (to be sure only in a cadence formula):

[410] Example 470.

+Examples follow. (*121)

++See pages 110-111.
Bellermann provides the greatest detail with regard to this problem. His teaching, which is only slightly correct, is as follows (p. 180):

If we mix half and quarter notes without ligatures, then it is better and more natural to set a half note on the accented beat and the two quarter notes on the unaccented beat, as for example: The reverse of this, namely, to set two quarter notes first and then the half note sounds harsh. This figure was almost totally avoided by the composers of the sixteenth century. In their works we find two quarter notes at the beginning of the measure only under the following conditions:

a) when the first quarter note of the measure is tied to the preceding half note on the thesis, as for example:

Example 471.

\[ \text{Example follows. (*)&122} \]

b) when, as in third species counterpoint, quarter notes also appear in the second half of the measure, as for example:+++

Example 472.

\[ \text{Example follows. (*)&123} \]

c) when the last note in the preceding measure is a quarter note, as for example:

Example 472.

\[ \text{Example follows. (*)&124} \]
d) when the half note following the quarter notes is tied to the following note, as for example:

Indeed, we must correct various things. Since point a), strictly speaking, concerns the syncopation in mixed counterpoint (see point d)), it has, for the time being, nothing to do with the question of the caesura and is, therefore, insignificant to our problem. Point c) is based on a mistaken assumption since, as we shall see below, a triple value in mixed counterpoint should not in practice be supplied by a $3\,$, but only by $6\,$. Thus, point d) is the only correct one; it actually involves the normal resolution by means of syncopation (proposed by all the other theorists) within which, as stated above, point a) should be included.

Nevertheless, Bellermann writes this at a cadence (p. 234, No. 6):

Example 473.

We have previously discussed this in detail.++

3. The Third Configuration: $\uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow \uparrow$

This pattern is totally unacceptable for strict counterpoint. The fact that the upbeat is not rhythmically articulated is seen as the irreparable flaw of this pattern. The rejection of the third configuration must appear all the more justified (since we previously rejected the second configuration) if it is not associated with syncopation, and the fourth quarter note is deprived of its proper rhythmical vivacity thereby.

When we summarize all three configurations, it finally

+Example follows. (*125)

++Cf. also the quotation in § 10 below.
becomes understandable why above, in § 6, it was declared that the setting of the individual half note, as the sole representative of second species, is bound by certain preconditions.

All of this says nothing against the special value of the third configuration in free composition where it may find application either in the closing formula or during a rhythmic circumscribing of a tone through the curving around of its neighboring tone, or the like.

In the following example:

Example 474. J. S. Bach, St. Mathew Passion, Recitative (score, p. 22).

we see this configuration applied on the fourth quarter. Indeed, it consists of an eighth-note passing tone, A♯, appearing between two sixteenths. In this case, the character of the passing motion is explained by the fact that free composition++ uses passing tones with whatever interval skips are desirable since it can confirm the harmony, as such, on the basis of scale-degree succession. But the stress which

+Cf. above, Section II, Chapter 2, § 5, Example 242 by Couperin.

++Cf. above, p. 248, and especially pages 314-315!
this creates for our musical sensibility enables us to establish a relationship between the tones of the same harmony even if they are placed far apart; thus, in the above example we quite naturally add to C♯ (as the proper root of the #II-degree) its seventh b, and conceive, all the more easily, the passing character of the tone A♯ intervening between them. Added to this is the fact that the latter tone (A♯) reveals the character of the passing figure in the strictest sense of the word, *+ since we can extract from the harmony C♯-E♯-G♯-B the tone G♯ which could easily sit before A♯ in place of the root C♯. In this way, we are always in a position to conceive the passing tone in the space of a third (or else a fourth) even when free composition uses larger skips on the basis of the representational possibilities of the chord tones:

Later, in the species combinations, **+ we shall, nevertheless, be permitted to use a similar configuration (in connection with the six-four chord prepared by a dissonance) but, to be sure, in the following expanded version:  d ∣ d ∣ d 

Here, I shall offer one example of free composition to illustrate the latter scheme:

---

*Cf. Section II, Chapter 2, § 3.*

**Cf. [Vol. II] Section VI.*

The rhythm of the middle voice beginning with b♯ can clearly be recognized as the configuration in question here:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b♯} & - c^\natural & - b♯ \\
\hline
3 & - & 4 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Albrechtsberger mentions the third configuration only with regard to four-part composition. He gives the following example (on page 149) in the discussion of the six-four chord:

Moreover, he remarks: "The four N.B's. indicate that we should not set syncopated notes such as these in strict counterpoint because then everything is too static on the second beat." At the same time, he overlooks the fact that, here, the six-four chord is more the impediment than the rhythm is.

In a footnote Bellermann offers this comment (p. 181):
In the works of good composers, cadence figures like following appear now and then:

Example 477.

For the time being the student should totally avoid such phrases in his lessons and try to invent smooth, flowing melodies.

For the time being? I think that even the teacher must totally avoid compromising counterpoint through free composition and vice versa. Then, at the very least, (if he is not in a position to define the differences between the two contexts) he must emphasize that much that we have to consent to in free composition is totally forbidden in strict counterpoint:


Mixed counterpoint finally supplies us with the possibility of constructing the syncopation in values other than those we have encountered up to now.

The free combining of the note values leads us, first of all, to the following list of possible syncopations:

[415] 1. \( \frac{1}{4} \)\( \frac{1}{8} \)
2. \( \frac{1}{4} \)\( \frac{1}{8} \)
3. \( \frac{1}{4} \)\( \frac{1}{8} \)
4. \( \frac{1}{4} \)\( \frac{1}{8} \)
5. \( \frac{1}{4} \)\( \frac{1}{8} \)
6. \( \frac{1}{4} \)\( \frac{1}{8} \) etc.

Yet, many of these forms do not qualify for use in strict counterpoint, as will be pointed out in the following discussion:

Form 1 is automatically excluded from strict counter-
point due to the fact that in the mixture species a whole note is generally inadmissible. +

In contrast to form 2, whose basic significance we already know, forms 3 and 4 equally represent less-natural types. With them a smaller value, i.e., a quarter note or an eighth note, is employed on the upbeat to "feed," dynamically, the larger value, the half note on the downbeat. This is not merely to be understood in a figurative and poetic way, but in a real and material way. To be sure, forms 3 and 4 each have a particular charm—as mentioned before, the charm of a change from weakness into strength—nevertheless, strict counterpoint must maintain a distance, in order to preserve its main interest, and, demanding naturalness as the basis for the lessons, reject these forms.

But, form 5 is free of the flaws associated with forms 3 and 4 since here a smaller value on the downbeat follows the half note on the upbeat. In terms of naturalness, form 5 is closest to the basic form, i.e., form 2. However, the quarter note on the downbeat, inasmuch as it may appear within the syncopation after the half note, is now, for the first time, the achievement of the mixture species. Thus it has, as we know, specific requirements to fulfill here, without which even this form 5 would be inadmissible. The further course must accordingly be either: or: .

It is important to remark that with form 5 a triple value enters into strict counterpoint for the first time. To be sure, the triple value in and of itself has another possible form: .

But, for the reasons we similarly encountered in §5, where we preferred the syncopated whole note to the non-syncopated one in strict counterpoint, it is equally true here, also, that the syncopated form is to be preferred to the non-

+ Cf. § 5. above.
syncopated one.

Form 6 must be eliminated in strict counterpoint for reasons that we will discuss later when we investigate the problem of eighth notes.+

If we sum up the results, it appears that only forms 2 and 5, i.e., either $d\uparrow d$ or $d\downarrow d$, are permitted in mixed counterpoint.

---

Strict counterpoint has done its duty since it has pointed out the various syncopation forms. In the type that \[417] it chooses for that particular domain, and at the same time, in the justification of this choice, implicitly lies an indication for the unrestricted usage of all the syncopation forms in free composition. But, in order to be able to determine which syncopation type may be used in a given passage in free counterpoint, it is frequently necessary to seek recourse in the hypothetical representation of the preparatory harmony. This has helped us several times++ to analyze the figures of free composition that seemingly contradict strict counterpoint, and to recognize them simply as extensions of figures established in strict counterpoint.

Some examples may help to explain what has been said.

Quite clearly, Example 18 in Harmonielehre++ presents a syncopation possessing the following value scheme:

\begin{align*}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} \\
\text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} \\
\text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} \\
\text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} & \text{\,} \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}

\[\neq 10.\]

++As, for example, in the explanation of the skipping passing tones (see pp. 248, 314), the implied preparations (see p. 366), or the free suspension (see p. 366).

+++Measures 6-7. (*126)
In the same example, measures 10-11:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ab}^2 & \quad \text{db}^2 & \quad \text{gb}^2 \\
\circ & \quad \circ & \quad \circ
\end{align*}
\]

In Harmonielehre, Example 35, we see the following relationship in measures 2-3 in the lowest voice: (*127)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{eb}^1 & \quad \text{eb}^1 & \quad \text{dl} \\
\circ & \quad \circ & \quad \circ
\end{align*}
\]

N.B. With regard to the character of the syncopation in the lower counterpoint, see p. 348 ff:

In Harmonielehre, Example 94, measures 2-4 yield this: (*128)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{f}^\#^2 & \quad \text{f}^\#^2 & \quad \text{f}^\#^2 & \quad \text{e}^2 \\
\circ & \quad \circ & \quad \circ & \quad \circ
\end{align*}
\]

[418] The appearance of the syncopation form \(\frac{5}{4}\) in the J. S. Bach example (in Harmonielehre) must be attributed to an anticipation brought about by the composing-out [Auskomponieren] of the suspension of the sixth. In such a case—let us not forget the extent to which free composition is justified in demanding prolongation, diminution, and the

\[+\text{Example 81, meas. 3.}\]
anticipation, etc.:--we must learn to perceive the subtle effect produced by a syncopation when the smaller value precedes a larger one.+

It is astonishing to suddenly find \[ \frac{\text{\textdagger}}{} \text{ in Fux's lessons in three-part, mixed counterpoint.} \]

Albrechtsberger's teaching is more thorough even if it lacks explanations. We read (p. 64 f.):

Third, we should often try to apply both short and long ligatures to the beautiful and variegated church melody. From practical music, each composer will have experienced for himself that there are many kinds of ligatures in counterpoint; I call them "short" and "shorter," "long" and "longer." Others may give them different names. The shorter tie is the one that comes only on the fourth part of the beat regardless of the meter. The short one covers a half beat; the long lasts a whole beat; the longer one lasts two whole beats. By noting the following example and recalling all four ligatures one will learn them if they have not been precisely understood already:

Example 478.

\[ \text{\textdagger} \]

[419] Observe here that only the "short" and "long" are to be used.

Albrechtsberger does not speak specifically about the form \( \frac{\text{\textdagger}}{} \). However, we would not be wrong if we were to draw upon his views about the use of the whole note needed for articulation as proof that he would prefer to see it forbidden.+++

---

+Cf. Example 422 above.

++See Table XIII, Fig. 7, and Table XIV, Fig. 1. (*129)

+++Cf. above, §§ 4 and 5.
The remainder of the problem is considered when he discusses three-part composition (p. 109):

Suspensions that are longer than the preparation are always wrong; they negate a good melodic line. When both are of equal length, the result is good; for example:

Example 479.

Yet, one should observe here that it is not good to use ligatures such as those in numbers 2 and 3 unless the passage continues in quarter notes, as in number 5, or it continues without introducing another ligature. For then it would resemble a section, like two quarters and a half note in one measure with no ensuing tie. . . . (*130) in most cases, fourth species should be used with the "short" ligature.

As Example 479, 2, shows, Albrechtsberger permits the use of even in strict counterpoint, a form which I have rejected above. But let us not overlook the fact that he rarely uses such syncopations himself.+* 

---

+Cf. page 110.
In Cherubini's Example 76 we find the following passage (p. 26):

Example 480.

\[\text{Example 480.}\]

[420] We see that he seems to sanction the triple value in the form of a dotted half note. He says nothing about the rest of the problems that have occupied us here.

In a more extensive discussion Bellermann adopts the proper viewpoint. He, too, excludes the quarter-note preparation and concludes (p. 181):

And thus we have the rule that a note on the arsis may never be tied to a longer note on the thesis. Furthermore, the note to which we tie must be either just as long or half as long as the one on the thesis. Therefore, it is forbidden to tie a quarter or an eighth to a whole note.

To be sure, he leaves this matter without any explanation— which is all the more blameworthy when he makes the following attack in a footnote:

Modern music frequently sins against the rule that forbids one to tie from a short note to a long one. Under No. 2 we said that in the stricter style all notes must be divided into two or three parts. We find this rule strictly observed by all composers in the sixteenth century. The mensural notation of that time did not permit the writing of fivefold or sevenfold notes, etc., for the reason that the dot was the only extension sign available and the application of the tie (\(\rightarrow\)) was not yet known. In newer music, one finds values such as this written without hesitation:

Example 481.

\[\text{Example 481.}\]

\[\text{+Example follows. (\#131)}\]
I believe that we are going too far—even in instrumental music—in stretching the limits of the beautiful (and also the understandable). In my opinion, it is important for the student to adhere in his exercises to the stricter rules mentioned above.

With the exception of the last sentence (which is quite true), how many absurdities are contained in this remark? Why, I ask, should the composer be bound by a presumed "rule" that may serve, at best, only as a key to the recognition of certain syncopation forms within strict counterpoint? Why not offer the student the forms that are varied according to their situations (i.e., successive or in proximity) in just such a variety? And why not provide instruction on how to use each one in timely fashion, that is to say, within the framework of a fixed lesson, from the simplest and most natural to the more complex ones that are further along in disposition and freedom? Why should what Haydn wrote in his example cited earlier (Example 428) be called a "mistake" when, after all, precisely this effect was sought and attained? [421] From this we see where the notion of having to link the teaching of counterpoint to free composition leads!

In § 8 above, we find that Bellermann, in order to present triple values, has already adopted the form of free composition ("the composers of the sixteenth century") for lessons; instead of \( \text{c}\), he writes \( \text{c}\).++ He does this in spite of the fact that he justifiably objects to the appearance of the whole note and demands that instead of the \( \text{o} \), the \( \text{d} \) be used.+++

§ 10. Eighth Notes in Mixed Counterpoint.

In a small world of tones where all movement seems to be consciously based on the principle of only a half note—we recognize this precondition best through the syncopation form required in strict counterpoint—and where the diminution of that value is carried down only to the quarter note, in such a world a lengthy, uninterrupted succession of eighth notes must appear to be a dangerous and exaggerated diminution that cannot be brought into balance with the other values.

++See the discussion of point c) under 2.

+++Cf. pages 182, 183, etc.

+++Cf. § 5.
Thus it is understandable that in the mixture species, despite the tendency toward mixture and the propensity of the composition to include eighth notes in its sphere, a succession of four eighth notes (\(\text{\text-supr 8}\)) will already be perceived as an inadmissible figure. Four eighth notes used in direct succession would have to disarrange and confuse our perception of the fundamental unity of the half note and quarter note as the smallest values assumed a priori.

Therefore, a succession of only two eighth notes (\(\text{\text-supr 8}\)) should constitute the maximum. It makes no difference whether such a pair of eighth appears within the realm of the down-beat or the upbeat.

We notice that also in the case of eighth notes, all symmetry must be characteristically avoided, since, by nature, \([422]\) it has already been enclosed in the quaternary number.\(^+\)

From this artistic and conscious adjusting of the balance between the fundamental unity of the half note and the other values (i.e., the whole note, quarter note, eighth note), the student may in addition learn how consistency should be given to an artistic intention, that is, unity in design and execution! Passing over into free composition, there is also a similar consequence—style—to mention!

There are, however, these additional limitations upon the already curtailed freedom of the eighth note in mixed counterpoint:

A) The rule which states that the larger value belongs on the stronger division, the smaller on the weaker,\(^++\) also applies to the eighth-note pair in the realm of the downbeat or the upbeat. In both cases the eighth-note pair must never

\[^+\text{Cf. } S\text{ }/ 6 \text{ and } 7 \text{ above.}\]

\[^{++}\text{Cf. } S\text{ }/ 8 \text{ above.}\]
occupy the place reserved for the first quarter note. The figure must be: \(\text{\texttt{JJJ}}\), not \(\text{\texttt{JJJJ}}\).

The prohibition of the latter pattern must be strictly observed. Although this configuration could be used if it were reorganized by means of a syncopation, as follows: \(\text{\texttt{JJJJ}}\), this figure can never be applied here because, in conformity to §9, syncopation patterns such as: \(\text{\texttt{J\ 0\ J\ 0}}\) or \(\text{\texttt{\ |\ 0\ 0\ |}}\) must be totally avoided.

[423] Thus, at the same time, this finally explains why, in §9, the syncopation form \(\text{\texttt{J\ 0\ J\ 0}}\) had to be declared inadmissible. After all, if the eighth note is forbidden the place of the first quarter note on the upbeat or downbeat, then we must also reject the syncopation that necessarily leads directly to that defect.

B) The two eighth notes that are permissible here must not be allowed to promote a continuing melodic independence. On the contrary, they must either restrict themselves to the service of a syncopation resolution\(^+\) or assume the subordinate role of the simplest embellishment. The implications of this will be clarified by my instruction on the syncopation resolution.

Fux writes (p. 83):

In addition, two eighth notes may sometimes be combined in the species that follows [fifth species]. However, they may be used only on the second and fourth parts of the measure, never on the first and third:

\[\text{\texttt{\ |\ 0\ 0\ |}}\]

\(^+\text{Cf. §12 below.}\)
Example 482. Table VI, Fig. 3.

```
Example 482. Table VI, Fig. 3.
```

However, as this example illustrates, Fux used the eighth note melodically, that is, beyond the limits of a mere syncopation resolution. Whether it is just by accident or truly intentional that he avoids setting two pairs of eighth notes in the same measure (\( \begin{array}{c} J J J J \end{array} \)) cannot be determined with certainty.

In Albrechtsberger we read at first (p. 64):

... (*133) in the counterpoint, we are not allowed to set four eighth notes on one beat but only a pair occasionally, and then certainly never at the beginning of a beat; for example:

```
Example 483.
```

Furthermore, we read (p. 68):

The ninth mistake is the four eighth notes [in meas. 11] that do not belong here in this species. (*134)

---

+Cf. also Table VI, Fig. 9; Table VI, Fig. 10; and in three-part composition Table XIII, Fig. 4 and Table XIII, Fig. 7. (*132)
It is a different situation when an entire piece, which might be marked \( \frac{2}{4} \) or \( \frac{4}{4} \), is written in alla breve for the sake of convenience, so that sixteenth notes are represented by eighth notes.

And finally he writes (p. 146): "... (*135) whereby a pair of quick notes amounting only to a half beat can appear."

A first trace of an explanation appears in the words "that do not belong here." To be sure, this thought would need explanation and clarification.

By the way, Albrechtsberger, like Fux, uses paired eighth notes in a melodic sense on pages 68, 69, 146, 148, etc., but only one time in the pattern \( \text{\textbackslash j} \text{\textbackslash j} \text{\textbackslash j} \text{\textbackslash j} \) (on page 146).

The following excerpt from Cherubini's Rule 1 should be quoted (p. 25):

Any eighth notes that are used ought to progress by step. It is seldom otherwise. In order to follow the old masters, we should never use more than two eighth notes in one measure... (*136). If we put four eighth notes in one measure, they should form the second half of each beat. They must not follow one another directly.† In general, we must make sparse use of this figure, otherwise the counterpoint will be too jumpy and alien to its proper character.

Thus, the usually so blindly radical Cherubini has not found the courage simply to forbid eighth notes that have melodic significance.

Even though he makes no attempt at an explanation, it is nevertheless admirable that Bellermann formulates this statement (p. 182):

Concerning eighth notes, only two may be used in succession on the second and fourth quarter of a measure as a small embellishment or decoration, in which case the neighboring tone is also permitted. Thus at a cadence we may find:

[Example 484]

†Example follows. (*137)
§ 11. Variants of Dissonant Syncopation Resolutions Made Possible by the Mixture with the Aid of Quarter Notes.

The two previous subsections have shown us that the possibility of using two quarter notes or a quarter and two eighths on the downbeat automatically leads to new configurations of the syncopation resolution in which even quarters or eighths play a role.

At this stage of the instruction it is necessary to point out the sharper differences that now appear in the effects depending on whether the resolution of a dissonant syncopation is carried out according to fourth-species principles or with the aid of quarter notes. In the former case, the succession of preparation, suspension, and resolution unfolds in an even rhythm of half notes. In the latter case, only the preparation retains the half-note value while the suspension and resolution are both reduced to quarters, that is to say, half the values demanded in fourth species. Thus, the pulse of the events quickens and the following downbeat, which, according to fourth-species principles could only bring the resolution of the dissonance, may now dedicate itself to a new task: it may either continue in quarter notes or prepare a totally new syncopation, etc. To understand this more clearly, notice the second measure in the lesson by Fux (reproduced here as Lesson No. 4) and compare the text on page 360 ff.

There can be no doubt that the effect resulting from the uniform values of preparation, suspension, and resolution is a natural one. But such an effect can be attained indirectly if we, in accordance with fifth-species principles, use two quarter notes in the resolution of a dissonant syncopation. The present subsection will deal with this possibility.

Here, we want to discuss all the variants and attempt to explain their individual bases.
If we take this syncopation as an example:

Example 485.

the following resolutions are possible:

Example 486.

Here, the second quarter note is an anticipation of the resolution tone itself since it is placed before the latter (we call this form ligatura rupta).

Example 487.

In this case, the second quarter note provides the third of the resolution tone whereby its harmony seems to be anticipated. N.B., to set the third an octave lower is forbidden in strict counterpoint because of the skip of the sixth.+

Example 488.

+See page 76.
Here, the second quarter note is related by fifth to the resolution tone, again producing the effect of an anticipation.

These variants (Examples 486-488) display a common characteristic: the second quarter note is consonant with the cantus firmus. Accordingly, a harmonic sum is even possible: e.g., $\frac{8}{6}$ in Example 487, and $\frac{6}{3}$ in Example 488.

If we examine the harmonic sums more closely, we reach the following conclusions: in Example 485, the sixth signifies the inversion of the third ($a^2 = c^1 - e^1$), thus the harmony in Examples 486, 487, and 488 corresponds to that of the root $e^1(6, \frac{8}{6}, \frac{6}{3} = \frac{5}{3} = e^1)$. From this it follows that, if we use two quarter notes in the resolution of a dissonant syncopation, the possibility of completing the resolution on the upbeat still exists++--despite the fact that the downbeat has the livelier movement of quarter notes. But, more than that, the second quarter note does not need to contradict the harmony that is created when we add to the cantus firmus the resolution tone situated on the upbeat!

With this determination, we arrive at a new, highly remarkable basis for differentiation whose nature will become even clearer when we consider the following example:

Example 489.

Here, the second quarter note, $a^1$, must be rejected simply because it is dissonant with the cantus firmus. But

++As in fourth species.
what carries even more weight is the peculiarity that this
dissonant note abruptly forms a new harmony that was not and
could not be present in the preceding resolutions. Thus, in
Example 489, the $a^1$ is the root of the new harmony $(e^1-a^1-e^2 = a-c^1-e^1)$, a harmony that is totally different from the one
[428] intended by the normal resolution (i.e., $c^1-e^1-e^1$).
The use of the tone $a^1$ denies $c^1$ its proper root status
which is, judged by the sixth in Example 485, above all its
due. In other words, the effect caused by the harmony $c^1-e^1-e^1$
in our example is more natural than the one caused by the har­
mony $a-c^1-e^1$. Now it is clear that strict counterpoint,
having to uphold the prerogative of the more natural effect,
may not entrust the formulation of a new harmony to a short
note, when, as here, this note is merely attributive to the
next resolution tone in relation to which it can claim only
the subordinate function of an embellishment:

For that reason this variant is equally unsatisfactory:

Example 490.

Moreover, the second quarter note is dissonant with the cantus
firmus and the harmonic sum yields $\frac{6}{2}$, a figuration incapable
of providing a consonant resolution of the syncopation.

In contrast, the following figure:

Example 491.

offers a more favorable situation so that its use in strict
counterpoint is not intrusive. To be sure, the figure contains no harmonic anticipation, as in Examples 486 to 488. However, by virtue of the fact that we hear the second quarter note as a lower neighbor of the resolution tone it avoids the danger of introducing a new, dissonant harmony \(c^-e^-b'^-\). The only thing left to do in this case is to justify the neighboring tone as such. If this can be accomplished anywhere in strict counterpoint at all, it is most easily done here at the resolution of the dissonant syncopation. Indeed, viewed from the strictest standpoint, this is the first occasion that requires the introduction of the neighboring tone. Here, there is almost no question of the neighboring tone as an end in itself (which alone had to create a dangerous situation in second species); on the contrary, there is, avowedly, only an embellishment of the resolution tone which remains unchanged throughout! Of course, we may note that although an obvious dissonant relationship necessarily exists between the neighboring tone and the resolution tone (due to the interval of a second), the neighboring tone permitted here is no less consonant with the cantus firmus than are the respective second quarter notes in Examples 486-488.

The results gleaned from all the variants permissible here are as follows:

a) the second quarter note must be consonant with the cantus firmus;

b) the second quarter note must never produce a change of harmony, that is, it must not inaugurate a new harmony in relation to the cantus firmus and the resolution tone.

Applied to the previously discussed syncopations, our principles lead us to the following permissible resolution forms:

\[\text{Cf. p. 240 ff. above.}\]
Example 492.

These, however, are still forbidden in strict counterpoint:

Example 493.
The latter forms involve either a lower neighbor to the resolution tone that is dissonant with the cantus firmus, or a second quarter note that produces a different harmony, as it must, which, with regard to the cantus firmus and resolution tone, poses a serious question.

If strict counterpoint had permitted ascending resolutions of syncopations, then we could have made use of ascending quarter notes; for example:

Example 494.

But, as we have said, these possibilities involving ascending resolution belong only to free composition.

[431] § 12. Variants of Dissonant Syncopation Resolutions Made Possible by the Mixture with the Aid of Quarters and Eighths.

From those original forms described in the previous paragraphs we can, without difficulty, trace the derivation of all the variants now made possible through the mixture of quarters and eighths:

Example 495.

Cf. § 11, Examples 486 and 491:
Example 496.

Cf. §11, Example 487:

Example 497.

Cf. §11, Examples 487 and 491:

Example 498.

Cf. §11, Examples 488 and 491.

It is clear that there are still other possibilities to be had from combinations of Examples 486, 487, 488, and 491, as for example:

Example 499.

Here the fifth and third of the resolution tone (following Examples 487, 488) appear combined. Such additional solutions, however, definitely belong to free composition. There they are much favored because of the advantage of the multi-linear texture and the heightened precision of the harmonies in their [432] unfettered, free deployment.
In contrast, a figure like the following:

Example 500.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 500.} \\
\text{may be freely permitted in strict counterpoint as an embellishment of the resolution even though it actually entails a consonant syncopation—indeed, that of the sixth—which, after all, requires neither a resolution nor, consequently, an embellishment.}
\end{array} \]

Even when free composition still adheres to the demand of strict counterpoint for the resolution of the dissonance in the same measure, the embellishment of a resolution offers the possibility of extended freedoms:


If, in measure 2 of this example, we observe a completely regular embellishment (according to Example 488), then we also see, in measure 3, the so-called ligatura rupta (according to Example 486—with the difference that here the second is changed to a seventh, \( a^b_2 - g^2 \), a change freely
permitted with string instruments).+ 

At the same time, free composition, as we already know, can also combine a change of harmony with the resolution.++

[433] If, for example, in strict counterpoint a passage must be set as follows:

Example 502.

\[ \begin{align*}
& \begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 502.} \\
\end{array} \\
\text{then free composition may express it in a shorter version:} \\
& \begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 503.} \\
\text{If, to such an abbreviation we simultaneously apply an embellishment, we will obtain from this archetype:} \\
\text{Example 504.} \\
\end{array}
\end{align*} \]

+Cf. above, pages 80, 91, 120 ff.

++Cf. page 367 above.
with unconstrained rhythm and the aid of a change of harmony, the following configuration:

Example 505. Schumann, Piano Quartet, "Andante" (meas. 6 ff.).

[434] In our example the syncopation of the ninth is only resolved by the of the third measure. This is proved by the adherence of the accompaniment to the tone of the syncopation (d1) even in measure 2. Furthermore, the bass produces a passing tone in measure 2.

Here is another example:

Example 506. J. S. Bach, WTC, I, Prelude in C-sharp minor.

This represents, as it were, the form of strict counterpoint:
that is, if we disregard the nature of the cantus firmus, for, after all, the cantus firmus should never move in skips like those shown in Example 507.+

If in strict counterpoint the use of quarter notes (or eighth notes) signifies the first stage of freedom in the resolution of dissonant syncopations and, at the same time, the highest measure of this freedom, in free composition there are countless other means which aid in making the resolution more exciting. Consider, for example, the possibility of using the components of the same harmony in such a way that one may [435] be substituted at any time for another! What a fertile principle: Its origin simply lies in the fact that in free composition we are able, due to the guidance of the scale-degrees, to conceive all harmonies "in the abstract," as though they rest on the foundation of the literal voice leading. This possibility of substitution, which we have already encountered in the skipping passing tones++ and the implicitly prepared dissonances,+++ can now play a role in the resolution, just as it did in the skip and the preparation. Let us consider the following example:

Example 507.

---

+ Notice what a great difference there is between the bass in a lesson and that in free composition!
++ Cf. pages 314, 315; cf. Example 273.
+++ Cf. page 366 and Example 423.
Measure 3 contains a prepared dissonant suspension: its resolution takes place during the still unchanged harmony. To be sure, the II-degree appears first in the six-three inversion in order to arrive at the genuine root-tone, $c$, in measure 4. Nevertheless, with the same scale-degree we have the same harmony, a circumstance that makes our example similar to exercises used here in strict counterpoint, which complete, likewise during the still unchanged tone of the cantus firmus, the resolution of the syncopation. However, if in spite of everything we wish to acknowledge the change of the roots within the same scale-degree, then we can say that the syncopation here may be conceived in two ways: measured from the root of the II-degree itself ($c$), $d^2$ is a ninth; measured from the root of the six-three chord, $d^2$ is a seventh. Be that as it may, its resolution should have been conveyed normally into $c^2$; and when the note $g$ appears in its stead, this only represents the substitution of one harmonic tone for the other. How much greater charm lies embedded here than in a mere embellishment!

Another example:

Such a substitution can be used also at the change of harmony, as the following examples illustrate:


Fux writes (p. 83):

[Aloys.] . . . (*138) the ligatures mentioned up to now may also be applied in another way. To be sure, they do not lose their character thereby, and yet they enliven the melody:

Example 511. Table V, Fig. 21.

Example 512. Table VI, Fig. 2.

. . . (*139) The ligature is also commonly broken in the following way:

These facts and explanations are all that Fux has to offer on this subject. Yet, the words "they do not lose their character thereby" clearly show that he knew how little the embellishments counteract the basic rhythm of the preparation, suspension, and resolution, which remains, as ever, the normal rhythm of half notes!

By contrast, Albrechtsberger haphazardly enumerates every possible type of resolution (p. 65 f.), without adhering to any plan at all. (*140)

Cherubini also offers all of the types that are useful in strict counterpoint but with a rather strange-sounding explanation. We read in Rule 3 (p. 26):

The dot serves as a diminution to the whole note inasmuch as it converts it first into a dotted half note and then into a quarter or two eighths. + We may also use variations of this kind in syncopations and thereby shorten the duration of the dissonances. These diminutions give the melody a pleasant quality. ++

---

+Example 78 follows. (*141)

++Example 79 follows. It contains the forms of syncopation resolutions. (*142)
[438] Bellermann vacillates between Fux, older composition instructors, and his own ideas. On page 179 we read:

. . . (*143) whereby we divide the dissonance on the first half note of the measure into two quarter notes, the second of which skips into a lower-lying consonant interval, and then we offer the regular resolution only with the third quarter note. In the time of Palestrina this type of resolution was rare. I find it necessary to mention it, however, since Fux permits its use in his Gradus ad Parnassum. We should not use it frequently in the following lessons since we have to regard this type of resolution as an incidental embellishment of the voice.++

Finally, he accepts the ligature rupta with the following explanation (p. 182):

Furthermore, it is good when the student gets used to writing in such a way that the singer has sufficient occasion to breathe. With the dissonance on the arsis, the older composers met this objective by forcing the resolution on the second quarter note and then repeating the same tone on the third quarter note.+++ Places such as this are frequent in the compositions of the sixteenth century, and the singer must never let them pass without taking a breath after the second quarter note.

No matter how correct the latter remark is, it would have been better if Bellermann had taken his explanation for the permissible effect from the actual composition rather than from singing technique.


Tone repetition is still excluded here in spite of the tendency of the mixture species toward the elements of free composition. Likewise, we should warn once more against the danger of monotony.

+Example follows. (*144)

++We should add here what was quoted earlier in § 10 when the eighth note was discussed.

+++Example follows. (*145)
CLOSING


Two formulas are possible:

a) in conformity with fourth species: $7-6|8$ or $2-3|1$, or:

b) with the use of eighth notes and the license of the caesura: $\downarrow \uparrow \downarrow$.

For Albrechtsberger's discussion, see page 67; also observe the following correction in Nottebohm (p. 50):

Example 513.

For Bellermann's comments, see p. 179f.

+Cf. $§$ 8 above.
LESSONS

Example 514.

1. Alto, C.f.  

2. Tenor

Fux, Table VI, Figures 4 and 5.

[440]

3. Tenor, C.f.

Fux, Table VI, Figures 8 and 9.

4. Bass
Alto

Tenor, C.f.

Bass

Albrechtsberger, page 69.

[441]
Counterpoint  H. Schenker (Cantus firmus by Fux)
Remarks Concerning These Lessons

[444] About 5. Concerning the melodic use of the eighth note, see § 10.

About 7. The lesson begins with a syncopation. Measures 6 and 8 modulate briefly to G major and E minor, but, to be sure, without the clarity and power that are attainable only in free composition. Also, the use of the neighboring tones in measures 10 and 12 is remarkable.
NOTES TO KONTRAPUNKT I


by A. Manfredi as, Salita al Parnasso, o sia guida alla regolare composizione della musica con nuovo, e certo metodo non per anche in ordine si esatto data alla luce, e composta da Giovanni Giuseppe Fux principale maestro di cappella...


(*7) S. Sechter, Die Grundsätze der musikalischen Komposition. I: Die richtige Folge der Grundharmonien, oder vom Fundamentalbass und dessen umkehrungen und stellvertreten (1853). II: Von den gesetzen des Taktes in der Musik; Vom


chapelle, son élève; traduite de l'allemand, avec des notes (Paris: Bachelier, 1830). Eng. trans. of the Choron version by A. Merrick as, Methods of harmony, figured bass, and composition, adapted for self-instruction, by J. G. Albrechtsberger. Tr. from the last German ed., as augmented and arranged by his pupil, the Chevalier von Seyfried, with the remarks of M. Choron (London: R. Cocks, & Co., [1844]).

The quote cited here comes from §6 titled: Concerning Strict and Free Composition in General (Ger.).

"... in unison with the alto and tenor; sometimes doublebasses, violoncellos, and bassoons are used in unison with the bass or organ."

"... but they must be especially guarded against in the upper part."

"... whether the harmony is in two, three, or four parts; it contains only perfect accords or accords of the major or minor sixth. The accord of the fourth and octave is not tolerated even in settings of three or more parts.

"... that is, when they are stepwise and on a weak or unaccented part of the measure."

"... and their inversions, by which one can skip from a seventh in the upper counterpoint or from a fourth in the lower counterpoint (of a cantus firmus)."

"... which may be used to advantage in third and fifth species of free composition (especially in violin parts), ...

"Notae objectae are passing tones by skip that do not belong to the accord; for example:

\[\text{Music notation image}\]

"... For the sake of convenience, the examples given are almost all in alla breve measures. Other kinds of measure can be used."
("18") "... and even the tie may be omitted, for example:

\[ \text{The organ part would be written in the following manner:} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Do - na no - bis pa - cec.} \\
\text{Do - mi-ne Pi - li; u - ni ge-ni-te}
\end{align*}
\]

("19") "... In both styles of composition, fa's resolve down by half-step, and mi's resolve up by half-step unless a deceptive cadence is used."

("20") "... A rest or pause may be used occasionally in vocal or instrumental parts in order to facilitate breathing. Appoggiaturas and other grace notes may be used if they enhance the beauty of the melody. Also, the same note may be repeated one or more times in the same measure, especially in instrumental music. In this style dissonant skips are permitted, especially in the violin, viola, violoncello, and bassoon parts, provided these are not used in an unnatural manner."

("21") "... for example, when the second in the upper part ascends to the third which requires the fifth and sixth in three-part composition 5 - or 6 - and the perfect 2-3 2-3 fourth and major seventh in four-part composition: \[ \text{7-8.} \]

("22") "... especially in arias, duets, trios, symphonies, and dramatic choruses; also in chamber arias accompanied with the piano or violin; in trios, quartets, quintets, and concertos for various instruments. Thus I need not illustrate these types, but I advise all who wish to devote themselves to composition to write in full score many examples taken from the good composers, in the style for which they feel most disposed."


(*25) [Bach's St. Matthew Passion, Chorus No. 1 "Come ye daughters, share my mourning"]:
(*27) "... for example, with numbers 1 and 4."

[This quoted passage refers to the examples]:

No. 1. Dufay:

No. 4. Palestrina:


(*31)


(*33) Concerning the minor system, Louis and Thuille write (§8, p. 20):

The minor key is formed in such a way that both of the dominants of minor tonic oppose it in generic equality as minor triads also.


The quotation comes from Book I, Chap. XXIII titled "The Present-day Musical System" (Mizler translation). The example Fux gives is:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textbf{Table 1, Figure 10.}\textit{Genus diatonicum modernum}\textbf{.}
\hline
\textbf{Genus chromaticum modernum}\textbf{.}
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

This quotation comes from the Foreword to the second edition (1876).

The example to which he refers is:

\begin{example}[Example 664]
\end{example}
The imperfect consonances vary and are used as frequently as the perfect consonances; similar, contrary, and oblique motion are distributed correctly; the tritone is avoided.

The two examples to which Cherubini refers are:

Example 29.

```
\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
\text{C.f.} \\
5 & 3 & 6 & 3 & 6 & 3 & 3 & 6 & 3 & 5 & 6 & 3 & 5 & 3 & 6 & 3 & 6 & 8 \\
\end{array}
```

Example 30.

```
\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
\text{C.f.} \\
8 & 6 & 3 & 3 & 6 & 8 & 3 & 3 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 5 & 3 & 6 & 3 & 6 & 3 & 8 \\
\end{array}
```


(*40) This never occurs.

(*41) Albrechtsberger's example is:
(*43) Albrechtsberger's example is: [This example also shows the dim. 4 and dim. 5.]

"ascending and descending: In G"

(*44) Albrechtsberger's example is:

(*45) "... As proof of this, I cite the way Bernard Reichenau substantiated the postulate of nine intervals: "As antiquity shrewdly discovered, there are nine kinds (of intervals). In my opinion, the case is precisely the same as with the human voice, which has nine actions, namely, the striking of the tongue, the stirring of four teeth, the rebounding of two lips in the fashion of cymbals, the hollowing of the throat, and the supporting by the lung, which, like a bellows, inhales and exhales the air. On the same basis, we also ascribe nine muses to Apollo."

(*46) Bellermann's example is:

Nic est pa - nis de coe - - - - lo de - [scendens]
(*47) The opening of Schubert's "Ihr Bild" can be seen in Example 43. The opening of "Am Meer" is:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Das Meer er glänzte weit hin aus im Letz ten.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

(*48) Bellermann's example is:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in ae ter in ae ter num.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

(*49) Bellermann's example is:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

(*50) The Schubert example is:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vor Schmerzens ge walt; eig ne Ge stalt. Du fop nel-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

```
|-----------------|-----------------|
```

```
|-----------------|-----------------|
```

```
|-----------------|-----------------|
```

(*52) Albrechtsberger's examples are:

(*53) No particular effort is made to discuss this.
Otherwise, there would also be a major sixth in the following example since, there, e to G appears to be a major sixth:

Table 1, Figure 3.

But would anyone, even someone totally inexperienced in matters of this kind, be able to say that for this reason there is a major sixth in this example?

Their application would be according to the rules given below (for two-part, fourth species counterpoint):

a) Two-part texture:

b) Multi-linear texture, that is, with accompanying voices:

(*58)

"good"

(*59)

(*60) The complete lesson is:

Counterpoint
Contrary motion:

Oblique motion:

Cadences:

(*62)

"All gone!"

(*63)

Example 12.
Example 13.

a) 

b) 

Example 14.
"forbidden motion"

Example 17.

a) 

dim. 5 

b) 

Example 17.

a) 

b) 

dim. 5 

Example 17.

a) 

b) 

dim. 5 
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b) 
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(*69)

(*70)

(*71) This appears on page 14 of Kontrapunkt II.

(*72) This comes from the section entitled "Concerning Fugues with Three Voices."

(*73) "Another requires that the leading tone (the seventh major tone) should ascend by half-step to the eighth, and the regular fourth tone, especially in major keys, should descend to the third . . . ."

(*74) "The second N.B. above d in the alto points out that . . . ." [The example referred to here is:]

(*77) "good" [Musical notation]

(*78) "awkward", etc.

(*79) "also good, but less so" [Musical notation]

"... or when the half notes are in the lower voice:"
"... Consider the example beginning in the eighth measure. If we disregard the intervening note that comes on the up-beat, those measures would be:

Table III, Fig. 5.

The same goes for octaves:

Table III, Figure 6.

(*81) "Look once more at the last example with the intervening skip of a fourth that invalidates the successive octaves!"

Table III, Fig. 7.

"good"

(*82)

(*83) "In measures with two or three notes, it is the first beat; in measures in common time it is the first and last quarter notes; in measures with six notes it is the first and fourth; in measures with twelve notes it is on the first and seventh. The remaining notes are called 'unaccented'; these will be discussed in detail later in third species."
(*84)

a) Third species, Strict counterpoint:

b) Free composition:

(*85)

"Battuta"

(*86) "Here, now, as we say in the introduction to Chapter 1, the smaller division of a measure stands in the relationship of "arsis" and "thesis" just as the relationship within a measure . . . ."

(*87)
If C is on the first quarter note and if the third quarter note should lie a perfect fourth below (G), understandably, the quarter note cannot progress by step to the designated tone at this place but it must skip a third.

The example given by Bellermann is:

(*91)

In the measures that follow, a weak beat may occasionally contain a dissonant accord introduced by stepwise motion. The strong beat must begin with a consonant accord, as may be seen in the counterpoints given above.

(*93) "... In the first instance it has freedom of movement; in the second instance, as previously stated, it must resolve down by step."
(95) [Musical notation image]

(96) "Before I begin the exercise . . ."

(97) The quotation comes from the section entitled "Concerning Imitation." It begins: "As I said, since we no longer have to work from a cantus firmus, the suspended 2, 4, 7, and 9, when both parts move, no longer need to resolve as follows: the ninth to the octave, the seventh to the sixth, in the upper voice the fourth to a third and in the lower voice to a fifth . . ."

(98) "... while the second resolves into a third or tenth depending upon the distance of the parts."

(99) There is no exact English equivalent for Die Rückungen. Ruckende notes are rhythmically shifted notes, hence "syncopations" comes closest if one uses the term syncopation in the broadest sense and not in the context of strict counterpoint.

(100) The example is from Beethoven's Piano Sonata, Op. 31, No. 1: [Musical notation image]
(*101) Haydn, Piano Sonata in E major (Payne, No. 34).


(*103) Table V, Figure 8.

(*104) Table V, Figure 9.

(*105) Table V, Figure 11.
(*108) "bad"

(*109)

(*110) The three kinds referred to are:

No. 1.

No. 2.

No. 3.

(*111)

page 58.

page 60.

(*114) H. Riemann. *Grosse Kompositionlehre*. I: Der homophone Satz (Melodielehre und Harmonielehre), 1902; II: Der polyphone Satz (Kontrapunkt, Fuge, und Kanon, 1903; III: Der Orchestersatz und der dramatische Gesangsstil, 1913 (Berlin: W. Spemann, 1902-13).

(*115) "... Just as we use all the other species of arithmetic--counting, addition, multiplication, subtraction--in division, this species is nothing other than a combination of all the preceding counterpoint species."

(*116) "This species is called ornamental counterpoint (contra punctum floridum) . . ."

(*117) "This is also called ornamental counterpoint . . ." [This comes from §17, fifth species, three-part counterpoint.]

(*118) [Aloys.] "You have worked very hard, and what pleases me most is that you have taken care to write a good melodic line . . ."

(*119) Table VI, Figure 11.
(*120) The example to which Albrechtsberger refers is reproduced in its entirety in Note No. 38.

(*121)

(*122)

(*123)

(*124)

(*125)

Palestrina I, 19.
(*126) J. Haydn, Piano Sonata in B-flat major (meas. 6-11).

a) meas. 6-7.

b) meas. 10-11.

(*127) J. S. Bach, WTC, I, Prelude in E-flat minor (meas. 2-3).

(*128) Liszt, Sonata in B minor (meas. 2-4).
(*129)

Table XIII, Figure 7.

(*130) "... These sections were explained in fifth species two-part composition. In this species, we should strive for a full, three-part harmony along with a pure style. Also, the counterpoint should not continue too long in one species; the first species should be guarded against until the last measure; ... ."

(*131)

"Rhythmically bad"

(*132)

Table VI, Figure 9.
(*)133) "Besides the rules of the previous four species, the following are observed:

(*)134) [This example is reproduced in its entirety in my Note No. 38.]

(*)135) This quotation concerns four-part, fifth species counterpoint. It begins: "This is called florid counterpoint (ornamental counterpoint), which may be written above or below a cantus firmus in the upper-most, middle or lowest voice. It is made up of all the previous species (first species being reserved only for the last measure) . . . ."
(*136) "... These eighth notes must not be used on the first part of a beat but only on the second part, that is, only in association with half or quarter notes:"

(*137)

(*138) "Concerning the next species I should like to say that...

(*139) "From this it is clear that the first and third examples are the original forms while the ones following, respectively, are variants used to enhance the melody or the movement."

[The complete example is:]

(*140) Albrechtsberger begins his presentation of resolution variants with the following statement:

Of these ties, only the short and long can be used [See Example 478, above]. In the upper counterpoint, the major and minor seventh, fourth and the ninth can be varied as long ties—in the lower counterpoint the major and minor second—in the following manner:
A) Simple syncopation

Var. 1. Var. 2. Var. 3. Var. 4.

Var. 5. Var. 6. Var. 7. Var. 8.

Ligatura regta:

(*141)

(*142)

B) Simple syncopation

Var. 1. Var. 2. Var. 3. Var. 4.

Var. 5. Var. 6. Var. 7. Var. 8.
(*143) "The resolution of dissonance described above is most regular. However, we may also use an interrupted resolution if we, for some reason, want to give the counterpoint more movement, . . . ."

(*144)

A) Counterpoint with regular resolution.
B) Counterpoint with interrupted resolution.

(*145)
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IN MEMORY OF MY MOTHER
PREFACE

How should I train my children
To sift out the useless, the harmful?
Advise me!
Instruct them of heaven and earth
What they will never grasp!

Goethe

Of all mistaken notions, the
most foolish is the belief of bright
young people that they will lose their
inventiveness if they acknowledge a
truth previously recognized by some-
one else.

Goethe

[vii] Twelve years have passed since the publication of my
first volume on counterpoint. Yet, during this long period
my activity did not diminish. On the contrary, I undertook
the writing of works designed to augment the basic ideas
expressed in *Theorien und Phantasien*. Just as I found it
appropriate, following the dictate of necessity, to set forth
the *Harmonielehre* as a first volume before the *Kontrapunkt*,
and as I, again following necessity, felt obliged to contrast
immediately the voice leading of two-part strict counterpoint
with the prolongations of free composition in the first volume
of *Kontrapunkt*, so it seemed appropriate to illustrate the
operation of the laws described in these two volumes by means
of living works of the indisputably highest calibre even before
I brought these laws to final clarity through the presentation
of advanced phenomena in the additional books. For, as I said,
current need has unrelentingly demanded this sacrifice. The
works I refer to are: *Beethoven's neunte Sinfonie* (1912);
Erläuterungsausgaben der letzten fünf Sonaten Beethovens.

As a result of this plan, I was able, in the present volume, to spare myself the extensive contrasting of strict counterpoint with free composition that was required in the first volume of Kontrapunkt. However, I found it important to retain the encyclopedic method of presentation.

[viii] If my theories (as all my other works) bear the stamp of a rescue effort meant to protect the art of music against centuries-old errors of theory and historicism, then the compulsion has now become even stronger because the intervening world war unleashed ruinous forces that totally eradicated the art of music in the West. For that reason, it is important to transmit the essence of music to later times, since there is no expectation that it can be rebuilt in the next few years.

* * *

What a dreadful picture of despair and impotency the present offers us; what a contrast it is to an epoch of genuine artistic creativity and artistic predisposition:

The world war has ended in such a way that Germany, unvanquished in the field but betrayed by various democratic factions,† has taken over from hostile western nations the

†I.e., factions of the mediocre and inferior, of superficial culture and nonculture, of the most wanton individualism--everyone, as Brahms would say, "an authority in himself," a world authority; factions of the unfit for synthesis, of the know-it-all (meaning the know-nothing), of the most irresponsible doctrinism and bloodthirsty lust for experimentation connected with terror, genocide, official falsification, of the "working class" fiction, of the adoration and mimicry of the West, etc.
falsehood of their form of "freedom." Therewith, however, the last bastion of aristocraticism has fallen, and culture sees itself betrayed by the democracy that is fundamentally and organically inimicable to it because culture is the selection, the most pensive synthesis based on the prodigious achievements of the geniuses.

Since then the decay steadily proceeds. The deceitful and profiteering, superficially-civilized nations of the West—it certainly is not a political statement when we say that, in retrospect, the Romans did more harm to world culture with their insatiable voracity for lands and nations than good with their moderate ideology, and no more so when we examine presently active nations, as we do individuals, according to the proportion of pretension and accomplishment—those nations, I say, operating under an even more cunning leadership, have simulated a "conquest" by carrying on, contrary to agreement, the blockade of the German stomach, an economic war waged for the benefit of their backwardness. Peoples and territories are robbed, or the theft is managed through the "League of Nations"—a true [ix] academy for mass thievery—with commissions and armies of occupation overrunning and impoverishing unconquered peoples. Wading, even now, in the filth of such cowardice against a disarmed Germany, they are once again in the process of contesting the right to "ascendency" among themselves: for so many nations, such an appetite for predominance! To be sure, we know the democrats' deceitful word "equality," which in the final analysis actually terminates in suppression!

The struggling, past and present, of capitalism against capitalism, democracy against democracy, has caused the slogans of "international capital," of the fraternalization of

\[1\]Compare this statement to Der Tonwille (I): "The Mission of the German Genius."

\[+\]A leadership that is more depraved than anyone sitting behind bars.
nations, to be branded as lies. Likewise, the opposition during the war of workers against workers conclusively revealed the lie of the "international proletariat." The masses are told they were victorious, and they believe it. But the masses can never be victorious. In every region and for all time, they remain perpetual sleepers, a humus variously discolored merely by the climate. Of course, the masses have been given their right to vote (circenses), but the fact remains that the millions of Chinese, millions of Indians, millions of Germans, English, and French, together with the thousands of populist lackeys are less than one Chinese, one Indian, one German, Englishman, or Frenchman. To become an effective body, be the purpose noble or evil, they need the direction of individuals (for example, Ghandi or Khemal-Pascha). Alas, the courtiers of the common people! More disgusting than anything is the fact that lackeys do not recognize the truth themselves and only mislead the masses. (Isaiah: "My dear people, those who praise and extol you, cheat you.") Quite honestly they take delight in their management craft, quite like the conductor in performances of inferior works: even if the listener is worn down by boredom or disgust, the conductor beats time and thus feels occupied and pleasantly distracted. In the face of such uselessness of the masses and populist sycophancy, must not the impelled secret diplomacy, lying to the parliament and ultimately deceiving the people, be worse than it could have been under the monarchs?

In its errors and lies, democracy stubbornly refuses to recognize its transgressions against nature and culture. Even though nature has established prenatal evolutions for humans, the populist lackey explains the evolutions of a democratic person are unnecessary: he is, and continues to be, complete, infallible, and even without synthesis, an artwork of the universe. If culture, through the mouth of one of its greatest spokesmen, Goethe, preaches as the meaning of life: "perish and come to be," then, in contrast, the populist
lackey preaches that first and foremost a person rises in the
world when he, as a consequence of democratic beliefs,
foresakes in school and society every connection with his fore-
fathers. The democrat will not accept the fact that there
truly are more heavenly miracles than western skepticism and
relativism can imagine. Because it is mentioned in the Bible,
he has long since lost the wonderment of the miracle of cre-
ation as it is proclaimed. He sees only himself and the work
of his hands and his calculation; he has nothing at all to say
of God—not even as the maker of so many enigmatic works. In
the worthless school of the West, the modern democrat has
learned to avoid speaking of God, just as he prefers to be
silent about men of genius. All that is left to him is the
commercial transaction and the fist, a sort of "spiritual pow-
der"—just don't ask about the attractiveness of the spirit
when the powder has been blown away!

When worldly wisdom as expressed by Goethe—to continue
with this noble witness of culture—proclaims the praise of
"activity," the populist lackey relates it only to the worker's
clanched fist, presumably the only one that is usefully cre-
ative. If Goethe leads his Wilhelm Meister from noble hobbies
to a useful profession, democracy, in contrast, leads its ad-
herents from professions which they could carry out better, at
least honestly, to tasks and occupations for which they are
unsuited. Yet, how their impulse contradicts Goethe's words:

The most sensible situation arises when everyone
works at the craft for which he is suited and trained,
and when he does not prevent others from doing their
best. Let the cobbler stick to his last, the farmer
to his plow, and let the prince know how to govern.
This, too, is a calling that must be learned, one
that should not be undertaken by anyone who does not
understand it.

The disdain for any work other than that carried out by a
professed Marxist has even led to granting the Marxist the
right to do nothing, and this is rewarded at the expense of
the work of women and clerical workers. Have we not reached
the point where the worker misuses his free time for profit-seeking and other vices, so that, in the last analysis, he is indifferent to work? If in Goethe's "Torquato Tasso" the prince significantly regards Antonio and Tasso as equals, then the democrat takes the matter more lightly: in his state he simply removes the intellectual as one would a troublesome blackhead.

In the mind of the delusional democrat one fact is certain: human progress can only come about through western democracy. To prove his cultural capacity, the democrat attaches himself to the genius. But how? Unhesitatingly he "acknowledges indebtedness," for example to Goethe (as has recently happened) although Goethe has clearly said:

My works cannot become popular and whoever thinks and strives for that is in error. They are not written for the masses but only for the individuals who strive for similar goals and search in similar directions.

The democrat simply has no inkling of the fact that just as a sound reverberates from a wall, so does the genius from the wall of the masses--but does the wall realize it? He considers, rather, that the accession to genius is about as simple as a contact, at one's pleasure, through plug points. He cannot see that, on the contrary, only proper conception, consequently organic profundity, is the precondition for an assimilation of genius. No more than it occurs to a foolish schoolboy, who in school has not learned to understand Homer, to draw inferences about himself, rather than just about Homer (or his teacher), does it occur to the democrat to draw inferences about humanity, a perpetually foolish schoolboy, as it were, when he learns nothing in the school of the geniuses. To the average man, problem posing and solving is never for the genius to do, but only for another person like himself. Therefore he believes he "makes progress" when he has merely run off as many democratic brain-storms as possible, when he has seen as many countries and peoples as possible, in short, when he has only superficially viewed the greatest possible succession of things. In
this sense, he sees "progress" rush forward and rush past him, man by man, second by second, thing by thing, more quickly than, in reality, even the geniuses are able to behold in millennia. He probably considers the metropolitan horses of today to be more advanced than horses of the Middle Ages or Antiquity simply because the former do not shy in front of a trolley.

With respect to music, the populist lackey knows positively that its salvation can come only from the "people" and never from individual geniuses. The fact that the inept have damaged the pure tone-material (the art of voice leading and harmony) to the point that not even a second-rate quality is attainable anymore (as it once was in the strata below the genius), escapes his understanding. In short, we are living in an epoch that future historians will designate as truly asinine, an epoch whose relationship to art, I repeat, is totally hostile.

* * *

[xii] When we see that humanity, in general, does not lack dedication but continually dedicates itself with greater perseverance and thoroughness to the goals of the illusory rather than the real, then, capriciously we are tempted to wish for a Jacques Offenbach to dispel the present-day insanity by dragging all the idols of the West, and their German imitations, along with Marx and his comrades, to the stage of the operetta in order to expose them to general ridicule. To free themselves from the enslavement of the incompetent West, the German people, of course, might have a nobler method. What if the German townsman and worker, after dismissing their superfluous and ruinous lackeys (having granted them unemployment compensation) would band together to become performing musicians, and under the baton of a chosen director, would play the last movement of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony with the power of thirty million resounding toward the West until the people there, stirred by
the German genius, gratefully kissed every hand and offered thanks that a German had opened the parlor to them. But, since we live in a totally degenerate world in which, due to German treason, the *capitis diminutio maxima* of the supermerchants has unfortunately not come about, we must show patience with such charming whims.

Big business and the power politics of the West have appropriated the task of rebuilding and rectifying the world they have trampled and soiled. Due to his limited perspective, the supermerchant intends to "cure man's endless woe, so thousandfold, at one stroke," namely, through commerce. He does not understand that although commerce may lead to prosperity, it affords only the means to the goods, but never yields the goods themselves, just as a rich man can attain only the means for his amusement, not the goods, and therefore never that feeling of well being which is guaranteed only by the possession of intellectual goods donated by the geniuses. As always, the rich stole religions from the poor, who are richer in humanity and spirit, in order to be able to retain their possessions for themselves alone as "brothers" among brothers; thus the rich man of today, townsman as well as worker, may wish to join the church of the intellect in a superficial manner for his self-protection. But, this has always been an empty self-deception and will prove itself, as such, once more today. Commerce certainly does not rebuild. Just as it brings about most of the wars, it continues, after a peaceful respite, to crave people and land to rob, because it is not its nature to be content with the exchange of goods alone. Imperialism calls forth scorn upon national independence and free commerce.

Commerce involves profit and egoism and is therefore the mortal enemy of culture. Culture requires a person to accept the matter as more enduring than his own ego, to entrench himself in it but not put himself before it in order to perpetuate himself and thereby gain immortality. Thus, it is precisely through commerce that culture, mankind's real immor-
tality, is threatened, the after-life of the genius, the true link to posterity, is jeopardized, and the path to the profound is blocked.

* * *

As the only nurse in the emergency, the only means of reconstruction, mankind must praise art: From it, and by it, let mankind learn to bridle the chaos that lurks everywhere, bridling it through selection and synthesis.

I remind the reader of what I said in the first volume with regard to the essence of tonality: there would be no scale if we had not left the path of raw nature and added to the progression of pure fifths an artificial one, the diminished fifth between the VII and IV scale-degrees. There, the disciples of mankind’s utopias have been seated for hundreds of years, townsman and worker, snob with snob, enthusiastically applauding masterworks that could have come into this world only because the false fifth was used: But, do they think that they can get by without a false fifth in the synthesis of a state, and do they expect their product to appear more suitable and complete than yesteryear's synthesis? They are mistaken. Posterity will certainly admire yesterday's tritone-tainted synthesis of the state more than the presumably natural and yet so deceitful fabrications of today. Schopenhauer remarked:

In general, we might even hypothesize that justice is analogous in nature to certain chemical substances which cannot be described in their purity and isolation, but at best, only with a trifling additive that serves as a base or gives them the necessary consistency (for example, florine, alcohol, and hydrocyanic acid, among others), and that, accordingly, justice, if it is to take hold and prevail in the real world, needs a trifling admixture of decree and authority in order, not withstanding its merely ideal (and therefore aesthetic) nature, to endure and be effective in this real and material world without evaporating and rushing into the heavens, as it happened in Hesiod. We may regard as such a necessary chemical basis or alloy every birthright, all inheritable priv-
ileges, every state religion, and many other things, because only with a truly confirmed foundation of this kind can justice assert itself and consistently operate. It is then, so to speak, the ὅσι μοι ὠν σῷ [Show me where to stand (and I will move the earth)] of justice.

In art, mankind may observe the steady, natural development of phenomena in the bosom of a few basic laws and may learn to rely more on the strength of the effects in themselves than on the whims of a low-caste humanity which believes that with every new movement of the hand or mouth it can, and indeed must, create new laws. To the extent that basic laws come to light in two-part composition, I have explained them in Kontrapunkt I. Now, tying in with the content of the previous volume, I will present the picture of the further development.

In three-voice texture, consonance extends to 5 3 6. The intervals 5 and 6 signify the boundaries of consonance beyond which composition in four or more parts does not reach (see below, p. 1). The fifth is the boundary drawn from nature; the sixth is a derived concept.

Anchored in the concept 5 3 is also the root-propensity of the lowest tone; it reveals the inclination of each lowest tone to be primarily a root (p. 9).

In three-part composition the outer-voice structure becomes the bearer of the fundamental two-part composition. Consequently, the extension of two-part composition dominates the three-voice texture, and the better it manages to tilt the contention between three-voice texture and outer structure in favor of the latter, the finer the voice leading will be (p. 5).

Three-voice texture automatically entails the need to differentiate between an open and close position (p. 27). Even if the distinction exists only in the consciousness, advantages for voice leading can be gained from it.
The introduction of the $6^\frac{3}{2}$ chord stimulates its own new questions and possibilities (p. 40).

The accession of a third voice often requires the use of nonparallel direct motion if harm to other important properties of the voice leading are to be avoided. The basic prohibition of such successions in two-part composition suffers no discontinuance but is, so to speak, reconciled through other effects. Consequently, the tone-society withstands the evidence of necessity, and the bad effect of an unjustified license only reaffirms the urgency of the prohibition (p. 29).

Since, at the conclusion of a melodic line, only two leading tones are accepted and others are unthinkable, the third voice can do nothing but reach for a tone that is not a leading tone. This third tone ought to complete the harmony. Under certain circumstances, it has to be the root that we recognize in free composition as the V-degree. Beyond that, however, it is not extended the right to disturb the leading-tone laws and in that way the tone-society (pp. 47 and 67).

Within the compass of three-voice texture, the disposition of the passing tone exhibits new depths and extensions. The dissonant passing tone in the lower voice immediately refers beyond the scale-degree by fixing the consonant starting point in our consciousness for the duration of the passing movement (p. 58). The expansion with respect to harmony occasionally turns consonant stepwise movements into seeming consonant passing tones and neighboring tones (p. 62). The fixation on the more pronounced harmony of the downbeat permits us to become aware of the "fourth-space" (p. 73); also, the possible rhythmical forms of the neighboring tone become more evident (p. 78). Accordingly, the concept of composing-out makes a significant advance (p. 59). With the passing tones, the "nodal points" of the third become noticeable (p. 59), and the neighboring tone leads to the concept of substitution (p. 76).
species combinations effectively show further extensions of the passing tone concept: a regular dissonant passing tone can also carry a skip along with it—thus the skipping passing tone arises (p. 177). With the conduct of two counterpoints in half or quarter notes, voice-exchange is found for the first time (p. 175), and with the coupling of two counterpoints in different values (half and quarter notes), the use of passing tones may occasion a dissonant confrontation on the upbeat that truly extends the concept of passing motion (p. 188). But, the experience that brings us closest to free composition occurs when simultaneously developing passing tones find themselves in a sort of special obligatory two-part construction, that is to say, when, for the sake of proper clarity, the consonances generally take care of their relationship (p. 176). When a three and four-part setting includes two or three counterpoints in second species, this quite frequently leads to formations that must be regarded as the spirit of the passing tone disposition (p. 180). Just as the downbeats must have recourse to consonance within the compass of the cantus firmus lessons, so [xvi] must the passing tones on the upbeat. And in the distance we already glimpse the concept of the passing harmonies of free composition, which are to be understood as entities, but without detriment to their passing function. Often they proceed as consonances when they fulfill a dissonant conception.

Composition in three or more parts brings us closer to the distinction between the true 9 - 8, or 4 - 3 suspensions and the other equivocal syncopations that may sometimes signify suspensions but not always, a distinction that demands total vigilance in free composition (p. 84). Although the expansion with respect to harmony brings new intervallic support to the syncopations of two-part writing, the unity of the syncopations remains intact (p. 99). In the species combinations, this unity permits us to achieve freer syncopation resolutions as well as new syncopation formulations that liberate the seventh-chord (p. 205). If, with the latter, it is evident
that the upbeat (resolution of a dissonant structure, notwithstanding) provides more independence than an upbeat with true suspensions, then, finally, we come to appreciate the "tying-over" as a purely rhythmic phenomenon. Logically, this realization impels us to use also the tying-over of dissonant passing tones or neighboring tones more in the service of passing movement than simply as an end in itself. If this occurs in simplest fashion with stationary bass tones (in free composition these can be omitted), then we have gained the first access to the organ point (p. 248).

The next, concluding volume of Theorien will have to describe the further developments, recognizing the tremendous breadth they have been given exclusively by the German musical geniuses. As I mentioned previously, several of my works have addressed the question of synthesis, and the "Entwurf einer neuen Formenlehre" already announced to the readers will treat it comprehensively. From the sum of these works one can formulate a picture of the art—how, in itself, it rests, grows, and despite the endlessness of the phenomena, again establishes boundaries by means of selection and synthesis. Oh, may it not be begrudged to humanity to grasp, by way of music's euphony, the exalted meaning of selection and synthesis, and to fashion, according to the laws of artistic synthesis, every earthly tie—state, marriage, love, friendship—into true works of art!
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SECTION THREE

THREE-PART COMPOSITION

Semper idem, sed non eodem modo.

CHAPTER 1

FIRST SPECIES: NOTE AGAINST NOTE

GENERAL COMMENTS

§ 1. In Three-Part Composition, the Two-Part Basis of Voice Leading Remains in Effect.

Even three-part composition is restrained by the primary principles of two-part composition. It is as if we were to add to two parts based on the appropriate rules, a third part, which in turn can be constructed only according to the same primary principles of two-part writing. Accordingly, we may articulate this primary principle: In three-part composition, two-part composition actually continues; thus, three-part composition is merely an extended phenomenon. Indeed, as we shall subsequently see, the extension thoroughly expresses itself in all the principles of three part composition, vertically, with regard to the basic law of consonance, and horizontally, with regard to the other basic laws of voice leading.


Inasmuch as the three tones of the setting ought to be of different pitch, the law of consonance\footnote{Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 152 ff.} automatically ties
the three-voice texture to $\frac{5}{3}$ or $\frac{6}{3}$. Thus, in the vertical aspect of three-part composition, the concept of the triad would develop merely under the weight of the law of consonance—a law first established through the voice leading of two-part composition. To be sure, this concept would develop according to the way it had already found horizontal realization, long before, in suitably constructed melodies.\footnote{Cf. Harmonielehre, page 281 ff., and Kontrapunkt I, page 26 ff.} Ever since then, the triad appears to us in two ways. The only difference, in effect, is that vertically it sounds in its total, physically perceptible sum, so to speak, whereas, the horizontal direction indirectly provides it a melodic unfolding, step by step—for this very reason it proves all the more convincing.

§ 3. Rejection of the $\frac{6}{5}$, $\frac{6}{4}$, and $\frac{5b}{3}$ Chords.

If, in the realm of three-part composition, we have now described the triad concept with $\frac{5}{3}$ and $\frac{6}{3}$, then we must necessarily reject the $\frac{6}{3}$ chord even though its two intervals are consonant with the bass. Contrapuntal experience alone teaches us that the triad, as such, can be composed of either $\frac{5}{3}$ or $\frac{6}{3}$, but not both at the same time.\footnote{In its own way, harmonic theory also offers proof of this consequence of voice-leading theory. Since it discerns the triadic "inversions" as purely derived arrangements, it automatically denies the possibility of a phenomenon that could appear as an original arrangement and an inversion at the same time.}

Yet, not even the three-
part counterpoint is able to bring about this decisive turning point. The reason for this is shown best by free composition, which illustrates how $\frac{6}{4}$ can be conceived as consonant only when it turns out to be an inversion of a triad that has functional-degree character and consequently expresses the scale-degree itself.\textsuperscript{+} Regardless of the reasons that would induce the voice leading to produce $\frac{6}{4}$ instead of $\frac{6}{3}$ or $\frac{5}{3}$, the only thing that matters here is whether the scale-degree stands behind the $\frac{6}{4}$. If this is the case, $\frac{6}{4}$ automatically ceases to act as $[3]$ a $\frac{6}{4}$ in the presence of a scale-degree, since the latter instantly transforms the $\frac{6}{4}$ into $\frac{5}{3}$ (as though the triad were simply standing on its foundation), not recognizing the fourth as the root-tone.\textsuperscript{++} This is shown by the following sketch:

Example 1.

If, however, everything that refers to scale-degrees is lacking in strict three-part counterpoint,\textsuperscript{+++] then naturally there is no possibility of hearing $\frac{6}{4}$ from the standpoint of a scale-degree. For this reason, the fourth on the bottom persists as a barrier to the perception of consonant character, both here and in two-part writing. Thus, we have to be content with the fundamental inadmissibility of the $\frac{6}{4}$ chord in three-part counterpoint. It is important to keep this in mind for the following reason: in contrast to free

\textsuperscript{+}Cf. Kontrapunkt I, Example 155.

\textsuperscript{++}If a passing $\frac{6}{4}$ chord must be evaluated only as a horizontal event because of its merely passing nature, it cannot, after all, be judged as a vertically conceived $\frac{6}{4}$ chord.

\textsuperscript{+++}See § 15, below.
composition, strict counterpoint is not yet in a position to acknowledge vertically aligned fourths and fifths as fully equivalent.

But, how the fourth-space is able to reveal itself already in strict counterpoint (through the filling-in with passing tones in the horizontal alignment), and thus to prepare the way for the final extension that is reserved to free composition—the extension that culminates (at least under certain circumstances) in a recognition of the complete equivalence of the fourth and the fifth even in vertical alignment—all this may be found in subsequent chapters.

Finally, the fact that a triad with a diminished fifth is also forbidden in strict three-part counterpoint, for example:

Example 2.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textbf{Example 2.}} \\
\text{\textbf{Example 2.}} \\
\text{\textbf{Example 2.}} \\
\end{array}
\]

is now sufficiently substantiated by the law of consonance that is present here through extension. There is no contradiction of this prohibition if, in \( \frac{6}{3} \), the diminished fifth or the augmented fourth is permitted in the upper voices:

Example 3.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textbf{Example 3.}} \\
\text{\textbf{Example 3.}} \\
\text{\textbf{Example 3.}} \\
\end{array}
\]

[4] for within these arrangements there are intervals (i.e.,

\[\text{\textbf{\textsuperscript{+To be sure, the fourth is given free reign in the horizontal alignment; cf., Kontrapunkt I, page 111.}}}

\[\text{\textbf{\textsuperscript{++Cf. also, Kontrapunkt I, page 158.}}}

\]
the thirds and sixths) that satisfy the law of consonance. To be sure, if the scale-degrees could be revealed in strict three-part counterpoint, then, without a doubt, their thrust would be able to justify the existence of the diminished triad, here, as well as in free composition. In the last analysis, it is only the lack of the scale-degrees that prevents the diminished triad from being regarded as one of the consonances (or as consonant to the triads encountered) in strict three-part counterpoint. Another wording, which will serve here as a dovetail to the theory of free composition, offers the same conclusion: strict counterpoint is not yet generally acquainted with the freedom of movement for the diminished fifth that, in free composition, becomes absolutely necessary, due to the scale-degree, on the one hand, or a passing movement (such as passing harmony) on the other.

§ 4. Triad Completeness as a Primary Requisite of Three-part Composition.

The very nature of three-voice texture++ demands that each of the three tones furnishes a different pitch or, put another way, that, if possible, each tone of the cantus firmus becomes part of a complete \( \frac{5}{3} \) or \( \frac{6}{3} \) triad.

Because it is able, from the outset, to influence the imagination in the execution of a lesson, the law of triad completeness--established for the first time here in three-part composition--proves to be an entirely new driving force of the voice leading+++-one that decisively appends itself to the other musical impulses of three-part composition.

++Perhaps as VII in major or II in minor; cf., Der freie Satz, the theory of free composition.(*2)

++Cf. § 2, above.

+++Cf. Der freie Satz, the section dealing with musical causalities.
We shall explain later how strict three-part counterpoint, without detriment to all this, seems, nevertheless, the better crafted the more finished the two-part structure of the outer voices appears. Also, it will be possible, for the first time, to show how the effect expresses itself differently with the triad postulate of strict counterpoint on the one hand, and the scale-degree postulate of free composition on the other, although in free composition again, as always, only the two-part structure of the outer voices remains in the foreground despite all the expenditure on scale-degrees and extended laws.


Often enough it is the voice leading which makes impossible the realization of the complete three-part texture at every sonority because it is already bound by the reality of the cantus firmus† and through this by the laws in effect in two-part composition. Between the exigency of triad completeness and the laws of voice leading a reciprocal action persists, so that only the reconciliation of the two forces represents, in truth, the essence of three-part composition.

§ 6. Triad Incompleteness as the Result of the Reconciliation.

Because of this reconciliation, usage may (and must) be extended in three-part composition not only to $\frac{5}{3}$ and $\frac{6}{3}$, but also to chords that lack completeness. Although these various harmonies have significant differences for use in free composition (as it will be shown later), in strict counterpoint they are still conceived only as chords in themselves, that is, exclusively according to the intervals predicted by the voice leading. As such, they have no specific designation as in harmony instruction where we talk about the six or six-four chord.

†Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 26 ff.
It is totally sufficient for voice-leading instruction if we, due to the urgency of triad completeness, dispense with the distinguishing symbols and divide the chords simply into the complete and the incomplete.


The addition of the third voice automatically calls for the distinction of high, middle, and low. When our ear involuntarily turns to the top and bottom boundaries of the composition, thus to the high and low voices, this lies simply in the nature of the matter and needs no particular explanation. The attraction of the outer voices naturally demands that we pay particular attention to their composition and carry it out in the best possible fashion, just as in a two-part composition. This is the meaning of the formula already expressed in § 1. It will be brought here to its final precision if we add the following: the two outer voices are to be regarded as the primary bearers of the two-part composition that continues in three-part composition.

Yet, with this demand we do not recommend always setting a three-part composition as if it were first planned as a two-part composition waiting to be filled in by a middle voice. Rather, the student should understand the statement only as an acknowledgement that he must be as careful here in the conduct of the outer voices as in a good two-part composition. Indeed, the same thing applies even when the cantus firmus is placed in the middle voice, where it is apparently in a position to counter this demand and where the realization is constrained by the guidance of the three-voice concept. As for the outer-voice structure, its method of achievement is unimportant as long as it exhibits that conduct we desire in a good two-part composition.

[6] Yet, with this demand we do not recommend always setting a three-part composition as if it were first planned as a two-part composition waiting to be filled in by a middle voice. Rather, the student should understand the statement only as an acknowledgement that he must be as careful here in the conduct of the outer voices as in a good two-part composition. Indeed, the same thing applies even when the cantus firmus is placed in the middle voice, where it is apparently in a position to counter this demand and where the realization is constrained by the guidance of the three-voice concept. As for the outer-voice structure, its method of achievement is unimportant as long as it exhibits that conduct we desire in a good two-part composition.

[+] See § 4, above.
It is clear that when the cantus firmus lies in one of the outer voices, its flowing character alone will be beneficial to the totality of the two-voice outer structure. Yet, the learner should not be deceived by the advantage inherent in this situation and should not rashly consider it a merit of his voice leading. He has a better chance of achieving merit when the cantus firmus is in the middle voice and the outer voices are written in a good, two-part counterpoint.

The mystery of the outer voices gains new, heightened significance in free composition, where, from its opposite world, the scale-degree casts a special light on their corporeality by causing them to be recognized, mysteriously, as only two upper voices of a lower, imagined third voice (the scale-degree).

In older literature we now and again find the designation "filling interval," yet the authors seem to have understood this designation only superficially and not as they should have, that is, according to the profundity of the outer voice problem.

§ 8. The Reaction of the Outer-Voice Intervals to the Triad Possibilities in General.

Considering the significance of the two-voice outer structure defined in the previous paragraph, we must now recommend making it the starting point of our investigation when we discuss the triad possibilities of three-part composition in general. In any case, such a procedure is more suitable than one that investigates the triad possibilities alone without considering the background. Therefore, in the following paragraphs the triad possibilities will be described and tested according to the intervals of the outer voices. To that end, we shall demonstrate how each interval of the series behaves in three-part texture.

This investigation will be more decisively influenced, however, by the fact that where there are several possibilities
(as in this instance), these possibilities, through their effects, counter each other, in the sense that a better possibility, which is always available, automatically suppresses those that are worse. On several occasions in two-part composition I have alluded to this viewpoint in the criticism of an accepted position in the light of other possibilities.† Now, it is obvious that the more convincingly the causal relationships prepare the ear for what is to come, the more easily it can detect hidden possibilities. Therefore, in two-part composition it is rather difficult to deduce from a departing harmony the following harmony since it is possible to set several consonances to the given tone. The choice is determined almost exclusively by the law of the flowing line. In two-part composition the guidance for the upcoming consonance proceeds from a very flimsy source, i.e., from the feeling for the total line, and because there is still so little causality, we perceive all of them as being vaguely possible. In three-part composition the causalities assert themselves more strongly. Here, there are three voices to delineate the succession, and in consequence of that, as long as the laws of consonance and voice leading are respected, we are granted, from the very start, a measure of latitude. This, then, is the essential content of that causal strength of three-voice texture, which, as I mentioned in § 4, originates in three-part composition. But the more we are able to measure the latitude of the possibilities, the more clearly we can understand the hidden ones. Thus, it turns out that in each situation of three-part composition not only the immediately given voice leading comes to our attention, that is, the one that is actually carried out, but also several others which, just because they are possible, help us decide whether the one applied is really the best of the possibilities.

†Cf. Kontrapunkt I, pages 118, 131, 277 ff.
Naturally, the greater causality that results in four-part composition (due to the increased number of voices), will alert the ear to the hidden possibilities even more effectively than in three-part composition and will provide a yardstick for the criticism of a given voice leading. To be sure, this capacity of the ear to perceive feasible voice leadings, achieves its full acuity only in free composition where the world of causality is enriched by the scale-degrees.

[8] If inferior composers would only understand how, behind the setting they offer, a well-trained musical ear can hear several other settings that are better, then, ultimately, they, too, would finally begin to believe in the validity of the principles that not only display themselves when a greater master brings his designs to fruition by means of revisions, but also when a knowledgeable artist judges compositions that are badly constructed. Surely, it is high time to do away with the delusion that in music everything is good just as written and that only taste determines the effect of the music. There is no need here for pride, no need for denial: there is poorly written music just as there are poorly written essays and poorly built houses.  

---

2In everyday life we do not accept a situation simply as it confronts us but we evaluate it on the basis of other possible solutions that might apply to it. For example, a frail old man enters a streetcar and cannot find a seat; young, healthy travelers see this but pay no attention. With this lack of consideration one solution is already given, but we judge the latter in the light of other possible solutions and therefore condemn the behavior of the youthful travelers. We see that, in the world of ethics as in the world of tones, there is a thing like voice leading, by which an implemented solution is judged in comparison to possible better solutions.

In the middle of a three-part composition, the outer voices rarely come together in a unison. However, considering the fact that the outer structure has at its disposal intervals that are more favorable (8, 5, 3, 6), such a unison would require us to repeat the comment offered earlier with respect to two-part composition: in the middle of a composition the unison always creates an overly empty effect.

§ 10.--B) With an Octave in the Outer Voices.

Naturally, an octave in the outer voices causes the triad affected by it to be incomplete.

The addition of one of the perfect consonances would lead to $\frac{8}{1}, \frac{5}{5}, \frac{8}{8}$. These sonorities suffer not only from the incompleteness caused by the octave but also from the fact that in this situation an especially useless effect is inherent in the interval connected with it, that is, that of the unison or the fifth. For, directly with 8, the unison must be rejected because of the empty effect, just as it must also be rejected, for the same reason, in the outer voices. The same can be said for the $\frac{8}{5}$.

Being such a limited entity, the open fifth with 8 is also too crass. This is why $\frac{8}{5}$ must be rejected in the middle of a three-part composition. But, with $\frac{8}{3}, \frac{8}{6}$ (or,

---

+Cf. Kontrapunkt I, Section 2, § 23.

++With regard to the last figuration (*3), I wish to remark once and for all that such a pairing of like numbers in the course of this work is intended to illustrate the doubling of the respective intervals.

+++See the previous subsections.

three-voice texture does provide forms complimentary to the octave which, by virtue of contrast, show \( \frac{3}{5} \) to be less suitable.

\[\text{§ 11.--C) With a Fifth in the Outer Voices.}\]

Because \( \frac{5}{1} \) and \( \frac{8}{5} \) were eliminated in §§ 9 and 10, and \( \frac{6}{5} \) in § 2, a fifth in the outer voices has but one possibility left: the third as a filler, i.e., \( \frac{5}{3} \). This limitation alone verifies the "unsociability" that the fifth already disclosed in two-part composition. We must add that, in consequence of the voice-leading laws in two-part composition, it is more difficult to approach the perfect fifth than the imperfect intervals.

On the other hand, if the fifth expresses the final triad boundary of the given root, and therefore, in conformity to the law of the overtone series, only the third can subsist with the fifth, then, merely through the voice leading of three-part composition, we have in the \( \frac{5}{3} \) the perfect embodiment of a triad with a genuine root as the lowest tone.

And thus, behind the need for triad completeness, a new requisite suddenly appears, namely, the postulate of the root-propensity of the lowest tone. Actually, it is as if, in order to fulfill nature's law, each lowest tone would intend to become a \( \frac{5}{3} \) chord.++ At one with nature and, so to speak, its echo, our soul merely reflects this law, in that we have the tendency to accept root-tone value with each lowest tone. This is a rather hidden inclination that fully develops only in free composition.+++  

---

\(+\)Cf. § 12 and § 13, below.

++Concerning \( \frac{3}{5} \), see § 12, below.

But, even though it is certain that the $\frac{5}{3}$ sonority, by virtue of the fulfillment of both needs—triad completeness and the root-propensity of the lowest tone—represents, in itself, the perfect figure, and that it is capable at the same time of evoking and emphasizing complete independence as no other sonority in strict counterpoint, it is, nevertheless, advisable to avoid its exclusive use. The reasons lie embedded in the fifth itself and persist in three-part composition no less than in two-part.

§ 12.—D) With a Third in the Outer Voices.

Because of the unison, $\frac{3}{1}$ represents the least advantageous of all the complementary possibilities involving the third: $\frac{3}{1}, \frac{3}{8}, \frac{3}{5}, \frac{3}{6}, \frac{3}{2}$. The fact that $\frac{3}{5}$ guarantees the fulfillment of the root-propensity of the lowest tone just as well as $\frac{5}{3}$ is obvious.

The sonority $\frac{3}{8}$ commends itself despite the incompleteness caused by the octave. The decisive factors are these: the third, due to its origin,++ does not oppose our supposition about the root-significance of the lowest tone—if anything, it fosters it; likewise, the octave+++ offers no impediment to this supposition. Thus, with the $\frac{3}{8}$, the lowest tone has its root-propensity preserved.

With the sixth, the third combines into a complete triad in the form of $\frac{3}{2}$, one which is distinct from the $\frac{5}{3}$ by virtue of the sixth.++++

---

+ Cf. § 11.
+++ See § 10, above.
++++ See the subsections that follow.
If the third itself is doubled, we again obtain an incomplete chord whose notation I represent with $\frac{3}{3}$*. To be sure, this sonority has the advantage of the third, but, on the other hand, it also has a disadvantage. In the face of the more advantageous complimentary possibilities: $\frac{3}{5}$, $\frac{3}{6}$, $\frac{3}{8}$, which, with 5, 6, 8, offer the third more favorable counterparts, here, the third, an interval so sharply profiled, gets duplicated. Certainly, such a duplication will always be perceived as superfluous unless a strong, inevitable necessity is communicated to our consciousness by means of the previous and subsequent voice leading.

§ 13.--E) With a Sixth in the Outer Voices.

Since 6 suffers equally from the unison and the sixth, only $\frac{3}{5}$, $\frac{3}{6}$, and $\frac{3}{8}$ remain as usable combinations.

As an inversion of the third,** the sixth obviously denies the root-propensity of the lowest tone.*** Logically, this is also the case in all combinations with 6, regardless of whether the triad is complete or incomplete. Thus, three-part composition gives us the opportunity to detect the artificial and artistic charm of the $\frac{6}{3}$ chord. It is important to state that with $\frac{6}{3}$ our consciousness must overcome the initially intruding supposition about a root-propensity of the lowest tone in order to attend to the artistically absorbing task of the inversion, that is, to capture subsequently what is lost through the nonfulfillment of that supposition.

The sonority $\frac{6}{8}$ can, for all that, claim the advantage of the octave, which, indeed, illuminates the sixth better than does the doubled sixth in $\frac{6}{3}$.

---

*Cf. § 10.

**Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 114.

***Cf. § 11, above.

When we summarize the results of subsections §§ 9-13, we reach these conclusions:

In the middle, we must totally reject the sonorities $\frac{8}{5}$, $\frac{5}{1}$, as well as $\frac{8}{5}$, $\frac{5}{5}$, and $\frac{5}{5}$. We can merely tolerate $\frac{3}{3}$ and $\frac{6}{6}$. Thus, only these usable sonorities are left: $\frac{5}{3}$ and $\frac{6}{6}$, which are complete triads, $\frac{8}{3}$ and $\frac{8}{6}$, which are incomplete but include the excellent doubling of the suitably natural octave, and finally, $\frac{3}{3}$ and $\frac{6}{6}$ which are appropriate only when the need is urgent, because, instead of the octave, they use a less-desirable doubling.

When, in addition, we now gather that the third appears in four sonorities: $\frac{5}{5}$, $\frac{6}{6}$, $\frac{8}{8}$, and $\frac{3}{3}$, the sixth in only three: $\frac{6}{6}$, $\frac{6}{6}$, $\frac{8}{8}$, the octave in two: $\frac{8}{8}$ and $\frac{8}{8}$, and finally the fifth in only one: $\frac{5}{5}$, the survey provides us the most emphatic affirmation of the superiority of the third and sixth as compared [12] to the perfect consonances--a result already proclaimed in two-part composition.

No less clearly, it shows the broader possibilities for application of the third compared to the sixth, as well as that of the octave compared to the fifth, a fact which is, once again, corroborated by the experience of two-part composition.

Finally, the precariousness of the fifth in its one possible application becomes quite blatantly evident.

Now, one can understand why in § 1 I had to declare that the basic principles of two-part composition quite thoroughly continue in three-part composition.

In conclusion, I need to mention an expedient for the elementary level of composition, which, drawn from harmonic theory and seemingly only a memory aid, in actuality describes in different words what comes to light here as a purely contra-
puntal result: whether complete or incomplete, all the sonorities permissible in strict three-part counterpoint fall within the notion of only two triad confines of which the second one lies a third lower than the first. The one lying a fifth lower (Example 4c) is out of the question.

Example 4.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 5. Table VII, Fig. 1.} \\
\end{array}
\]

Fux's discussion of this question reads as follows (p. 87):

Aloysius First, we must remember that the harmonic triad should be applied in each measure if other circumstances do not prevent it.

Joseph. What is the harmonic triad?

Aloysius It is a structure consisting of the third and fifth, e.g.:

Josef. What are the circumstances that sometimes prevent the use of this triad?

Aloysius Often the improvement of the melodic line fosters the occasional use of a consonance (either the sixth or octave) other than those of the triad. Sometimes, to avoid successive fifths or octaves, we must give up the triad and use a sixth instead of a fifth or an octave (or both), as shown in the following example:

+See Examples 4a and 4b.
Example 6. Table VII, Fig. 2.

The special formulation of the first measure is explained by Fux as follows (pp. 88-89):

[Aloys.] Have you overlooked the fact that in this example the bass ascends consistently by step? For that reason, the other voices must be far enough above the bass to provide room for them to move toward each other in contrary motion.

Fux thus emphasizes the need to prevent possible voice-leading difficulties by means of a suitable formulation of the first measure.

However, he is not content with only this one explanation, and offers two other possibilities for the above example in order to verify very thoroughly its first design:

Example 7. Table VII, Fig. 10.

Example 8. Table VII, Fig. 11.
With regard to the first of these examples Fux remarks (p. 89):

[Aloys.] I do not reject these examples totally, but you should see that in the first example all three voices ascend from the first to the second measure, partly by step and partly by skip. Indeed, this course can hardly avoid an error such as the demeaning one that occurs here between the tenor and alto in measures 1-2.

Here, the nonparallel direct progression to the fifth is to be avoided by means of the voice leading shown in Example 6 (Table VII, Fig. 2). With regard to the second example, Fux states (p. 92):

[Aloys.] There is nothing further to say except that the ascending sixths on the downbeats sound somewhat harsh. Sixths on the upbeats (which have no place in this species) are more bearable because they seem less intense. . . . (*4)

Contrary to the fact that in Example 6 (Table VII, Figure 2) a complete 2 triad could have been applied in the second measure, for example:

Example 9. Table VII, Fig. 3.

he finds it necessary to explain [88]:

[Aloys.] Your idea is quite pleasing to me, and your example cannot be rejected. However, who does not see that the first—that is, my example—is more natural, more orderly, and shows more variety? It conforms to nature and order because the tenor gracefully descends by step to the third measure . . . (*5)

And now I must return . . . (*6) to the reasons why my example has more variety. In my example [Table VII, Fig. 8], the note a occurs only once in the tenor. In your example, however, it is found twice . . . (*7)

*Cf. § 22, below.
Once and for all, I want to admonish you to take great care to have this sort of variety.

Here, the master just as effectively calls attention to the hidden, seemingly irrelevant drive of the voice leading, as to the fact that the right to a flowing melody must be preserved even for a middle voice, or that it must be spared monotony, in the broadest sense of the word. In addition, Fux's contrasting of the two examples may serve the learner as the strongest proof of the statements made in § 8 above, how actually only one given solution in a particular situation has a good effect that is, therefore, beautiful, if it withstands comparison with other possible solutions. But this presupposes also that the latter are present in our perception.

Elsewhere, Fux speaks of other reasons why we can and may occasionally use incomplete triads. Here is where the prohibition belongs that was already stated in Section I, Chapter 2, § 2: "... (*8) one is not permitted to transgress the limits of the staff unless it is absolutely necessary." Furthermore, he refers to the embarrassing situation caused by the cantus firmus in certain lessons (p. 95): "If the need to follow the cantus firmus had not limited my compositional freedom, I believe the composition could have been enriched in many places by the harmonic triad." With hints more than words, Fux speaks (particularly with regard to two-part composition) of the imperfect consonances in contrast to the perfect++ [p. 66]: "You should know that imperfect consonances are more harmonious than the perfect ones... (*9)

In the case of the 6 chord, Fux obviously does not consider whether the fourth is perfect or augmented. Yet, he belatedly gives the basis for this usage in reference to four-part composition where he says (p. 109):

[Aloys.] We must remember that the character of consonance and dissonance is measured according to the disposition of the bass regardless of what occurs in the middle parts, so long as mistakes such as the succession of two fifths or two octaves are avoided.

Compare to that the statement on page 116 (with regard to syncopation in four-part composition):

(*10) ... you must know that the fourth in the middle voices is either not taken into consideration, or it acts as a substitute for an imperfect consonance.

+Cf. Kontrapunkt I, Section 2, § 21.
++Cf. § 14, above.
I wish to emphasize that Fux uses no distinctive designations. His only technical term is "harmonic triad," or abbreviated, "triad," whose meaning is explained above. Even designations like "incomplete" or "imperfect" chord* are foreign to him. He is so strongly influenced by contrapuntal thinking that to him everything means voice leading. As far as its needs are concerned, every further distinction appears superfluous. It does not contradict his viewpoint when he talks about a particular sonority as he does on page 93 with regard to 3: "Afterwards, the tenor merges with the bass in a unison, which contributes less to the harmony than the octave does." Finally, we should remark that since its appearance, Fux's example, Table VII, Figure 2 (Example 6), has made the rounds through all the counterpoint textbooks. No matter whether the authors acknowledge it to be the old master's or not (as is the case with Cherubini), they use it again and again to explain the principles of voice leading in three-part composition.

Albrechtsberger uses the following technical terms with regard to three-part composition (p. 79 ff.):++

When the perfect fifth and the major or minor third are added to the fundamental tone, the combination is the harmonically perfect triad, called trias harmonica perfecta. When, with a minor or major sixth, a minor or major third is added to the fundamental tone, it is an imperfect harmonic triad, trias harmonica imperfecta... (*11)

From his own examples we can glean that he conceives all accords that contain 8, 5, and 3 as "perfect" (with 6 the only exception!) no matter whether they are otherwise complete or incomplete. In the latter case, he speaks also about a "doubled dyad in three-voice texture" (or a "doubled triad in four-voice texture") which are all good and permissible for avoiding mistakes."

These technical terms prove Albrechtsberger's strong feeling for the different value of the fifth and sixth from a purely contrapuntal viewpoint. Indeed, his conception of [16] the perfect triad already expresses a suspicion that, in contrast to the sixth, the third confirms a supposition regarding the root-propensity of the lowest tone in the case of the complete 3 chord.+++

---

* Cf. below, in Albrechtsberger's comments.
++ Cf. also, page 26.
+++ Cf. §11 and §12, above.
On page 78 Albrechtsberger remarks:

The chords of the second, fourth, seventh, and ninth, as well as those marked N.B. in these examples, cannot be used in first species because they are all dissonant. Here, and in four-part composition, only the two perfect chords and triads of the sixth can be employed in any key—the sixth, however, must not be augmented or diminished. The $\frac{4}{3}$, $\frac{5}{4}$, and the dominant seventh chord, $b^7$, are also excluded here.

Besides this, Albrechtsberger furnishes a detailed table of all possible three-voice sonorities that are used only in free composition, but as so often before, without the faintest attempt to explain why a particular triad is permitted in strict counterpoint, while a far greater number are reserved only for free composition. If, as his presentation discloses, he wanted to keep the teaching of strict counterpoint in the immediate vicinity of free composition, he has, on the contrary, pursued the riddle of how strict counterpoint is to be allied with free composition, without knowing how to find a solution for it. Even if we do not accept his contrasting of the phenomena of free and strict composition as a solution to the riddle without benefit of an explanation, we must regard it as his solution. That is the reason why he finally explains (p. 81): "By the way, the remaining measures contain only the following chords: $5$ and $6$, or $8$, $8$, or $10$, $6$, when the latter are not leading tones."

Along with Fux's examples (see above), Cherubini also repeats his instruction, the only difference being that Cherubini speaks of a "complete triad" instead of a "perfect triad." As for the prohibition against $6$, he deals with this in Rule 6 on page 29.

Bellermann follows Fux quite strictly inasmuch as he insists on reserving the concept of triad exclusively for $3$. To be sure, in the course of his work he cites all of the doublings, but he avoids—again, totally following Fux's thought—tying the question to one certain solution. Without offering any proof, he finally explains (p. 190 ff.):

---

+Pages 75-77.

++Page 27, Rule I, Examples 81 and 82.

+++With regard to the incomplete chord, see $\S$ 18, below.
Of those combinations in which the bass note is
doubled by the octave (he means $\frac{8}{3}$, $\frac{8}{5}$, $\frac{8}{7}$), the three
last-named (whereby he understands $\frac{10}{3}$ ($=\frac{6}{3}$), $\frac{6}{3}$, and $\frac{12}{5}$)
ought to be preferred.

Bellermann does not object to doubling by means of the
unison, provided that it offers a more favorable departure.+

§ 15. The Dissimilar Meaning of the Sonorities in
Strict and Free Composition.

[17] The fact that three-part composition is fuller in
sound than two-part composition makes it seem—at least at
first glance—to approach free composition. No doubt, even
in listening to a short three-part lesson,++ we tend to hear
various scale-degrees in its consonant sonorities. Apparent
cadences as well as real ones become especially evident to our
ear; when linked with the sixth as an interval inversion, these
awaken various associations of free composition (e.g., sus-
pensions or passing tones.)

Nevertheless, this tendency is explained very simply,
for in all the compositions we listen to, we never hear
"strict counterpoint" in the sense of mere lessons, but only
in an actual free composition founded on scale-degrees. There-
fore, due to such familiarity with scale-degrees, we auto-
matically develop the capacity for making connections and com-
parisons which then stays with us and reawakens whenever we
encounter anything musical, even if it should only be a lesson
in strict counterpoint. It is all the more difficult to
account for the reasons that cause us to view the earlier
tendency, in retrospect, only as an error. From the stand-

---

+ Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 298.

++ Cf. the lessons below and compare them to Harmonielehre, page 198 ff., the chapter entitled "Scale-degrees and Counterpoint."
point of the scale-degrees, it is the evident antagonism toward meaning and purpose in the progression of the harmonies that speaks against the presumption of scale-degrees. For, as we know, the scale-degrees are subject more to nature than to art. From the former they receive their originally prescribed course, and therefore a deliberate simplicity in the chord progression, typical in strict counterpoint, is entirely inconsistent with the essence of a genuine degree-progression.

The final reason why the three-voice texture in strict counterpoint cannot progress to the full effect of scale-degrees is that the given cantus firmus, as the foundation of the voice-leading lesson, essentially composes-out a triad (under certain circumstances, several triads), that is to say, in it (even though in a horizontal line) a previously fixed harmonic sonority is apparent.++

Already in two-part composition the fixed nature of the cantus firmus causes certain consequences, for example, the counterpoint shows signs of subordination. Similarly, these consequences also show up in three-part composition since the vertical sounds must subordinate their individual meaning to the reality of the horizontal sounds. The horizontal harmony proves to be stronger than the reciprocal relations of the vertical sonorities. This effect, which is brought to our attention first by three-part composition—the first occasion in which three-voice texture displays its content and corporeality with regard to scale-degrees—appears like a red thread through all similar manifestations in both strict and free composition, as I will show in the

---

+I already proposed this argument in Harmonielehre, page 200.

++For example, f-a-c in Fux's cantus firmus (see below, Lesson 1; in addition, cf., Kontrapunkt I, pages 133-134 and 140-141.

+++Cf. Harmonielehre, page 197.
course of the discussion. We may, therefore, express as a major principle:

Every fixed melodic line weakens the individual significance of vertically expressed chords, in the same measure that it, itself, presents the horizontal unfolding of a specific chord.

Later I will show in more detail how this recognition helps to strengthen and deepen the concept of scale-degrees, as well as the concept of the forms.

For the reasons just presented, I consider Fux's pertinent omissions made in measures 3 and 4 of Example 6 (Table VII, Figure 2) to be confusing. They totally contradict his own, otherwise thoroughly developed, teaching. N.B., the following quote refers directly to Figure 9 (% 14):

(*12) . . . in which a sixth appears. When the note mi stands in the bass, it prefers the sixth to other consonances, as I stated previously and intend to clarify again. Let us look at this example of the sixth:

Example 10. Table VII, Fig. 4.

Here, the note forming the sixth stands, as it were, in an unusual place outside its proper setting. In its regular position, it would appear thus:

Example 11. Table VII, Fig. 5.

+Page 88.
The C, occurring in its normal position, constitutes the harmonic triad. If it stands an octave higher and the other parts remain, a sixth must result. But, this only makes sense if mi is followed by fa, as in this example:

Example 12. Table VII, Fig. 6.

\[ \text{Example 12. Table VII, Fig. 6.} \]

If, however, the mi goes elsewhere, then we have to take the fifth rather than the sixth, as in the following example:

Example 13. Table VII, Fig. 7.

\[ \text{Example 13. Table VII, Fig. 7.} \]

We can understand why Fux advises adding C to the bass note E in the first case, and B (the fifth), in the latter two cases only by assuming that he has suddenly been struck by the feeling of scale-degrees. The fact that Fux calls upon the spirit of scale-degrees in the middle of contrapuntal instruction and practices harmonic teaching is rather unexpected and regrettable, no matter how much this maneuver can be judged as a first inkling within him caused by the world of scale-degrees.++

Such mistakes are less surprising with Albrechtsberger, as when, for example, on pages 105-106, he illustrates an erroneous syncopation formulation:

---

+Cf., in Figure 6, measures 3-4, a movement by step (I-II); in Example 13, [Figure 7] movement by third (III-I), and by fifth (III-VI).

++See "Preface," Kontrapunkt I.
Example 14.

\[ \text{c.f.} \]

\[ \text{etc.} \]

and contrasts it with the following:

Example 15.

\[ \text{No. 2} \]

\[ \text{etc.} \]

and then remarks:

The ninth mistake is again an inharmonic cross relation in the tenth and eleventh measures: \( B \) in the discant and alto with the tenor. This \( F \) augmented fourth ligature, \( B \), can be used in three-part composition only with the natural major sixth \( D \), when this \( B \) belongs to the key of A minor and not C major, as we can see in Number 2 above.

§ 16. In Strict Counterpoint, Even the Concept of Tone Repetition Conforms to the Chordal Disposition Generated Purely by the Voice Leading.

[20] As we know, conventional harmonic theory lays down the rule that, in connecting two triads, one or two available common tones should be left where they stand, that is, in the same voices. This rule seems at first to express exactly what contrapuntal theory tries to express with its special license, namely, that if need be, a tone may be repeated two, three, or four times, that is to say, allowed to continue in its existing position. However, in terms of the consequence of that harmonic rule and of the contrapuntal license, the similarity is merely apparent. There is, in fact, a basic difference

\[^*\text{Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 223 ff.}\]
between the two. While the former orders the student to sustain the voice held in common, the latter gives the practitioner the discretion to decide whether he prefers to repeat a tone or, in order to accommodate a future advantage for the voice leading, to replace the repetition with a better option. Thus, the rule taken from harmonic theory causes the voice leading to be generated automatically, whereas, in contrast, contrapuntal theory permits us to decide according to the situation whether the repetition should be applied or not.

Free composition, which, despite the scale-degrees, completely preserves the independent character of the voice leading, now also maintains the concept of tone repetition only according to its meaning in strict counterpoint. While free composition, for the sake of melodic interest, makes use of passing tones and suspensions in all possible extended forms and takes all sorts of liberties in abbreviations, in the substitution of intervals, octaves, etc., it shows that tone repetitions, no matter how veiled they may be, are totally dependent on the demands of the momentary situation, just as in strict counterpoint.

The agreement of strict counterpoint with free composition about the use of tone repetition, which, in both cases, originates in the preservation of the independent character of the voice leading, clearly demonstrates the falsity of the previously discussed rule taken from conventional harmonic theory. Of what use is this rule if it fails to hold up in strict counterpoint and fails all the more in free composition? When and where does it express its actual validity if neither strict nor free composition is bound by it? This rule is totally wrong and cannot be justified. It can be simply explained by the fact that the whole plan of conventional harmonic theory is wrong from the very outset, as I have proved

+Cf. Der freie Satz.
in Harmonielehre (p. 233 ff.), because it undertakes to teach voice leading along with scale-degrees without first showing their fundamental conceptions. And only the fact that this kind of harmony instruction is still being offered to beginning students, in spite of its obvious recalcitrance and blatant uselessness, has caused me to speak here of its false rules.

Coming back to strict counterpoint, I wish to declare emphatically that if the advantage of the line demands it, then even two voices at once may be allowed to stand over.+

§ 17. How the Concept of Interval Doubling Likewise Implicitly Results from the Autonomous Nature of the Voice Leading.

Because two-part composition prohibits parallel, direct ("open") octave-successions and consents to conduct the octave only in contrary motion,++ it advances, for the first time, the concept of doubling—which, in two-part composition, is possible with no interval except the octave. It bases this concept on the necessity of avoiding parallel, direct octave-successions, which is a precondition of obligatory voice leading, and thus differentiates it from the concept of reinforcement, which, contrary to obligatory voice leading, takes advantage of direct octave-successions.

Three-part composition now makes an extension possible because it not only permits the doubling of the octave, but also the doubling of other intervals such as the third and sixth. However, as in two-part composition, the obligatory voice leading is again the prerequisite for such doubling.

---

*In Fux's lessons, Table VII, Figure 22, and Table VIII, Figure 4, we sometimes find a threefold or even fourfold tone repetition. (*13)

++Kontrapunkt I, page 173 ff.
Therefore, as long as parallel, direct octave-successions are avoided among all three voices, every doubling of the octave, third, or sixth can be considered a permissible doubling rather than an impermissible reinforcement.

In strict counterpoint, it is much easier to adhere to this rule because the voice leading, although it lacks the scale-degrees, shows an absolute character all the same. Here, each interval has a simple significance: a third is but a third, a sixth is but a sixth, etc., so that a doubling of the third or sixth is nothing other than just that.

But, in free composition, which preserves the autonomy of the voice leading despite scale-degrees, they are covered by the independent nature of the doubling. Therefore, in an expansion of strict counterpoint, we may double the octave, third, and sixth within an obligatory voice leading to the extent that they can be expressed through the voice leading. Thus, we should never speak, for example, of a prohibition against doubling a third about which the conventional teacher grumbles. The following examples provide a sketch of what will be fully exemplified by the musical examples given in Der freie Satz. In free composition, the following:

Example 16.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{C} \\
\text{F} \\
\text{G} \\
\text{F} \\
\text{C}
\end{array} \]

would appear as a fifth-doubling if the logic of the harmony indicates the scale-degree C:

\[ \text{C} \]

*Except that of an ascending leading tone.*
Example 17.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 18.}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 19.}
\end{array}
\]

appears as an octave or third-doubling depending on whether the F or D is regarded as the scale-degree:

Nevertheless, the voice leading independently obeys its own nature and, regardless of the doubling of the third or sixth, proceeds according to its own requirements, whereas, the scale-degrees limit themselves in general to inducing the compositional unfolding and to imprinting their functional logic.

\section*{8. The Prohibition of Doubling the Ascending Leading Tone.}

Only the ascending leading tone is excepted from doubling. Its concept belongs to pure voice-leading theory; and, because of its prescribed path to the tonic, doubling it would produce parallel octaves or primes.

\[\text{Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 142 ff.}\]
However, the reason why the descending leading tone is not also affected by the doubling prohibition is this: if the relationship to the tonic is fundamental to the leading tone in the contrapuntal sense, that is, if both leading tones begin to appear only when they draw toward the tonic (as it is best seen in strict counterpoint at the cadence formula), then, due to their equivalent function, we should make no distinction between them with respect to the doubling prohibition. Now, for the first time, three-part composition discloses an essential difference between the two leading tones, which consequently must lead to limiting the prohibition to only the ascending leading tone.++ Three-part composition shows that if the ascending leading tone were led downward—see Example 20a—it would come to a tone that is not a member of the tonic harmony, whereas, the descending leading tone, even if turned upward—see 20b—leads nevertheless to the third of the tonic harmony:

Example 20.

\[ \text{Example 20.} \]

The descending leading tone has two paths open to it. If it confirms itself as a leading tone, in the strictest sense of the word, only when it actually leads to the tonic tone, it nevertheless retains the value of a leading tone even when, for one valid reason or another, it ascends to the third of the tonic harmony. In contrast, for the ascending leading

---

++See Kontrapunkt I, pages 232; and § 27, below.

Let me remind the reader that in two-part composition a doubling of the leading tone could not come into consideration. Thus, there was no opportunity to become aware of any possible distinction between the two.
tone there is only one path, namely, to the tonic itself unless it should stray from the harmony and therefore from its original concept. In this sense, it is apparent that doubling the ascending leading tone would have to lead to forbidden octave or prime-successions, whereas the possible doubling of the descending leading tone need not necessarily be coupled with such a succession.

The prohibition of doubling the ascending leading tone—but strictly this one only—is also accepted in free composition, but in this context the leading tone exhibits a variety of chromatic procedures in various extended forms and transformations.

On the question of doubling, Fux maintains such a strict posture regarding autonomous voice leading* that he does not find it necessary to express the prohibition of [24] doubling the ascending leading tone at all. Obviously, for him, it suffices that the doubling of the latter must automatically be excluded by virtue of the character of the voice leading.

In contrast, Albrechtsberger is very much concerned with this question even though, as we shall see right away, he has been brought to it by his continual peeking at free composition. Thus, with regard to the first species of two-part counterpoint, we read a remark belonging to four-part composition, where he explains [p. 27]:

Another (rule of a good melodic line) demands that the major seventh tone, called the "sensitive note" (Nota sensibilis), should ascend by half step to the eighth, and that the fourth ordinary tone, especially in major scales, should descend to the third, without the requirement that the expected chord must follow.**

Here, he speaks of the ascending leading tone (with a different technical term), but at the same time he speaks of a "fourth tone," which he obviously tends to regard as no less the leading tone, descending, than the other, ascending. What confusion of concepts is caused by the lack of understanding of the matter at hand! Instead of understanding the leading tone in strict counterpoint from a purely melodic

*Cf. § 14 above.
**N.B., the quote offered in Kontrapunkt I, page 221 f.
standpoint* and applying its original concept also to the cadence in two-part composition** (which then must automatically lead to the first confronting of the two conceivable leading tones in strict counterpoint), he speaks (in strict counterpoint) of "full and half cadences" entirely in the sense of harmonic instruction (V-I), and likewise (in the same sense) of a presumably different leading tone with the degree-progression IV-I.***

Albrechtsberger speaks emphatically of the prohibition of doubling the leading tone on page 81.**** On page 84 he comes back to it by remarking, with regard to two doublings which he applies in measures 5 and 11 of the lesson given under Number 5:

The N.B.'s at the B in the alto and at the F# in the tenor refer to the fact that it would not be a mistake to double these two Mi-notes because neither one of them is the leading tone [Semitonium modi] D#. (*14)

Similarly, he composes this faulty passage in a syncopation lesson in three-part composition (p. 104):

Example 21.

\[\text{Example 21.}\]

simply to be able to remark (p. 105):

The (third) mistake is the following B in the alto because, through this, the leading tone of the following C chord has been doubled, a doubling permissible only on the upbeat.

Compare this to the one on page 362 with regard to five-part composition:

N.B. Even if this (the major seventh tone) were third or sixth (as doubled root-tone, i.e., as octave, it is tolerated in an inner voice), it would still be

* Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 142 ff.
** Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 232 ff.
*** For the resolution of the entire question, see Der freie Satz, under "Voice Leading."
**** See the quote in § 14.
forbidden on accented divisions of the measure in compositions for five or more parts.

And, finally, let us look at Albrechtsberger's correction of a Beethoven exercise that contains "forbidden" voice leading (Nottebohm, p. 54):

Example 22.

Concerning the otherwise permissible doubling of the third and the sixth, beyond that of leading-tone type, see § 14. Finally, it deserves to be mentioned here that Albrechtsberger never speaks of the prohibition against doubling the alleged other leading tone (IV-I) which he mentioned, surprisingly enough, on page 27.

Cherubini writes (p. 28f. Rule 5):

In incomplete chords, we must not allow the third or sixth to be heard in two voices at the same time (to be doubled). This is forbidden because of their imperfection and the apparent thinness of the harmony. For the opposite reason, it is advisable to double the octave and fifth because they are perfect consonances. Yet, this rule, too, is not without exceptions. For the sake of good harmony, better voice leading, and especially the avoidance of even more clumsy mistakes, we may double the imperfect consonances if there are no other options. [Here are some] examples demonstrating the strictness of the rule.
Example 23. (Example 83)

Bellermann, also, makes no mention of a prohibition against doubling the leading tone. Instead, we find him using such a doubling on page 232—to be sure under especially difficult circumstances:

Example 24.

[26] Even though Bellermann was obviously thinking in the Dorian mode, in which case B is not the leading tone, the above succession of chords may be considered in this context as a "modulation" into C major, which would therefore prohibit a doubling of the B.

BEGINNING


These are the suitable beginning formations.

a) Complete triads: Only the \( 5 \) is suitable. Since \( 6 \) lacks perfect consonances, it must not be used in the beginning in spite of its completeness.

b) Incomplete chords: In the first rank are the sonorities that include two perfect consonances: \( 8, 8, 5, 5', 1, 1' \).

+Concerning the precedence of perfect consonance, see Kontrapunkt I, Section II, Chapter 1, § 4.
In second rank are the sonorities with imperfect consonances: 8 10 3. To be sure, these are useful only if they lead to an essential advantage for the voice leading in the following measure.

Fux frequently uses sonorities with imperfect consonances at the beginning: 10 8 3 10 8 3 1 1. Remember, he makes use of the minor third for the Dorian, Phrygian, and Aeolian scales, while on the other hand, he avoids it in the final chord, as we shall see in § 27.

Albrechtsberger writes (p. 81): "The beginning and end must thus be perfect." According to his use of terminology, this does not mean the beginning chords must be complete. That is why he could write (p. 79): "... (§15) we are permitted to set the incomplete chords 8 and 5 only in the first measure."

Cherubini's explanation on page 28, Rule 2, is similar to Albrechtsberger's.

MIDDLE


The more strictly the three-part lessons are carried out according to a vocal point of view, the more we must maintain a suitable distance between the voices.

In case of need, a crossing of voices is permitted not only between adjacent voices but even between the outer voices.

The imperative for interval variety, which was established in two-part composition, is extended into three-part composition as well. Therefore, the voice leading will

---

*Cf. § 14, above.

**Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 17.

***Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 222.

benefit to the extent that such variety appears, above all, in the outer-voice structure (with which a variety of triad formations is also linked).

With regard to two-part composition Fux writes (p. 71): "Still, it is worth noting that, if we link the nearest clefs together, it becomes much easier to distinguish the disposition of the simple from the compound consonant intervals."

In contrast to his misleading two-voice exercises, Albrechtsberger makes use of incomparably more correct voice distances—misery teaches one to pray—in three-part composition, a fact that can be cited as counter-evidence against the former.

Cherubini writes (p. 28, Rule 3): ". . . (*16) the closer they (the voices) are to one another, the better will be their effect," etc.

§ 21. The Open and Close Positions.

As far as the effect is concerned, the most important thing to consider in triad assembly is the distinction of the open and close positions. Above all, I remind the reader that only the open position complies with nature since it, alone, follows the pattern of the overtone series in which the fifth appears before the third:*

Example 25.

Perhaps, then, it is as if nature, faced with the stronger fifth, intends to grant the distinction and protection of register to the third (the weaker overtone, as it were). Thus, the spacing of the third in the register above the fifth assures the ear's attention.

If we compare the open position to the close position that originates in the artificial realm of music, and place the fifth above the third:

*Cf. Harmonielehre, § 39 ff.
Example 26.

[28] then, the register unfailingly attracts the ear to the fifth, which by nature is stronger than the third. If nature, itself, opposes the strengthening of something that is already strong or the weakening of something that is already weak, which, strictly speaking, would be only a type of redundancy alien to its nature, then, on the contrary, an artificial cultivation such as music is disposed to strive for such effects according to need. Therefore, in the realm of strict counterpoint lessons the student may learn to recognize how the open position always assigns a particular emphasis to the momentarily highest tone, an emphasis that is unattainable for the same tone as a middle voice in a close position.

It must be understood that what has been said here concerning the natural pattern for $\frac{3}{4}$ and $\frac{5}{4}$, now, by artificial extension, holds true no less for $\frac{3}{5}$ and $\frac{5}{6}$, and also for the incomplete triads $\frac{8}{3}$ and $\frac{5}{3}$, in which, just as in the complete ones, we are able to distinguish a close and open position. And, it must be understood that the displacement in register implies an emphasizing of the respective intervals. The third may be considered the distinguishing mark of the open position—and indeed, the third alone for all chords without exception—whereas the intervals 5, 6, and 8 are, from the start, characteristic only of the close position: 

+Compare, in addition, Examples 25 and 26.
Example 27.

From this we can see what significance must be attributed to the outer-voice construction, which, aside from its various other tasks, determines, by itself, the open or close position.

It is another matter when we talk about the relationship of the middle to the outer voices. To be sure, the situation of the middle voice cannot change anything with regard to the open and close position; however, it would be advisable to speak of an internally open position when, as the following example illustrates:

Example 28.

within a close position, the middle voice is set in a relation exceeding the third with either the upper or the lower voice.

The octave registers seem better combined in Example 25 than in Example 28. Taken from a point of view of pure sonority, it requires no proof. But, a still stronger requisite of the voice leading may press for a setting such as found in Example 28, in which case even such a situation, demanded by necessity, will sound good and beautiful.

At the same time, the distinction between the close
positions in the strictest sense (Example 26) and those with merely internally open spacings (Example 28) shows that the distance between voices has to be real—for, how should, for example, an internally open position be determined if the distances are merely taken figuratively? To be sure, the significance of this question is not very often disclosed in three-part composition, but sooner than elsewhere, perhaps, with the $\frac{6}{3}$ chord (details of which appear below in § 23). The distinction seems more clearly defined in four-part composition and most clearly in free composition, where principles of the open and close positions are also applied to the seventh-chord and, in addition, where the whole business of the reinforcements finds its final justification in the positions, and particularly in the reality of the voices.

Finally, it must be mentioned that it is part of good voice leading to alternate the positions, since a variety in the respective voice distances, or in the change in the chord density, would entertain the ear most effectively.

§ 22. The Permissible Unequal Successions.

Parallel octaves (8-8) must be forbidden in three-part composition for the same reason they were forbidden in two-part composition. From this originates the obligatory nature of the voices, which would otherwise proceed in "reinforcements." All this was explained first in Kontrapunkt I, page 177 ff. and has been repeated several times since.

Moreover, three-part composition introduces no counter-effect for parallel fifths (5-5). For its part, free composition has means at its disposal to reveal the two fifths, under certain circumstances, as merely a harmless encounter of tones that, because they are given the task of passing tones, neighboring tones, or the like, are certainly not intended to present their vertical relationship to each other in the foreground. Therefore we cannot, in reality, speak of
parallel fifths. However, strict counterpoint totally lacks the means of producing such concealments and that is why parallel fifths, which must always be taken here as fifths in their strictest sense, are unsuitable once again (for the same reason as in two-part composition).

In strict three-part counterpoint, we have a different situation with nonparallel direct successions. As I shall immediately show, they must be permitted in certain circumstances. Yet this--to repeat this extremely important thought expressed in Kontrapunkt I, page 196 ff.--is not an "exception" of the principal prohibition when we permit nonparallel direct successions in three-part composition. Rather, it is the case that three-part composition is in a position to improve the otherwise bad effect of a nonparallel direct succession and, because of fortunately changed circumstances, to make possible a voice leading that would have been forbidden for the bad effect if the composition were merely in two-parts. In three-part composition, the presence of a third voice as well as the potentiality for triad completeness offers for the first time the opportunity for a simultaneously developing countermovement or for new sonorous impressions which are substantially strong enough to distract the ear from the otherwise bad effect of the forbidden succession and absorb it, so to speak.+

Notwithstanding the basic granting the nonparallel direct successions, it is again our duty, as discussed in § 8, to bring into play all the latent voice-leading possibilities for comparison and examination. This forces us also to assess the licenses for their intrinsic value and to grade their values individually. We can determine very precisely whether (and for what reason) one license is more suitable than another.

The inner compulsion on the part of the voice leading, always considered the first and absolute supposition, solely determines the value of a license. Thereby, it also determines how many of the primary requisites of the three-part composition we must, nevertheless fulfill. That is to say, the closer we adhere to the guiding rules, (in effect, the less we, out of necessity, have to venture away from them), the better the license will work and the more it will appear justifiable.

If we regard the precept of the flowing melody (the causality in horizontal direction) and that of triad completeness (the causality in vertical direction) as the two main postulates of three-part composition, and add, moreover, contrary motion as a remedy in itself effective against forbidden successions, then we must conclude that we have justifiably employed a nonparallel direct succession when we have seen to it that:

1. to adhere to the precept of the flowing melody, at least one of the three voices progresses stepwise;
2. to satisfy the precept of triad completeness, the next sonority appears as a complete triad; and finally,
3. at least the third voice—being uninvolved in the forbidden succession—moves in contrary motion.

In addition, I want specifically to make the following remarks:

About 1. Basically, it does not matter which of the three voices moves by step, whether it be one of those involved in the forbidden succession or the one not involved. Yet, we must remember what was said about the ottava battuta in Kontrapunkt I, page 276 ff., namely, that the lower rather than the upper voice should be given the skip. From this it follows that also in the voices of a forbidden succession the stepwise movement is better reserved for the upper rather than the lower voice.
About 2. With the nonparallel direct movement to the octave, a complete triad is impossible because of the octave itself. If we abide by what was said in 1, that the upper voice should be given the stepwise movement, then an octave will probably not be created unless we let the second of the involved voices skip a fourth or fifth:

Example 29.

"less good"

In contrast to that, a complete triad is possible in the case of nonparallel direct motion to a fifth and is therefore worthy of the effort.

[32] About 3. Only contrary motion can counteract forbidden successions; oblique motion cannot. Oblique motion lacks the power to divert the ear from the forbidden succession because of its own restfulness.

Now it is time to illustrate what has been said with several examples.

With a voice leading such as this:

Example 30.

we find the second triad complete, contrary motion of the third voice, and in the nonparallel direct succession itself, the favorable feature that the upper voice moves by step while the lower (here the middle one) skips by a third. For all these reasons, this voice-leading example represents a license more justifiable than the following one, in which contrary motion is totally lacking.
Example 31.

However, in a voice leading such as the following:

Example 32.

the stepwise movement, the contrary motion, and the complete triad are certainly not lacking, but its value is less than that of the previous example since, in the nonparallel direct succession, the upper voice, attracting the ear most strongly, skips while the lower voice moves by step.

Even more reprehensible is the following voice leading:

Example 33.

It would be tempting to establish a scale of licenses from the one that is most justifiable and therefore best to the one that is at least still admissible, if it were not more advantageous to judge each license entirely according to its own situation in the practice of the lessons. In other words: if the voice leading occasionally requires a license that is further removed from the requisites, then we should gladly pay the price, but we should know what we have paid.

With regard to skips taking place in permissible non-parallel direct successions, I wish to point out here, again, the remarks made in Kontrapunkt I, pages 118, 131, and 176 ff.

---

+See above, § 8.
Even if we might have been able in two-part composition to judge, on the basis of the meagre but nevertheless already given causalities, whether, for example, instead of this solution:

Example 34.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textbullet} \\
\text{\textbullet} \\
\end{array}
\]

this alternative would be better:

Example 35.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textbullet} \\
\text{\textbullet} \\
\end{array}
\]

--of course, we know that nonparallel direct successions are not yet allowed in two-part composition--we are now able in three-part composition to perceive, all the more clearly than there, which smaller movement may be substituted for such a skip.\(^3\) For example:

\[\text{\textbullet} \]

\[\text{\textbullet} \]

\[\text{\textbullet} \]

\[\text{\textbullet} \]

\[\text{\textbullet} \]

---In this sense, we may add a new reason to those already given in Kontrapunkt I (page 176 ff.--especially pages 177-181, which deal with the prohibition of nonparallel direct successions). This presentation now clarifies why, in the discussion of this question in two-part composition, I have not yet dealt with it on the basis of only secretly felt possibilities: this becomes noticeable for the first time in three-part composition!

And in order to guard against the danger that an interval, as a secretly felt possibility of the voice leading, could be confused with the concealed interval that, as I stated in Kontrapunkt I (p. 178 ff.), the older teachers brought into play to justify the prohibition of the so-called \([34]\) hidden successions, let me state the distinction in the following manner: whereas the interval that I designate as secret seems to be causally stipulated by voice leading and harmony, the fifth (or the octave), as advanced by those teachers remains merely a puzzling formation. This can be clearly seen from the fact that no matter how a figure sounds--thus even situations such as Examples 32 and 34--only the fifth (or octave), and no other, is to be considered "concealed." For example:
Example 37.

Instead of:                  Thus:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{f} \\
    \text{e} \\
    \text{d}
\end{array} \]

In order to avoid the forbidden successions, let us use contrary or oblique motion as much as possible, or else cross the voices. To be sure, contrary motion requires more space but, on the other hand, it has the advantage of permitting the triad to appear sometimes in open position, sometimes in close.\(^+\)

[34] Although the crossing of voices may occasionally prevent a forbidden succession, we must be aware that under certain circumstances it can also create a forbidden succession, as, for example:

Example 38.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{f} \\
    \text{e} \\
    \text{d}
\end{array} \]

The bad effects of antiparallels are the same in three-part composition as in two-part composition.\(^{++}\) Yet, three-part composition reveals a further disadvantage, as the following examples illustrate:

Example 36.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
    \text{f} \\
    \text{e} \\
    \text{d}
\end{array} \]

\(^+\text{Cf. \#21, above.}\)

\(^{++}\text{See Kontrapunkt I, page 175.}\)
Example 39.

In each case the disposition of the voices betrays the fact the countless other voice-leading possibilities offer themselves as being more natural and better working than the antiparallels; the outer voices would be spared the succession of empty octaves, the setting would be spared the triadic incompleteness caused by the octave, and in addition, less space would be required. In consideration of these secretly felt [35] alternatives, our ear rejects antiparallels also in strict three-part counterpoint.

With fundamental comprehension Fux speaks to this question on page 90:

[Aloys.] The rules should be executed not only according to the bass but also according to the other voices, one with another. Moreover, they should be followed wherever possible, even if they cannot be observed quite strictly in the assembling of several voices. Sometimes for important reasons, however, it is permissible to depart from the strictness of the rules in three-part writing.

In other respects, his presentation of this question lacks coherence and appears only randomly. According to Fux's opinions, to mention a few here, a nonparallel direct succession is, for example, irrevocably tied to a cadence (p. 91-92):
Example 40. Table VII, Fig. 13.

To the student's countering question as to whether a better way could not be found perhaps by means of a tenth, or third, instead of an octave, Fux replies:

[Alois.] We could have avoided it. However, this imperfect consonance is not capable of displaying the perfection and repose demanded at the end. It is another matter in four-part situations where this demand is fulfilled by the addition of the fifth, the third being thereby no longer too prominent.

Or, to cite another example, he criticizes the voice leading in the following:

Example 41. Table VII, Fig. 15.

because of the two nonparallel direct progressions following each other in measures 3-4 and 4-5, as well as the empty 3 sonority in measure 3.

He also criticizes the voice leading in this example:

Example 42. Table VII, Fig. 16.

+See Fux, page 93.
because of the forbidden skip of a seventh in the bass in measures 2-3. He prefers to set the same cantus firmus in the following way:

Example 43. Table VII, Fig. 14.

In order to corroborate his teaching in respect to the non-parallel direct fifth used here, he says: [Aloys.] "When there is a dilemma in three-part writing, one may ignore the letter of law to avoid greater error." As we see, in each situation, he depends upon the examination of all possible voice leadings. Then, he chooses the one most suitable in every respect so that under certain unavoidable circumstances he still ventures to use two non-parallel direct fifths following one another as in Table VIII, Figure 12, Table XIII, Figure 3, etc. (*17)

With reference to the voice leading in Figure 7 (meas.1), ++ Fux remarks (p. 89):

[Aloys.] From this it is clear that, if we take out the bass, the progression is faulty not only because the progression from an imperfect to a perfect consonance occurs, but, what is worse, this fifth is not even perfect, but diminished.

From this it follows that to Fux, nonparallel direct motion to a diminished fifth appears to be a doubly-serious mistake. +++

Finally, in Fux we find the following voice leadings:

+See 8, above.

++See page 13, above.

+++How the real destiny of a diminished fifth, as primary passing motion, is assured its freedom even in parallel fifths, we can read in Der freie Satz, "Open Successions."
Example 44. a) Table VIII, Figure 6; b) Table IX, Figure 7.

Example 44a exhibits the skip of a third in the upper voice—among licenses, this one is probably more remote than those that simply show stepwise movement—44b, however, resolutely presents so-called antiparallel fifths.

A strong advance toward a coherent presentation of our question is made by Albrechtsberger when he explains (p. 80):

Furthermore, two hidden fifths, octaves, and unisons are permissible here, especially when the third voice is set in contrary motion or when the bass voice skips a fourth. In such dispensations (licenses) the upper of the two faulty voices must proceed by step, for example:

[37] Example 45.

---

*See text above.

**About this, cf. Albrechtsberger's view and Example 49.
Let us pay particular attention to the fact that he demands in every case stepwise motion in the upper of the "two faulty" voices.

But, Albrechtsberger loses all sense of direction and subsequently writes (p. 88 ff.):

Finally, we must remember that Handel, J. S. Bach, and several other masters of strict composition have often used the following three examples which contain hidden fifths:

Example 46.

Now if these words do not even enable us to conclude whether or not he has sanctioned such progressions in strict counterpoint, then we must point out here that they show, in every case, a transgression against the rule he himself has made.

On the same subject Albrechtsberger adds [p. 88]:

These remaining (settings) where all three voices move in direct motion or where the upper two voices skip at the same time even though the bass moves in contrary motion, are almost all forbidden:

Example 47.
Can we ignore the prohibition of the fourth example whose voice leading, strictly speaking, complies with Albrechtsberger's basic rule? (Obviously, the lack of contrary motion as well as the skip in the middle voice has caused him to refuse it.) And if we see that he approves progressions such as the following:

Example 48.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{“good”} \\
\text{“possible”}
\end{array}
\]

then his indecisive attitude has been proved beyond a doubt. This stems from the fact that, in misunderstanding the true task of counterpoint instruction and the relation of strict counterpoint to free composition, he was not in a position to formulate the license so that it would satisfy the requirements of strict counterpoint and, through extended forms, the increased requirements of free composition. Moreover, it stems from the fact that, being ultimately indecisive and planless, he was obliged to jumble instances of strict counterpoint and free composition. But, observe how easily we can take care of cases such as those in Example 46 with the aid of the wording I give in the text: under certain circumstances, all of these successions should be permissible in the realm of lessons if we are conscious of their relative distance from other possible and more natural licenses. For example, at No. 1, the demands of contrary motion and triad completeness are fulfilled; only the flowing melody was impaired by skips in all three voices, and that is the reason for giving this sort of voice leading a less-than-good rating. At No. 2 and No. 3, we see the value of the voice leading further reduced because the upper of the "two faulty" voices makes the larger skip.

Even though Albrechtsberger made this remark only with regard to three-part second species writing (page 88): "In an emergency, two perfect consonances of the same name are permitted in the outer voices from upbeat to downbeat in contrary motion," it follows that, even without an "emergency," antiparallels are obviously better avoided and certainly here in first species. He explains the example of Fux (cited here as Example 44) and adds: "Here we find the exception, or license, of the two fifths in measures 8-9, which Fux wrote in this lesson in F." For the use in free composition "where
[39] each voice may move however and whenever it pleases" he decides to "improve" Fux's voice leading:

Example 49.

"improved"

We can hardly describe this proposed improvement of Albrechtsberger's as other than childish. The freedom of the antiparallels in free composition rests much less on the fact that "each voice may move however and whenever it pleases" than on its justification through the stronger necessities of the degree-progressions, the compositional unfolding, etc. These antiparallels certainly need not be "improved" since they appear to be urgently needed in many cases.

Finally, with regard to the expedient of voice crossing, Albrechtsberger uses it much too often.* Cherubini becomes excessive when he refuses to allow, under any circumstance, licenses between the two outer voices (p. 28, Rule 4): "No exception is permissible when it comes to the two outer voices." In contrast, notice the words that preface this prohibition:

To be sure, we can occasionally circumvent this rule (yet, only with regard to the middle voice) in cases where strict adherence to it impedes the progression of the outer voices or produces worse drawbacks in the following measure.

This is clearly the teaching of Fux. But, it certainly cannot be reconciled with the crass prohibition above, which is Cherubini's own brainstorm. If this instruction shows a clear lack of consistency, then we are all the more surprised to find this voice leading in one of his lessons:**

---

*For example, page 98, measures 5-7.

**Regarding the antiparallels, see the quote below about four-part composition, Section IV, Chapter 1, §7.
Example 50.

More strictly than Albrechtsberger (but not as contradictory as Cherubini) Bellermann demands that (p. 192 ff):

1. Of the two faulty voices, the upper progresses by step.
   2. The lower voice skips a fourth or fifth at the same time.
   3. Through the skip a complete triad is created, excepting at the final cadence.†

Bellerman not only distinguishes himself from Albrechtsberger on the third point, but on the second as well (so that the license regarding contrary motion of three voices that is permitted frequently by Albrechtsberger remains forbidden by Bellermann) and they agree only in forbidding nonparallel direct successions with oblique motion in the third voice.++

[40] § 23. Special Remarks Concerning the $\frac{6}{3}$ Chord.

To lead all three voices with complete triads and direct motion throughout is possible only if $\frac{6}{3}$ chords are used. Here, as in the first species of two-part composition,+++ it is not advisable to use too many $\frac{6}{3}$ chords in succession. What causes the unfavorable effect is, in part, the monotony of the excessive application of the sixth (in close position!) that threatens the ultra-sensitive outer structure, and, in part, the persistent illusion about the root-propensity of the lowest tone.++++

†Cf. above, Fux, Example 40.
++See, in contrast, Cherubini, above.
++++See § 11, above.
Also, a succession of $\frac{6}{3}$ chords forces us to raise the question--to my knowledge, it has not been raised until now--of why, in light of the fact that the fourth in the $\frac{6}{3}$ chord was recently declared to be consonant, the prohibition of parallel successions does not also apply to this particular succession of fourths. Would we now have to consider, for example, this succession of fourths:

Example 51.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 51}.
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{to be faulty parallel perfect consonances, or is it here, in spite of the recognized consonant character of the fourth, against all consistency, still something different again?}
\]

This question can be answered as follows:

In strict counterpoint we do indeed distinguish very precisely between the succession of fourths in Example 51 and the succession of fifths in the following example:

Example 52.

\[\text{Example 52.}\]

\[\text{And when strict counterpoint accepts the former without hesitation and rejects the latter as sounding unpleasant, then it obviously does so only because of the unconditional perfection and sharp profile of the fifths whose immediate succession manifests their inherently bad effect in strict counterpoint even if, as here, the fifths are not considered boundary intervals and, in addition, the three-voice texture}\]

\[\text{Cf. Kontrapunkt I, pages 111-112 and page 155 ff.}\]
contributes to their being absorbed. Moreover, because the fourth is much less touchy (being eminently less perfect), \[41\] direct motion is permitted without ado.

In a stepwise progression, an extended succession of 6 3 chords is more acceptable descending than ascending. The reasons for this are the following:

Since, in strict counterpoint, we are not in the position to grant such 6 3 chains a purely passing value as we frequently do in free composition, the question regarding the root-propensity of the lowest tone \( \frac{5}{3} \) necessarily intrudes more urgently in strict counterpoint than in free composition. But, a far shorter process leads to the fulfillment of the root-propensity of the lowest tone in 6 3 chords descending stepwise (the movement of only one voice):

Example 53.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
6 & 5 & 6 & 5 \\
(5) & (5) & (5) & (5)
\end{array}
\]

than in those ascending stepwise (the movement of two voices):

Example 54.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
6 & 5 & 6 & 5 & 6 & 5 \\
(5) & (5) & (5) & (5) & (5) & (5)
\end{array}
\]

\[N.B.\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
5 & 6 & 5 & 6 \\
(5) & (6) & (5) & (6)
\end{array}
\]
In Example 53 the lowest tone becomes the root by anticipating its subsequent arrival tone, while in Example 54, the lowest tones, a, b, c, etc., cannot, by any means, be converted into genuine roots.

Disregarding the sixths--let us remember that 6-5-6-5 already operates "suspension-like" in two-part composition--here it is the fourths which prefer to resolve downward rather than upward, as if they were dissonances in suspensions.++

Whenever possible, we must keep the voices of the 6 chords close together because of the density that is produced [42] by the close position. However, the distance of a tenth in the lowest voice is permitted as long as the voice leading demands and justifies it.

Fux expresses himself explicitly with regard to the progression to the fourth (p. 116): [Aloys.] "This progression must be regarded as if we were to move from a perfect to an imperfect consonance in direct motion, a fact that should be remembered well."+++ 

Albrechtsberger takes care of the question of the 6 chords with the following remark (p. 83):

The two N.B.'s point out that in simple counterpoint it is not a mistake to set two or three sixth-chords in succession because they will not be inverted; in double counterpoint at the octave, however, it would be a mistake because . . . , (*18) etc.

He continues:

Formerly there was a rule that stated: one should always keep the successive sixths close together so that the successive fourths in the upper voices will not be so obvious.++ But, first of all, we are not

++According to the rule of resolution known to us from page 336 in Kontrapunkt I.
+++See quote above, § 14. With regard to several ascending sixth-chords in succession, see the quote with his Figure 8.
++++Examples follow (*19)
always in the position to move the discant and alto into the lower register or the bass voice into the upper register without disturbing the melody. In the second place, it is often the chorale melody, the fugue subject, or the countersubject that forces us to place the sixths far distant from one another. Consequently, this rule was arbitrary.

Aside from insisting upon using composition from the sixteenth century, which is totally irrelevant and is to be criticized in every circumstance, Bellermann's explanation must be acknowledged as correct (p. 193):

Just as we tried to avoid using longer successions of parallel thirds and sixths in two-part composition, so should we also avoid the extensive repetition of sixth-chords in three-part composition. On the contrary, we must strive for variety in the tone combinations, placing the triad now in a closer spacing, now in a wider spacing, sometimes with the third, sometimes with the fifth appearing in the upper voice, etc. This can be achieved only by skillful use of contrary and oblique motion.

§ 24. The Succession of Two Major Thirds.

Here I must merely augment the thought already expressed in Kontrapunkt I (page 202 ff.) that a three-voice texture offers a new defense against the tritone danger: it is the expansion in harmony which diverts the ear from the unpleasant sound of the tritone sum in certain cases, and the more this expansion can direct our attention to the harmony, the more easily it will succeed. Thus, we have additional proof that in tone-life, as in life in general, each stronger effect pushes the weaker one into the background. Note, however, that here again the given situation determines whether the three-voice texture will triumph over a risky succession of two major thirds.

Even in three-part composition, Fux remains noncommittal with regard to the so-called tritone cross relation.

+Cf. Table VII, Figure 14, measures 4-5; Table VII, Figure 17, measures 5-6, etc. (*20)
Albrechtsberger teaches (p. 80 ff.): "It is more
dangerous to set two major thirds in succession in three-part
than in four-part composition, especially when they constitute
perfect chords." Note first of all, that he speaks (as in
two-part composition) of only two major thirds, to which the
following example attests:*

Example 55.

By the way, this formulation of the license does not con-
tribute much to its illucidation, for it certainly can be
said only very conditionally that three-part composition is
more sensitive than four-part with respect to the tritone.
Fortunately, Albrechtsberger's own practice is just as
unconstrained as Fux's; thus he writes, for example (p. 89):

Example 56.

or:

*Cf. Example 14.
In spite of his exaggerated strictness, which is customary and therefore present in this case, Cherubini writes:

Example 57. Example 84 (Lessons 6 and 7).

and even:

Example 58.

whereby it is remarkable that Fux's original example (Table X, Figure 2) --which Cherubini wanted to improve--has at the same place:

Example 59. [Fux, Table X, Fig. 2, meas. 4-7].


Regarding modulation and cross relation in three-part composition, the same basic principles that were presented in reference to two-part composition in Kontrapunkt I (page 226 ff.)


++By the way, the learner has the occasion here to compare Cherubini's use of neighboring tones and Fux's renunciation of them.
are applicable. Even the increased richness of sonority offered by the three voices is too weak to fulfill the requisites of a true modulation in the sense of a reinterpretation of scale-degrees or of a chromatic process. Thus, in the lessons in three-part counterpoint, the right to modulate is exclusively restricted—with the elimination of all chromatics, be they in one or two voices—to only the simplest reinterpretation of intervals.

In strict counterpoint, since we are not permitted to write skipping passing tones because we lack the pretext to formulate and reveal them here as extensions of regular passing tones, we likewise cannot use a cross relation in a three-voice texture. Indeed, as a modification of a chromatic movement, cross relation can only be used through dire necessity in free composition.

Albrechtsberger writes (p. 80):

Even when one third is minor and the other major, or both are major, we often fall into the mistake of the inharmonious cross relation by bringing about an augmented or diminished octave involving two successive beats; for example:

Example 60.

\[\text{Example 60.}\]

---


++See Der freie Satz, "The Passing Tone."

+++See Der freie Satz, "Voice Leading."

++++Compare several similar examples (for the syncopation species) that Albrechtsberger gives precisely for the purpose of illustrating mistakes (pages 104-105).
Notwithstanding the fact that he now speaks for the first time of a cross relation involving an augmented or diminished octave, he, nevertheless, neglects to explain its inner [45] nature. That this neglect stems from a defective feeling for this question, is clearly shown by an excess he commits on page 147—to be sure, only with reference to four-part composition:

Example 61.

On page 148 the following words accompany this example:

The license of the F# does not in the least offend the ear because nowadays we are in the habit of liberally mixing the chromatic genus in with the diatonic to enhance the harmony. But, for all that, it should not be used often in counterpoint. Chromatic fugue subjects that are intentionally created to express sadness are exempt from this rule. However, the chromatic runs seen and heard repeatedly ad nauseam in new Galant compositions and concertos create a poor effect. Nevertheless, this particular license is good because the inharmonious cross relation F-F# is not a diminished octave but an augmented octave (which is more tolerable). Finally, this raised accidental, F#, is a leading tone that makes the following G of the harmony easier for the singer and pleasanter for the listener.++

Chaos and confusion! Merely to be able to support the teaching of strict counterpoint as he understood it, Albrechtsberger voiced such a prejudice against "chromatic runs in Galant compositions and concertos," which, because they are totally irrelevant, are also totally unusable in strict counterpoint. Moreover, he illogically discards the rule in favor of "chromatic fugue subjects" which have nothing to do with strict counterpoint either. In addition, we find that he criticizes the use of chromaticism also in free composition (!), and yet he uses it as justification for the license in the chromatic passage of F-F# in the above example! Such

++Cf. also page 144, measure 7 of the lesson. (*21)
vacillation! So, we can clearly see where the weakness of a teacher will lead students when he himself does not know how to separate sufficiently pure voice leading from that of free composition, which is based upon voice leading and scale-degrees simultaneously: The teacher sometimes fetters free composition in the name of counterpoint, as Albrechtsberger often does, and sometimes oversteps the bounds of counterpoint in the name of free composition. How much simpler and more natural is the instruction I have devised and presented up to this point: Chromatic progressions are totally forbidden in strict counterpoint lessons without exception. With that we do away with every chromatic cross relation without having to distinguish the octaves that result thereby.

Therefore, I reject what Albrechtsberger says on page 87 concerning this question as it pertains to the second species of three-part counterpoint: "In this species and those following, inharmonious cross relations are permissible [46] if they are not too offensive to the ear." Such a point of view has to be judged premature for the lessons in every circumstance; they should strictly convey only the perception of pure voice leading no matter whether we deal with a three or four-part composition, in this or that species. Finally, let me mention that in Albrechtsberger's strict counterpoint lessons we do find examples of modulation, for example, on page 84 (meas. 5 ff.), page 89 (C major to F major), page 92 (E minor to G major), page 96 (meas. 8 ff), etc.

When Cherubini composes the following in the third lesson (p. 48):

Example 62.

we must criticize it in the face of his usual strictness. For, the two major thirds in the lower voices (meas. 1-2) comprise an augmented fifth$^+$ which, unfortunately, is not softened by the voice leading in this setting. In addition, the unnecessary doubling of the leading tone C# is brought to our attention in a most unpleasant way.

Bellermann writes (p. 103):

On the other hand, in multi-linear composition it may happen that a major triad follows a minor one, or vice versa, a minor triad follows a major one on the same scale degree. To avoid raising or lowering the third in the same voice earlier composers preferred transferring it to another voice, for example:

Example 63.

After all, it is very difficult to gauge the small semitone; singing the minor and major third is far easier. But when, in one voice, we use the small ascending semitone, as Goudimel has done, it must continue to move in the same direction to the next diatonic degree. A movement such as the one sung by the alto in the following example is very unpleasant and difficult to execute well. That is the reason it must be totally avoided in a cappella music:

Example 64.

[47] So much for Bellermann. He is justified in forbidding cross relations and chromatic movements in strict counterpoint, but when he goes over and beyond this and also prohibits their use in free composition, then it is a false doctrine and a presumption based on a crass misunderstanding of the true task of counterpoint teaching. Note, to say it once more, the cross relations shown in Example 63 are forbidden in strict counterpoint only because they are part of purely harmonic events, such as mixture, tonicalization, and true modulation, which cannot satisfactorily be proven to
exist in strict counterpoint. To be sure, by analogy with free composition, one may assume in the first example, Example 63, a mixture of C minor and C major, and in the second part of the same example as well as in Example 64, a chromatic modulation and a tonalization process. But, as stated, it is simply a comparison and, as such, lacks any power of proof which, in free composition, is typical of true mixture or tonalization.

§ 26. The Half Cadences in the Middle.

As we shall see in the following paragraphs, since three-part composition is already capable of introducing the "full cadence," it naturally shows less touchiness about the "half cadence" that two-part composition had to forbid because of its own character. Therefore, half cadences in the middle, as, for example:

Example 65.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{can now be used without further ado.}
\end{array}
\]

Albrechtsberger writes (p. 81): "Half cadences are permitted in the middle throughout:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
6 8 6 6 \\
3 3 3 1 \text{ etc.}
end{array}
\]

de\text{d\text{c}}

CLOSING

§ 27. The Formation of the Closing.

In three-part composition the formation of the closing is chiefly guided by the two leading tones. The principles of voice leading in a melodic line make it unthinkable to have a real cadence without a leading tone, be it ascending or
descending. In searching for a closing formula for the added third voice, we find that it could close with a leading tone, [48] but only the descending one that admits a doubling.++ This must result in an incomplete chord in the penultimate measure and an 8 in the last measure:

Example 66.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Example 66.} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{3}{4} \\
\end{array}
\]

If, however, the important requisite of triad completeness is to be met in the penultimate measure, there are, depending upon the circumstances, only the following possibilities:

1. If the two leading tones are in the middle and upper voices, then the lowest (third) voice may not make a 6.

Example 67.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Example 67.} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{3}{4} \\
\end{array}
\]

It purely and simply must be assigned to the dominant tone (the third below the ascending leading tone) from which it then skips down a fifth or up a fourth to the tonic:

Example 68.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Example 68.} & \frac{1}{4} & \frac{3}{4} \\
\end{array}
\]


++See § 18, above.
In such cases the last measure produces $\frac{6}{\overline{8}}$, a sonority that, because of its complete perfection, is more suited for the closing than an $\frac{3}{\overline{8}}$.

Example 69.

\begin{center}
\begin{music}
\lbar
.\underline{6}\underline{3}\underline{9}.
\rbar
\end{music}
\end{center}

2. If the lowest voice bears one of the two leading tones, we must make a more exacting distinction:

a) When it has the ascending leading tone, then the third voice might be:

Example 70.

\begin{center}
\begin{music}
\lbar
.\underline{6}\underline{3}\underline{9}.
\rbar
\end{music}
\end{center}

But, because the diminished fifth is forbidden, it may, once again, only be assigned to the dominant:

Example 71.

\begin{center}
\begin{music}
\lbar
.\underline{6}\underline{3}\underline{9}.
\rbar
\end{music}
\end{center}

[49] Then, it must move down a third in the last measure:

Example 72.

\begin{center}
\begin{music}
\lbar
.\underline{6}\underline{3}\underline{9}.
\rbar
\end{music}
\end{center}

The first of these has the better effect.

b) When the lowest voice bears the descending leading tone, then the third voice, wherever it is, may, because of
the unsuitability of:

Example 73.

\[ \text{Example 73.} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{produce only this third:}
\end{array}
\]

Example 74.

\[ \text{Example 74.} \]

In the bargain, the following progression is permitted:

Example 75.

\[ \text{Example 75.} \]

On the other hand, this progression is forbidden under all circumstances:

Example 76.

\[ \text{Example 76.} \]

The result to which the theory of melodic closing formulas\(^{+}\) in three-part composition have led us, coincides surprisingly well with the result we know from harmonic theory regarding the use of a V or VII scale-degree in the penultimate measure of the cadence. Let us pay particular attention to the revelation already in strict counterpoint of the ideal

\[^{+}\text{Cf. Kontrapunkt I, § 23.}\]
neighborliness and likewise the inner relationship of these 
[50] two chords† that obviously results from the very same 
voice-leading requirements. Without a doubt, the purely 
contrapuntal collaboration of the leading-tone principle with 
the requisite for triad completeness has made us familiar with 
the concept of the dominant for the first time. ‡‡ However, in 
strict counterpoint, both of the complete triads of the pen-
ultimate measure signify, as it were, the final concentration 
of triad completeness just prior to their dissolution to 
perfect unity in the last measure.

In particular, the following considerations of far-
reaching significance are to be stressed:

Not every major third of a complete (major) chord 
taken at random can be considered an ascending leading tone, 
but only the major third above the root that is the actual 
dominant tone of the key (=V-I). This statement is not an 
arbitrary assertion. We simply restate in different words 
that in three-part composition, if the penultimate chord is 
complete, the ascending leading tone complies with the dominant 
tone and no other. The significance of major third of the 
dominant permanently clings to the ascending leading tone, pro-
vided there is the cadence and multi-linear composition, and, 
even in free composition, it provides the final clarification 
of any possible doubts. Therefore, neither in strict counter-
point nor in free composition can we consider (in C major) the 
major third in C or the b a fifth above E as an ascending 
leading tone. ‡‡ This concept refutes the present-day teaching, 
which apparently cannot discover enough leading tones.

Already, strict voice-leading theory furnishes proof 
that the ascending leading tone, no matter how it may have

†Cf. Harmonielehre, page 249 ff.; and Der freie Satz.
‡‡Cf. Harmonielehre, page 182.
been used to form a complete triad \((5 \text{ or } 6)\), always represents a consonant interval due to its third-significance. From this it follows that the leading-tone commitment by itself cannot confirm a dissonant nature for the leading tone. All the hair-splitting of the so-called modern theorists falls into disrepute because they, not recognizing the nature of the leading tone, compulsively falsify every such relationship of tones as dissonant.+

Likewise, the prohibition against doubling the ascending leading tone does not change its consonant nature into a dissonant one. The mere suppressing of successions of octaves or primes does not eliminate the consonance, for, if the open succession could be taken as the only basis for a genuine origin of dissonance, all the rest of the intervals would have to be explained as being dissonant.

Quite unlike the leading tone is the third we find in the construction in Examples 74 and 75. Yet, due to its third-significance, even this third, like the leading tone itself, is a consonance.

How all these results of an authoritarian voice leading stand the test in the voice leading of free composition may best be seen there.

Fux takes no position at all with reference to the penultimate chord. He only wishes to see \(8, 8,\) and \(8\) for the very last chord. In Phrygian, therefore, he changes the minor third to major.++

Concerning the closing formula:

---


++Cf. § 19, above.
Example 77. Table VII, Figure 18.

he remarks (p. 94):*

[Aloys.] But which third do you intend as the one we should use, the major or the minor? The minor third, as you realize, would not be suitable at the close, nor would the major third be any better. Since the mode, according to its nature, contains the minor third (i.e., $F$ with no sharp), to which the ears have become accustomed throughout the cantus firmus, it would be unsuitable if this tone should now be raised at the end. Therefore, it is better to omit the third altogether.

However, the situation in which the third must be used in the last chord, in order to avoid parallel fifths;** comes up only in regard to the second species of three-part counterpoint (p. 97):

The major third that appears at the close [of the third example] is justified because setting the fifth in the upper part would cause two successive fifths to result:

Example 78. Table IX, Figure 1.

On page 81 Albrechtsberger prescribes the formulation of the penultimate measure to be $\frac{5}{3}$ or $6$. As for the last measure he says:

We are permitted to double even the octave in the last measure. But when the lowest voice has the cantus firmus, one of the upper two voices must go from the third to the octave.

---

* Cf. above, Example 71, and in Harmonielehre, Example 162.

** See Example 76, above.
From this it follows that he does not permit $^8_5$ in the last measure. He refers to this explicitly only $^5_3$ in regard to the second species of three-part counterpoint, where he also [52] discusses the question of the major and minor third at cadences in minor keys (p. 87):

At the end, the fifth with the octave or the unison is too empty, for the old maxim states: *in fine cognoscitur cujus toni* (we recognize the actual key only in the last measure). Without the third we cannot say whether the key is major or minor. Even today there are skeptics who do not know whether they should end a four-part composition in minor with the minor or the major third. Most present-day music scholars maintain that we can close a piece with the minor third. But, we can also close a minor key with a major third if no more music follows.

It should be mentioned that Albrechtsberger skipped by a sixth into the leading tone in order to make the triad in the penultimate measure complete:*

Example 79.

The completeness of the penultimate chord is also demanded by Cherubini on page 29, Rule 7. Concerning the last chord, see Rule 2 (page 28):

In regard to the application of a triad in the last measure, we can use the following:

$$
\begin{array}{c}
1 \quad 8 \quad 8 \quad 5 \quad 5 \\
1 \text{ or } 8 \text{ or } 5 \text{ or } 8 \text{ or } 1 \\
1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \quad 1 \\
\end{array}
$$

But this is sometimes difficult or even impossible, especially when the cantus firmus is in the lower voice, because then we must almost always end with the third and octave.

* Cf. Fux, Table VII, Figure 22, which shows a similar event with a skip of a fourth (*13); see, in contrast, *Kontrapunkt I*, page 142 ff.
Bellermann, with great detail and admirable order, represents the closing formations on pages 190-192. Since it would be too much to reproduce the total passage, you must read it for yourself. Let me say only that if he intends $6\frac{1}{8}$ (instead of $3\frac{1}{8}$) with the words: "Here it is best to conclude with the way designated N.B. even though the modern ear objects to it at first," then we must in no way derive a rule for free composition from this. And if, moreover, Bellermann intends "In compositions that are not tied to a cantus firmus" (thus in free composition), to keep a final chord complete by using the following voice leading:

Example 80.

![Example 80](image)

this means, then, that the "descending leading tone" may move upward to the third, which is only too obvious since it was previously permitted in strict counterpoint.

**LESSONS**

[53]

Example 81.
Alto Cherubini, Example 84.

Tenor

C.F.

Alto C.F.

Cherubini, Example 84.

Tenor

Bass


Alto

Tenor C.F.

Bass

[55]

Alto C.F.

H. Schenker

Tenor

Bass

Soprano

H. Schenker

Alto C.F.

Tenor
Remarks Concerning These Lessons

About 1. The large skips in all the voices in measures 7-8 go beyond strict counterpoint and exhibit an instrumental character. Without a doubt, the situation is difficult, but one that presented itself to the author without danger to the last four measures, which he correctly regarded as essential in consequence of other voice-leading possibilities:

Example 82.

Bellermann, who uses the same lesson on page 195, tries to improve on the old master as follows:

[56] Example 83.

As we see, he crosses voices and makes the doubtful skip of a fourth into the leading tone (in the bass, a-ø).
About 2. In measure 8, a $6$ appears in an internally open position (see above, § 21). The voice leading in the last four measures of the lesson behaves instrumentally but only to arrive at a suitable conclusion. Note the doubling of the third in measures 5 and 10.

About 3. In measures 5 and 6 we see two sixth-chords move upward and beyond that into an internally open position. (See Fux's quote in § 14.)

About 5. With regard to the octave doubling of the $F#$ in measure 11, see above, § 18. Concerning the nonparallel direct fifths in measures 13-14, cf. above, § 22, Example 48.

About 6. Measure 7 shows a modulation. The middle voice crosses with the cantus firmus but degrades the use of this means in measures 9-12. In addition the soprano line, the entire support of the lesson, is too monotonous, meagerly hovering around $c^1$.

About 7. Concerning the octave skip in measures 8-9, see § 22. Beginning in measure 8, the bass line is structured in a purely instrumental style; note the successive skips of a third, octave, and third in the same direction. In measure 11 we see a $9$ in an internally open position that, however, is not adequately justified by the voice leading.
CHAPTER 2
SECOND SPECIES: TWO NOTES AGAINST ONE

§ 1. Guiding Principles in General.

In three-part, second species counterpoint, the principles of three-part writing join those of two-part, second species counterpoint. The following paragraphs show the influence of the three-voice texture on those principles and the way it extends and deepens them.

§ 2. The Relationship of the Vertical Harmony of the Downbeat to the Half Notes in the Horizontal Plane, i.e., to the Consonance or Dissonance of the Upbeat.

In the thoroughly autonomous character of the voice leading, a rather definite relationship between the vertical harmony of the downbeat and the progression of half notes in the horizontal plane is expressed in two-part, second species counterpoint. The content of this relationship varies according to whether the half note is in the upper or lower voice and whether it is consonant or dissonant. Everything, however, is limited by the general characteristics of strict counterpoint which, as we know, can never define the chords as precisely as free composition. If we begin with consonance on the upbeat in the upper counterpoint, we see, under certain circumstances, as for example:

\[\text{See Kontrapunkt I, page 285 ff.}\]
Example 84.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{c.f.} \\
\text{etc.}
\end{array}
\]

that the harmony of the downbeat seems to continue through the upbeat whereby the sum results in one and the same complete or incomplete triad. While in the following example:

Example 85.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{c.f.} \\
\text{= (3) - 6?}
\end{array}
\]

the upbeat is not included in the harmony of the downbeat (as in Example 85a), and for that reason we must speak of a change of harmony (5-6). Because of the irrefutable root-propensity of the downbeat, we cannot be certain, at 85b, whether a change of harmony occurs or the sixth is to be assumed in retrospect.

The results are similarly uncertain when the counterpoints appear in the lower voice: sometimes, as in Example 86a, we have an unquestionable triad sum, but, then again, as in 86b and c, it is unclear whether a change of harmony occurs or not:

Example 86.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Effect: } C \rightarrow \quad C \rightarrow F^\flat \quad C \rightarrow A^\natural \\
\text{or: } F \rightarrow ? \quad A \rightarrow ?
\end{array}
\]
The harmony of the downbeat is capable, as we said, of so
influencing our hearing that we imagine the first half note
as continuing to sound regardless of the situation of the up-
beat. However, two-part composition is not able to allevi­
ate the doubts about harmonic change, except in the undis­
puted case of 5-6 (Example 85a), let alone bring about a
[58] complete certainty of meaning.

With the effect of the dissonant passing tone in two-
part composition, the matter is more certain:

Example 87.

Inasmuch as the second half note moves in dissonant fashion
away from the consonant (first) half note, only an interval
that is dissonant with the lower voice is perceived, strictly
speaking, on the upbeat. Nevertheless, the second interval
still remains under the influence of the just-departed harmony
of the downbeat. It is as if the harmony of the downbeat
were still sounding with the interval of the upbeat:

Example 88.

This effect occurs in both situations in Example 88, the dif­
fERENCE being that, in the case of a passing tone in the lower
voice (see 88b and d), it is extended and intensified in a
very special way. If the lower tone on the downbeat remains
stationary, as at 88a and c, this, alone, sustains the memory
of the first consonant interval, for indeed, every interval
determination is made from the lowest voice. In the second situation (see 88b and d), the lower engaged voice lacks the means to audibly continue the harmony of the downbeat. Therefore, there is an urgent need here to continue the departed harmony of the downbeat, at least in the memory. If at 88b, for the sake of greater clarity, we shift the sustaining tone into the lower register to elucidate it, since it is only imaginary anyway:

Example 89.

[59] then we gain insight into the true essence of the lower, outside voice that is represented even more precisely in free composition: it retains the meaning of only an upper voice in relation to a scale-degree tone conceived even lower. In other words, the dissonant passing tone affirms the harmony of the downbeat more reliably and emphatically than the consonant upbeat, which, as we saw above, lacks a uniform effect and frequently leads to a more or less clearly expressed change of harmony.

Notwithstanding the concreteness of the intervals possible in strict counterpoint, the appearance of the dissonant passing tone reveals an unusual hint of what is coming: it lies in the secretly active suggestion of the consonant starting point, which accompanies the dissonant passing tone

---

+See *Der freie Satz*, the section on passing movement.
++See above, § 7.
+++This concreteness is always to be regarded as independent.
on its way through the space of a third. It is as if the
dissonance might also convey the impact of the beginning
consonance. Thus, we thoroughly comprehend the prescription
of strict counterpoint which requires the dissonant passing
tone to proceed stepwise in the same direction.

The scope of this effect is highly significant: in
the dissonant passing tone we recognize the most reliable,
indeed the sole bearer of the melodic aspect. While the mel­
odic line is unveiled laboriously sound by sound in first
species, we see it progress in connection with a latent verti­
cality in second species. In this sense, two-part composition
shows a first start toward melodic unfolding, that is, the
simultaneous development of the same harmony in both the
vertical and horizontal direction, insofar as it is able to
establish a relation to the same harmony between the downbeat
and upbeat--depending on the interval in the case of the conso­
nant upbeat, but always in the case of the dissonant upbeat.

With the dissonant passing tones we may now link the
concept of nodal points [Knotenpunkte] which plays such an
important role in the voice leading of free composition. As
the dissonant passing tone fills in the space of a third, it
gives the two consonant points the significance of beginning
and end of a seemingly unified third-space. It then frees
the end tone to become the beginning of a new tonal event:

Example 90.

\[ \text{Example 90.} \]

\[ \text{\[See Der freie Satz, the section on scale-degrees.} \]
[60] As for the dissonant passing tone, the interval it forms with the counter-voice (9, 7, 4, etc.) is totally irrelevant because it is supported by the horizontal aspect alone. This characteristic also carries over into free composition so that, with either a passing tone or a passing harmony, it is inappropriate to differentiate the dissonant intervals, let alone measure the degree of dissonance and evaluate one as being more dissonant than another.

In three-part composition the consonance on the downbeat obtains a clearly defined meaning. But, to the same extent, the meaning and intensification of the beginnings of compositional unfolding now also advance. No matter whether the upbeat is consonant or dissonant, the quantity of consonance amassed on the downbeat is able to offer the arrangement a mental buttress that especially benefits the dissonant passing tone in the lower voice.

In the lessons on the combined species,† we shall also see how the necessity to adhere to the consonant harmony of the downbeat increases in urgency as the other voices, simultaneously moving in half notes, threaten the unity of the harmony of the downbeat. The imagination must project, on its own, the harmony of the downbeat, particularly when the dissonant passing tone is in the bass. By doing so, it fittingly prepares the way for the conception of the great spiritual marvel that governs free composition, namely, the scale-degree, which optimally clarifies this extension of a harmony for the duration of the passing figure. Also, in free composition, the consonant harmony of actual or assumed repose tones remains the measure of all dissonant passing-tone arrangements in spite of the increased possibilities of compositional unfolding. And no matter how obscurely, through substitution or other

†See Section VI, below.
abbreviation processes, the dissonant passing tone is used, the consonance situated a second higher or lower always stands at its cradle, exactly as the primitive figure requires.

Returning to three-part composition, I have only to demonstrate in a few examples how, + faced with a complete triad on the downbeat, a consonant upbeat is able to continue the harmony or change it, whereas a dissonant upbeat must always confirm it:

Example 91.

\[ \frac{5}{3} - \frac{5}{3} = \frac{5}{3} \frac{6}{3} \frac{6}{3} \frac{5}{3} \frac{5}{3} - \]

Furthermore, if the first harmony is incomplete, a consonant upbeat has the option of providing the completion, but a dissonant upbeat always leaves it unchanged:

Example 92.

\[ - \frac{3}{3} - \frac{3}{3} - \frac{3}{3} - \]

Fux addresses this question only with regard to third species. He remarks (p. 98): "... (*22) except that, as in all species of counterpoint, and therefore here too, we must be especially careful with the notes on the thesis." And later he says: "Be sure to observe that if you cannot apply the harmonic triad on the first quarter note of the arsis, it comes about on the second and third." ++ Yet, in Fux's opinion, the relationships of voice leading decide all

+ Exactly as in two-part composition.

++ The inference from third to second species is demanded here because of his own words.
the possibilities first and foremost, and therefore in his lessons we often find triads that are not completed by the upbeat.

Albrechtsberger writes (p. 88): "All downbeats must have a perfect or imperfect chord, namely: $5, 8, \text{or } 6, 8, \frac{3}{3} \frac{3}{3} \frac{3}{6}$ or $3, 6$." In addition, on page 87 he writes: "Here, too, with the passing tone, it is permissible on the upbeat to use $8, 5, 5, 6, 8$ over the bass."

Cherubini states in Rule 3 (p. 30): "On the strong beat we must never double the third, but it is permissible on the weak beat," and right after that he explains: "There are cases where we cannot avoid doubling the third on the strong beat, even though these cases occur rarely." This is a very unskilled and unsafe paraphrase of the misgiving that among all doublings the imperfect consonances have the least value. Concerning the completion of the harmony on the downbeat by means of the upbeat, Cherubini (like Fux) addresses himself only to third species.

§ 3. 5-6 (6-5): Harmonic Change or Consonant Passing Tone?

According to the discussion in § 2, our impression of:

Example 93.

[62] must waver between a $\frac{6}{3}$ chord on the one hand and a change of harmony on the other because of the incompleteness of the first harmony and the sixth on the upbeat. It is as if the assumed root-propensity of the lowest might induce us to presume the $\frac{5}{3}$ chord on the downbeat, which would then

+Cf. Section III, Chapter 1, § 17.

++Rule 1, page 33.

+++Cf. Example 85b.
indicate the succession: 8-5-6. Thus the first prerequisite for a real harmonic change is that the harmony on the downbeat is actually complete with the 5.+

However, in the succession 5-6 (6-5) we hear, despite the completeness of the triad on the downbeat, a difference in effect which, in another way, endangers the concept of harmonic change once again:

Example 94.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a)} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textit{et c.}}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{\textit{et c.}}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
5 \quad 6
\end{array}
\end{array}
\text{\textit{etc.}}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
6 \quad 5
\end{array}
\end{array}
\text{\textit{etc.}}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
5 \quad 6
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\text{\textit{etc.}}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
6 \quad 5
\end{array}
\end{array}
\text{\textit{etc.}}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

Since, in the process of a compositional unfolding (no matter how simply it proceeds), we tend to value the harmony of the downbeat as that of the entire measure, will we not be more inclined to perceive Example 94a as a passing tone than as a true harmonic change, in as much as the progress of half notes conforms entirely to the rule of the passing tone?

On the other hand, can we fail, in 94b, to hear a neighboring tone; and in 94c, submitting to the effect of the 5 which fulfills the root-propensity of the lowest tone, can we fail to hear 6 before 5 as an accented passing tone despite the strength of the downbeat harmony?

+See above, § 2, Example 85a.
The final solution to these questions cannot be offered by strict counterpoint. That is not its business. By simply attending to the voice leading, strict counterpoint cannot prevent the secondary effect of passing tones, neighboring tones, and accented passing tones from turning up (as in the examples above) where certain more or less fixed suppositions confront us.

In this sense, strict counterpoint seemingly provides the first start for the consonant passing tone, consonant neighboring tone, and consonant, accented passing tone, each of which plays a prominent role in free composition.\[1^

BEGINNING


To the possible beginnings described in three-part, first species counterpoint, we now add the familiar license of the half rest taken from two-part, second species counterpoint.\[2\] But, within the compass of a three-voice texture, this raises the question as to whether under certain circumstances we could write $\begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ -3 \end{bmatrix}$ instead of $\begin{bmatrix} -3 \\ 8 \end{bmatrix}$; that is, could the perfect consonance be belatedly fulfilled on the upbeat? Basically, nothing can be said against the latter arrangement; it can be used whenever we are in a position to secure particular advantages for the voice leading. However, we must be aware that the former arrangement remains the more natural. Consequently, at the beginning we may set not only:

---

\[1^\]See Der freie Satz, the section on passing movement.

\[2^\]Kontrapunkt I, page 302.
Example 95.

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
8 & 8 & 8 & 5 \\
5 & 8 & 3 & 5 \\
\end{array} \]

but also:

Example 96.

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
10 & 5 & 10 & -8 \\
\end{array} \]

On the other hand, a construction such as:

Example 97.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
6 \\
-8 \\
\end{array} \]

is better set aside because the interval of a sixth obscures the root-tone status.

[64] In Fux's lessons we find licenses such as \( 10 - 5 \) only in three-part, fourth species counterpoint.\(^*\)

Albrechtsberger writes: "In the very first chord, \( \frac{8}{5} \) and \( \frac{5}{1} \) may be used even if the upper voice has the counterpoint and the third is omitted." Shall we conclude from this that he prefers \( \frac{8}{5} \)? Concerning the license of the rest and with it the question about ordering the intervals in third species, we read (p. 93):

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{+}For example Table XI, Figure 9. (\textsuperscript{*23})} \]
It must be observed that the counterpoints may begin with a rest equivalent to a half-beat. Here, and in four-part composition, the counterpoint, with or without a rest, is no longer required to begin with the fifth or octave (as it had to in two-part composition), but may use the third when the complementary voice has the fifth or octave. In short, the perfect chord* required by all species in the first measure, may be placed as we see fit in compositions of three and more parts.

Obviously, with these last words he arrives at beginning formations in which the imperfect consonances precede the perfect. In lessons, Albrechtsberger applies them rather frequently.++

With regard to the use of the rest, Cherubini remarks in Rule 5 (p. 31): "... (24) it is more elegant than beginning with a complete measure." "More elegant"?! What does that mean in strict counterpoint?

§ 5. A Reminder of Some Older Principles.

There is no objection to the unison on the upbeat.+*

Since there is always the possibility of furthering the general balance offered in strict counterpoint through the use of the consonant or dissonant passing tone on the upbeat, the neighboring tone is superfluous. It all-too-easily endangers the balance and should be avoided.+*++

Variety is served here especially when we alternate complete and incomplete triads on the upbeat and downbeat.

---

*According to Albrechtsberger it is not the complete one:

++10 - 8 (page 90), 10 - 5 (page 92, 96) and even 6 - 8 (page 92).

+++Cf. Chapter 1, § 12.

About Fux's attitude toward the neighboring tone, see Kontrapunkt I, page 243.

Strangely enough, we find no neighboring tones in Albrechtsberger's second species lessons although he usually favors them.† Is this an accident?
Cherubini writes in Rule 4 (p. 31): A unison is not permitted on the strong beat unless no other arrangement is possible. It is permitted in the first and last measures, and can be tolerated on the weak beat.

†††See Kontrapunkt I, page 244.

[65] § 6. How the Usually Forbidden, Downbeat-Related Fifth and Octave Successions Can Be Improved by the Skip of a Third.

In the relationship of downbeat to downbeat (bracket 2):++

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{bracket 2} \\
[1, 2, 3, 4] \\
\text{bracket 1}
\end{array}
\]

a skip of a third in the middle voice can (in this species) disarm the open successions involving the middle voice.+++ This is possible because the outer voices push the bad effect of the succession into the background.

The fact that—as opposed to open successions on downbeats—three-part proves to be less sensitive than two-part composition with regard to both the skip of a fourth (in a middle or outer voice) and afterbeat successions, is self-evident.

On the other hand, a skip of a third in the outer voice, as for example:

+++See, in contrast, two-part composition, Kontrapunkt I, Example 279.

Example 98.

\[ \text{\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example98.png}} \]

is forbidden all the more so because the following voice leadings ultimately offer themselves as substitutes:

Example 99.

\[ \text{\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example99.png}} \]

The latter voice leading is the one that plays the greatest role in alleviating the open fifth successions in free composition. In contrast to the one in Example 99a, whose consonant skip confirms the harmony of the downbeat, the voice leading in 99b at least provides an interval succession that, in strict writing, we usually conceive as a change of harmony.

Fux writes (p. 96):

. . . (\textit{*25}) in this species of three-part composition, we may now and then—on behalf of harmonic triads—avoid two fifths by means of a half-note skip of a third:

\[ \text{\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example25.png}} \]

---

\textit{See Der freie Satz, the section on open successions.}

\textit{As in Example 98.}

\textit{See § 3, above.}
Example 100. Table VIII, Fig. 10.

This formation is not allowed in two-part composition. It is permitted here, as I said, for the sake of the harmonic triad.

Since Fux mentions parallel fifths and not parallel octaves, should he have distinguished the two here in reference to our license? Be that as it may, he believes that it is the triad perfection (of both downbeats) whose need justifies the fifth successions. That is why he does not simply limit the license to the middle voice but seems to permit it also in the outer voices. These examples from Fux's lessons should be reproduced here:

Example 101. a) Table IX, Fig. 3. b) Table IX, Fig. 4.

Albrechtsberger expresses himself more concisely (p. 86-87):

Pay particular attention to the fact that here the fault of two fifths or octaves, which, in two parts, were forbidden to make a skip of a third in the upper voice, is no longer considered wrong if the skip appears in the middle voice. In the upper and lower voice this procedure is still incorrect. However, it is also wrong to apply formations such as 5 3 5 etc., 8 6[8 etc., in the middle voice more than once in succession, because they sound too fifth-like and octave-like.+

+Examples follow. (*26)
That a skip of a fourth in one of the outer voices improves the successions of fifths is ascertained by the remark "good" on pages 87 and 91.†

In much the same way as Albrechtsberger, Cherubini augments Fux's teaching on page 30, Rule 1, whose example he uses, by the way, in Example 85.

Bellermann apparently takes care of this question in a different way on page 198 ff. According to him, such a skip of a third is permitted in the outer voices but it must be used only once, and it must progress in contrary motion as in leaving a unison, for example:**

Example 102.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 102.} \\
\end{array}
\]

CLOSING


If it is possible, the half notes in the penultimate measure should be placed:

Example 103.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 103.} \\
\end{array}
\]

†Cf. page 126 ff.

**See Kontrapunkt I, page 263.
To be sure, a construction such as this is forbidden:

Example 104.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{E} \\
\text{3} \quad \text{4} \quad \text{5}
\end{array}
\]

because the second half note cannot act as an ascending leading tone despite its appearance to the contrary. Since the second half note is only a dissonant passing tone, it lacks the essential prerequisite for an ascending leading tone, as seen in Chapter 1, § 27, i.e., a consonant third relationship to the dominant tone.

In order to avoid the mistake of a unison or an octave doubling on the downbeat, such as:

Example 105.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C.F.} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{E} \\
\text{3} \quad \text{4} \quad \text{5}
\end{array}
\]

or to prevent other incongruities of voice leading, we must take refuge in the syncopation in the penultimate measure (just as we were frequently forced to employ the whole note of first species in this same species of two-part composition\(^{+}\)); for example:

Example 106.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C.F.} \quad \text{D} \quad \text{E} \\
\text{3} \quad \text{4} \quad \text{5}
\end{array}
\]

\(^{+}\)See Kontrapunkt I, page 289 ff.
Not only does this make it possible to maintain the half-note motion until the end, but three different tones become audible on the downbeat whereby the dissonant syncopation appears as a placeholder for the ascending leading tone.

However, such a syncopation can be assigned only to the ascending leading tone. If it appears in the lowest voice, then, in close position we find that instead of this:

Example 107.

\[ \text{\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example107.png}} \]

the diminished fifth is applied with more justification:

Example 108.

\[ \text{\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example108.png}} \]

The pressure exerted here by the postulate of the flowing melody in the outer voice is so strong that it induces us to move by step rather than by skip of a third, even at the cost of a diminished fifth. If, on the other hand, it appears that we must use the syncopation to avoid the fifth succession caused by the diminished fifth, then, ultimately, this deception fosters the impression of that particular necessity all the more. In this position, it can be alleviated in no better way than with the voice leading exhibited in Example 108.

This pressure of the flowing melody disappears, however, in open position because the voice in question is in the middle and full tribute is paid the flowing melody through stepwise motion in the outer voice. With the reduction of the pressure on the middle voice, the requirement for stepwise
movement as well as that for the diminished fifth disappears. In the end, the illusion that the syncopation was necessary here in order to avoid the open fifth succession cannot even arise. If, for all these reasons, there is no longer any necessity to set, for example:

Example 109.

\[ \text{Example 109.} \]

then it is advisable to avoid the open position in order not [69] to use the syncopation whose necessity is less convincing here than in close position.

The descending leading tone should not be syncopated, especially in a cantus firmus in minor.+

We should bear in mind that the leading tone must not always be blindly imposed on the voice carrying the half notes. On the contrary, the method practiced in Phrygian mode ++ exercises, of assigning the leading tones to the two whole-note voices in order to free the counterpoint moving in halves from this obligation, is also transferred to exercises in major and minor:+++.

Example 110.

\[ \text{Example 110.} \]

Otherwise, we must deny ourselves this sort of cadence construction when the half notes are in the lower voice. In the

---

+ See below, Chapter 4, § 10.
++ See Example 113a, below.
+++ Cf. Example 113c, below.
last analysis, the disposition of the leading tone is decided by the demands of the voice leading, so that in certain instances this can be written:

Example 111.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 111.}
\end{array} \]

The strict observance of diatonicism in minor does not allow, in contrast, a cadence such as:

Example 112.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 112.}
\end{array} \]

since the raised leading tone clashes with the minor third.+

Concerning the use of syncopation Fux offers this clarification (p. 96 ff.):

Because hardly any rule is without exception, we must understand the circumstances in which observance of the rule is appropriate. This is always the case in two-part composition, but it is not appropriate when three voices are present, as we can see from the preceding examples. If, instead of the ligatures, we were to set two untied half notes, we would end up either with an incorrect unison, or an octave stripped of its harmony.

We also find the following closing patterns in Fux:

---

+For more about this see Chapter 4, § 10.
Example 113. a) Table IX, Fig. 2; b) Table IX, Fig. 3; c) Table IX, Fig. 7.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a)} \\
\text{b)} \\
\text{c)}
\end{array}
\]

[70] Without a word of explanation, Albrechtsberger attempts to show all sorts of cadence forms in one list. Among the various forms in half notes, he includes one in which, strangely enough, the ascending leading tone is approached by a diminished fifth skip:++

Example 114.

He also sets syncopations including one with the diminished fifth. If we compare these to the closing formulas of the lessons on pages 90, 91, etc., we realize that he makes no further distinction between close and open position in the syncopation with the diminished fifth. He does not even mention the irregularity of the diminished fifth in such a situation.

Cherubini chiefly follows the teaching of Fux and even shows, by means of an example, the faulty doublings (1-1, 5-5) that will occur if we stick to two half notes in the penultimate measure. But by recommending the solution of this difficulty with the following:

Example 115.

---

+Page 88. (*27)

++Cf. in contrast, Example 103.
he, himself, makes an unpardonable mistake since he fails to set the leading tone directly before the tonic.† That he recommends the syncopation as a remedy is only natural, but his explanation for it sounds only too childish:

In this way, by taking advantage of the above-mentioned exception, we avoid the mistake of putting a unison on the strong beat. Since there is no rule prohibiting the syncopation in this species, we can apply it without making a mistake, provided it appears only in the penultimate measure. Nevertheless, we advise doing it only rarely. The following examples will prove that in many cases, it is easy to avoid the syncopation in the penultimate measure.**

Bellermann describes the "most satisfying" syncopated closing formulas and adds (p. 200):

If the ascending leading tone is in the lower voice and the cantus firmus is in the middle, then here in three-part composition—against all other rules—we can construct the closing in the following way by means of the ligature and the diminished triad on the weak beat.*** This is permissible, however, only when the voices are close together. It would be fault if we were to set the cantus firmus (now in the middle voice) an octave higher or the lower voice an octave lower.****

We see the difference between his opinion and Albrechtsberger's. Yet, I confess, I prefer to place myself in Bellermann's camp in this question, particularly with regard to the fact that at the closing***** the mingling of the voices caused by the close proximity appears to be better and more natural than the distance of a tenth found in open position.

†Kontrapunkt I, Chapter 2, § 17.

**Examples follow. (*28) Example 92 contains a quotation from Fux.

***Example follows. (*29)

****Examples follow. (*30)

*****Compare Kontrapunkt I, Section II, Chapter 1, § 29.
Example 116.

1. Soprano

Alto C.f.

Tenor

2. Soprano

Alto C.f.

Tenor
Remarks Concerning These Lessons

For each cantus firmus, the lessons can be carried out in six different ways.

Concerning the value of these lessons Fux states (p. 97):

[Aloys.] How much advantage these lessons have and how easy they make it for a beginning composer to write can hardly be expressed in words. And when the cantus firmus has been removed and its restraints are gone, he who is well practiced will find free composition to be child's play.

About 2. In measures 3-4 the successive fifths are acceptable by reason of the skip of a fourth that separates them. Concerning the quinta battuta in measures 8-9, see Kontrapunkt I, page 279.

About 3. Totally instrumental in character. Concerning the expression "filler voice," see Chapter 1, § 7.
CHAPTER 3

THIRD SPECIES: FOUR NOTES AGAINST ONE

MIDDLE

§ 1. The Fourth-Space.

As we can see from Example 117a:+

Example 117.

the side effect of a consonant passing tone++ suggests, in connection with the continuing effect of the harmony of the downbeat,++ the notion of a fourth-space as it extends through two passing tones from the fifth to the octave of the triad.++++ In 117b, because of the side effect of the accented passing tone,+++++ the awareness of such a space is somewhat impaired, while in 117c, the intervals heard from the root (although lacking their full severity) foster the concept of the fourth-space through the dissonant nature of the middle tones.++++++

---

+Cf. to that, Kontrapunkt I, page 298, and Example 331.

++Chapter 2, § 3.

+++Chapter 2, § 2.

++++Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 312.

+++++Cf. Example 94c.

+++++++Chapter 2, § 2.
The developing composing-out process within the sparse material of strict counterpoint experiences an enrichment and heightening through the development of the fourth-space, even though this, as may be seen above, is far distant from the absoluteness and certainty of free composition.

§ 2. Recollection and Extension of Some Older Principles.

In connection with the rejection of $\frac{6}{5}$ in strict counterpoint* and, consequently, also the prohibition against skipping into a dissonant interval, the following is forbidden in third species:

Example 118.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\textcopyright} \end{array} \]

Obviously a consonant neighboring tone can be more evident in the third species of three-part composition than in the second species:**

[74] Example 119.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\textcopyright} \end{array} \]

The neighboring tone, more justifiably set free in third species than in second,*** inspires a question which, to my knowledge, is asked now for the first time: do both neighboring tones (the upper and the lower) have the same

---

* Cf. Chapter 1, § 3.
** Cf. Chapter 2, § 3.
*** Kontrapunkt I, page 301.
effect and value in their application? It is striking that according to each individual case our sensibility, contrary to theory, in comparing the two neighboring tones, often allows the one and rejects the other. In order to convince ourselves of that, let us compare the effects in Example 120a and b:

Example 120.

![MIDI Staff 120a.png](attachment:MIDI%20Staff%20120a.png)

The reason why the effect of the lower neighbor in 120a (second measure) is better than the upper neighbor in 120b (second measure) can obviously be found in the fact that only the former reproduces the underlying passage:

Example 121.

![MIDI Staff 121.png](attachment:MIDI%20Staff%20121.png)

Thus, the predominance of the passing tone concept over that of the neighboring tone, as one only deduced from it, as also the neighboring tone is established, within strict

---

*Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 240 ff.*
counterpoint, is revealed the clue to a hidden original line behind the given live, for whose embellishment (diminution) it disposes itself.

[75] On the other hand, with the upper neighbor in the third measure of 120a, a fourfold repetition of $f^1$ is avoided (as in 120b). In addition, the upper neighbor offers an especially subtle attraction consisting in the fact that the note $a$, which has been set once as a neighboring tone on the weak beat, points to, and at the same time prepares very effectively for, the upcoming $a$ that appears on the third quarter note of the following measure. In the producing of this attractive effect—how often have our great masters looked for one such as this in their works—the changed rhythmic position of the same tone plays the major role.

No matter how simple these examples are, it may be very difficult in numerous other cases to decide between one of the two neighboring tones. The sensitivity of tone-life is revealed in the fact that such a decision cannot be made without the awareness of many different hidden imponderables, as, for example: the main line [Hauptlinie] of the song, the fundamental line [Urlinie], the strictest fulfillment of source concepts, the number of repetitions of one tone, etc.

Strict counterpoint furnishes the first occasion to recognize how different the effect of the neighboring tone is as a result of its location in the measure:

thus: \[\text{or:}\]

That the first form is the more natural needs no further proof.\(^+\) Occasionally, however, the second form is not un-

\(^{+}\text{See above, Example 120, meas. 3.}
pleasant, insofar as the situation substantiates it. In free composition, too, this distinction plays an important role.+

Just such a difference in the effect is revealed when 5 goes to 6 (or 6 to 5), but less if it involves a consonant neighboring tone (or accented passing tone) than a change of harmony. In contrast to the regular arrangement in Example 122a, this can be seen in the irregular cases in 122b and c:

Example 122.

Example 123.

[76] If we consider, solely from the horizontal perspective, that the end point of a true passing tone is consonant with the starting point, that is to say, it abides with it in the same harmony,++ then we see in the neighboring tone figure, which is derived from the passing tone, the first seeds of a substitution that is applied so frequently in free composition, enabling us to substitute one part for another within the same harmony:

Example 123.

---

+See Der freie Satz, section on passing movement.

++See Example 90, above.
Much more evident is the substitution in third species when the neighboring tone figure extends from the first to the third quarter note, for, then, the preservation of the same harmony is clearly seen:

Example 124.

If, however, the neighboring tone figure extends from the third quarter note to the first quarter note of the next measure, then the returning principal note is already part of the new harmony, from which, now, a new harmonic light is cast upon the end point of the figure:

Example 125.

In this sense, such a neighboring tone configuration may be designated irregular. If we consider that second species is in a position to use only the less regular variety, then we will understand why we should refrain from using the neighboring tone here.

We have previously spoken, in two-part composition, of an accented passing tone involving a dissonance on the third

---

*In a contrapuntal sense, the harmony on the following downbeat is always considered to be a new one, even if, in the sense of harmonic teachings, it is continued.

**See Example 123.

***Kontrapunkt I, pages 242-243.
quarter note. Here is a continuation of that explanation.

The justification for placing a dissonance on the third quarter note arises not only from the law of the passing tone, which finds fulfillment only if the sequence, consonance-
\[\text{dissonance-consonance, is followed, but also from the} \]

principle that applies to the basic rhythmic subdivision of half notes (two-part, second species counterpoint), according to which the half note on the upbeat may be dissonant.

The dissonant passing tone is not allowed on the down-beat because the unavoidable effect of an accented passing tone, for example:

Example 126.

would have to blur the original concept of the suspension (9-8). In the early stages of learning, the pupil would be forced to deal simultaneously with two different effects that he could not easily distinguish. Since it is the task of strict counterpoint to pinpoint the primary concepts, in order to ensure the understanding and application of the extensions, the student must deny himself the use of the genuine accented passing tone along with the original concept of the suspension.

Already in Kontrapunkt I (page 311), I said that the nota cambiata is a compositional phenomenon of free composition that was accepted by the older teachers in counterpoint textbooks only because of its frequent application. It is necessary to state here that this figure, which consists of two passing tones similarly interwoven, in the final analysis,
merely draws out the melodic line by step-movement, a step downward in the descending cambiata and a step upward in the ascending cambiata:

Example 127.

Thus, the ultimate meaning of the figure is encountered, inasmuch as (as will be shown later in Der freie Satz) the melodic line asserts the final word over the phenomena of composition.

§3. Parallel Successions.

I wish to remind the reader here that, if possible, parallels should be avoided in third species in the relationship of downbeat to downbeat, unless it is a question of octave or fifth-successions going hand in hand with the nota cambiata. On its behalf, we must patiently consent to them:

---

*Section entitled "Composing-out."

**Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 304.

***Concerning the seventh skipped into in Albrechtsberger's second example, see Kontrapunkt I, page 317 f.
Example 128.

From Fux: Table X, Fig. 1.

From Albrechtsberger: page 95. page 97:

page 98:
§ 4. The Formation of the Closing.

In the closing formulas let us not forget that, according to the discussion in Chapter 2, § 7, the second leading tone may be set in the other whole-note voice. As for the rest, we should utilize the occasion of the closing to correctly apply the nota cambiata and the neighboring tone. When we compare the effect of the usual and permissible closing formula in Example 129a with the forbidden one in 129b:

Example 129.

[79] it seems that the evident superiority of the lower neighbor in 129a comes from its indication of a latent IV harmonic degree and, at the same time, from the fact that the lower neighbor (as a diverted passing tone+) paves the way for the third above tonic in our imagination. On the other hand, the upper neighbor gets stuck as the first passing tone in the fourth-space, a-b-c#-d.++

Under no circumstance must we be guilty of setting a chromatic passage, as for example:

+ Cf. what was said in reference to Examples 120 and 121.
++ Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 312.
Example 130.

We must also avoid skipping into the ascending leading tone:

Example 131.

Concerning the inadmissibility of using a closing formula such as:

Example 132.

see Chapter 2, § 7.

Once again Albrechtsberger, as in two-part, third species counterpoint, offers a list of all sorts of possible formulas (p. 93 ff.). Only the most noteworthy will be reproduced here:
Example 133.

[80]
LESSONS

Example 134.

Soprano

1. Alto C.f.

Bass

Fux, Table X, Fig. 1.

[S81]

Fux, Table X, Fig. 3.
CHAPTER 4

FOURTH SPECIES: SYNCOPATION

GENERAL COMMENTS

§ 1. In the Syncopation Species of Three-Part Composition, the Outer-Voice Structure is the Bearer of the Continuous Two-Part Composition.

Since, despite the three-part texture, syncopations are understood in three-part composition exactly as in two-part (i.e., exclusively from the lowest voice), it seems here that no matter where the syncopating voice is situated, it helps to shape the two-part composition that we assume as continuous in three-part composition. It is as if a third interval were added as a kind of filler.† Thus, we have to ask ourselves: what is the status of the outer-voice structure, in which alone we have seen embodied the continuous two-part composition in the three-part composition? Does the outer-voice structure yield to that of the syncopation or not?

This question of such importance to the voice leading of the composition has to be answered as follows: In cases where the syncopation is in one of the outer voices, the two structures coincide to the benefit of the fundamentally active two-part composition within the three-part composition. But when the middle voice syncopates, the outer structure dominates the syncopations, exactly as it dominates in the first species of three-part composition when the cantus firmus lies in the middle voice. Therefore, we have to say the outer-voice structure governs in all situations, no matter how we

†Chapter 1, § 7.
explain the syncopation (in a middle voice). Thus, the syncopation species, in contrast to appearances, makes it very clear why we must regard only the outer structure as the two-part composition whose influence is continuous in the three-part composition. And this explains why we must, above all, seek to perfect the two-part, outer-voice structure in the syncopation species (particularly when the middle voice syncopates), despite the significant difficulties that are pointed up by the constant obligation for syncopation in and of itself. We cannot be too emphatic in pointing out to the learner the importance of the outer-voice structure as the Alpha and Omega of voice leading also in free composition.


In discussing the consonant syncopation in two-part composition, we determined that although its sense (like that of the dissonant syncopation) seems to span three beats, it actually involves only two beats. Owing to the consonance on the downbeat, there is, strictly speaking, no genuine compulsion toward this or that progression on the upbeat. And it is only the general rhythm of the syncopation-species lessons that requires a tied-over upbeat behind each downbeat in such a manner that the effect of an apparently inseparable span of three beats automatically results. I remind the reader that with respect to parallels (octaves or fifths) in connection with the consonant syncopations in two-part composition, the downbeat was found to be sufficiently weighty to alleviate the bad succession. This may be regarded as a further proof of the decisive effect of the downbeat and, consequently, of the intimate connection of only two beats.

---

All this leads to the following informative result:

Since, in strict counterpoint, the syncopation does not always have to be dissonant, and the consonant syncopation involves only two beats (\(\widehat{\text{\textsuperscript{1}}} \mid \text{\textsuperscript{8}}\)), the basic sense of the syncopation already becomes faintly evident within the compass of strict counterpoint: purely and simply, it is a rhythmical tying-over from upbeat to downbeat that spans just two beats. We shall see in the following the significance of this result, especially in the extended application of free composition.

Concerning the dissonant syncopation, the legacy from two-part to three-part composition is as follows:

1. In strict counterpoint the voice leading may never be constituted in such a way that it entails a compulsion toward certain predetermined paths for the voices, as is so often the case in free composition. For example, as it happens with motivic or passing tone constraints, or to take an example close to the issue, with the leading tone suspension, the so-called major seventh-chord of thoroughbass theory:

Example 135.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textsuperscript{8}}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textsuperscript{4}}
\end{array}
\]

In which the leading tone, as such, must ascend despite the tying-over.\(^+\) The impossibility, in strict counterpoint, of granting the harmonies such certainty that the path of the individual voices could be similarly predesigned from the very beginning is the factor that must cause all voice leading here to be independent and uninfluenced. It is expressed in a most significant way in the irrefutable demand for the prepar-

\(^+\text{Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 338, and Examples 395-397.}\)
ation of a dissonant syncopation by means of a consonance that as such does not prescribe anything and, absolutely, cannot.

In this way, the true and final meaning of this basic rule of the syncopation species is now revealed. Tied in with this meaning is the fact that we grasp the nature of the dissonant syncopation immediately at the sound of the downbeat and imagine the dissonant passing tone figure hidden within the dissonant syncopation as beginning, therefore, on the downbeat and not (as is possible in free composition) already earlier.

2. On the other hand, the compulsion of the dissonance inevitably refers to a third beat, that is, to the upbeat following the tied downbeat: \( \uparrow P \), whereby the dissonant syncopation is now distinguished from the consonant syncopation (see above) as a matter of course.

3. Nevertheless, within dissonant syncopations two groups can be distinguished: (1) \( 9--8 \), and \( 4--3 \) in the upper counterpoint, (2) \( 7--6 \) in the upper counterpoint, and \( 2--3 \) and \( 4--5 \) in the lower.

Due to their origin, only the first group constitutes that type of tied phenomena which, encompassing three beats, also flows (with the third beat--the upbeat) into the harmony of the downbeat. These, then, are the "true" suspensions.

In contrast, the \( 7--6 \), as well as the \( 2--3 \) and \( 4--5 \) syncopations, must initially create doubt as to whether at the third beat (i.e., the last) the harmony of the downbeat continues or, perhaps, because of the interval of a sixth in the upper counterpoint or a third or fifth in the lower, we should assume a second harmony. Since the 6, as an inversion, relates to another root-tone (and likewise the 3 and 5 of the lower voice may also produce a change of the root if they

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{+}See Kontrapunkt I, page 340 ff., and here, \S \ 3.} \]
appear on the upbeat), the harmony of the upbeat (i.e., third beat) in these syncopations must, as far as strict counterpoint is concerned, be described as still hanging in the balance. Nevertheless, the effect here seems to defer quite readily in favor of suspensions disposed in three beats (as with \( \overline{9--8} \), or \( \overline{4--3} \)). Upon closer examination, this effect must be explained as merely a reflection of these genuine suspensions and also of the circumstances of a syncopation lesson.

4. The descending \( 6--5 \overline{6--5} \) syncopation (in the upper counterpoint) occupies an intermediate position.\(^*\) The sixth, although naturally consonant and therefore justified in any progression (i.e., not just to 5), nevertheless, borrows from the dissonances the apparent obligation of the descending stepwise movement—even to 5—of a third beat and therefore demands treatment according to their nature.

All these relationships of the consonant and dissonant syncopations reappear in three-part composition and, despite the three-voice texture, the case is the same regarding the above-described uncertainty of the harmonies with the \( \overline{7--6} \), \( \overline{2--3} \), and \( \overline{4--5} \).

Regarding the latter, let us say here, for the sake of better understanding, that their ambiguous condition continues even in the species combinations,\(^{**}\) but that there they tend to decree another direction. Since, in four-part species combinations, these syncopations can form complements such as \( \overline{7-6} \overline{5-4} \), and \( \overline{6} \overline{3-2} \overline{5} \) on the downbeat, they reveal, differently than in two and three-part composition, the developing independence of the harmonies of the downbeat in contrast to those following.

\(^*\)See Kontrapunkt I, pages 381 ff.

\(^{**}\)See Section VI, below.
on the upbeat. This appears so starkly that, contrary to the compulsion toward the third beat (the upbeat) stemming from the tied dissonance on the downbeat, we observe in still another sense only two beats, \( \text{p} \text{p} \), and an even sharper contrast between the syncopations and the actual suspensions.\(^+\) To be sure, these syncopations lose their uncertainty only in free composition.\(^++\)

\( \% 3. \) How Three-Part Composition Finally Clarifies and Confirms the Necessity for a Downward Resolution of the Dissonant Syncopation.

The postulate of the downward resolution of all dissonant syncopations in strict counterpoint is now finally confirmed in three-part composition through its increased means. This will be shown here by examining the syncopations one by one.

a) \( \text{7--6}: \)

According to the explanation given in Kontrapunkt I (pages 340 ff.), the \( \text{7--6} \) is based on a descending and not an ascending passing tone figure. Thus, in two-part composition:

Example 136.

The difference in the effect of these two passing tone figures is clear in two-part composition inasmuch as with the ascen-

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{+}}\text{See No. 1, above.} \]

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{++}}\text{Cf., Der freie Satz.} \]
ing passing tone (no matter whether we assume here only one chord A, or a succession of two, A and C) it does not appear feasible to shorten the figure by eliminating the beginning point, as my concept of the syncopation demands. Indeed, the reason is that we do not have the right to infringe upon the root-propensity of a given root-tone and presume its sixth.

Three-part composition adds further reasons why this line of reasoning favors the descending resolution:

Let us suppose that the octave of the root-tone is in the third voice. With the descending passing tone figure, this octave explicitly demonstrates the starting point of the figure even if the tie is eliminated:

Example 137.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\textbf{Example 137.}} \\
\text{\textbf{Example 138.}} \\
\text{\textbf{Example 139.}} \\
\end{array} \]

With the ascending passing tone figure, however:

Example 138.

the effect of a neighboring tone is felt:

Example 139.

because the added octave strengthens the root-propensity of the lowest tone to such an extent that we have even more difficulty imagining the sixth, a, as the beginning point of
a passing tone figure than in two-part composition.+

[87] If the third voice contains the third, then it is again impossible to presuppose a sixth at the beginning of the passing tone figure. This avoids the question concerning the relative effect exerted by a third:

Example 140.

Moreover, in the ascending figure the root-tone would have to cause us, because of the third, to perceive an octave rather than a sixth, in which case 7−8 would again necessarily have the effect of a neighboring tone:**

Example 141.

It is clear that the third voice must not contain the fifth. After all, apart from the emptiness of the fifth, a dissonant sonority on the upbeat would have to be endured in the descending passing tone figure:

Example 142.

---

*See Example 136, above.

**See Example 139, above.
and, in the ascending figure, such a sonority would already have to be endured on the downbeat:

Example 143.

For in the case of the fifth, who, merely to preserve the passing tone impulse, would want to assume a sixth when it is possible to hear the dissonance either in the sense of a neighboring tone:

Example 144.

[88] or even in the sense of a passing tone figure taking place in the space of the fourth:

Example 145.

b) \( \sim 4 \rightarrow 3 \);

The resolution of the dissonant syncopation \( \sim 4 \) is based on the descending passing tone figure (\( \sim 4 \rightarrow 3 \)) and not on the ascending (\( \sim 4 \rightarrow 5 \));

+See Kontrapunkt I, page 312.
++See Kontrapunkt I, page 344.
If we consider that the passing tone in the first case leads to the third, which refers back horizontally to a fifth no less than the root-tone refers vertically to a fifth, then that alone gives it the advantage over the ascending figure, whose endpoint results in an unwelcome empty fifth in two-part composition. This is correct even if we should concede that ultimately the third no less than the fifth must be allowed as a starting point of the passing tone figure.

In three-part composition, the most natural action is to assign the fifth to the third voice. With this tone the descending passage explicitly reveals the passing tone figure and its starting point:

Example 147.

Here, we clearly see the particular advantage of the suspension, which, alone, makes it possible to use the fifth that would otherwise be useless due to its emptiness. It fills in the fifth with a dissonant passing tone and thus heightens our expectation of the third.

In the case of the ascending resolution, the fifth would not only lead to a totally unusable doubled fifth on the upbeat:

Example 148.
[89] but would also cause the impression of a neighboring tone to come to the foreground:

Example 149.

Thus, also in three-part composition, this important interval, the fifth, favors only the descending resolution of the syncopation of the fourth.

Moreover, instead of the fifth, the third voice can easily be given a sixth, so that with the descending figure:

Example 150.

the sixth represents the acknowledged starting point of a passing tone in the fourth-space (between the sixth and third of the chord). Of the two possible passing tones in this space, we choose the more natural one situated a whole step from the endpoint. Yet, even with the sixth, the remains within the same chord. This is unequivocally shown by the fact that, next to the sixth, a fifth would be inadmissible as a starting point of a passing tone figure because of the 6.

Assuming an ascending figure, the dissonant sonority would necessarily arise on the upbeat:

†See Kontrapunkt I, page 312.
Example 151.

unless one proposes this passing tone figure:

Example 152.

which is, after all, too unnatural to accept voluntarily.

Finally, by assigning a third to the third voice with the 4–3, we would have, in the descending passage, the disadvantage of a neighboring tone effect:

[90]
Example 153.

This would be as superfluous as assigning a fifth, sixth, or octave, since an interval such as this can be tied over in any case. On the other hand, in the ascending figure the third would be well placed at the beginning:

Example 154.

if a fifth were not automatically perceived through the root-propensity of the lowest tone supported by two thirds, which causes a neighboring tone effect:
Example 155.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
n_5 \quad 4 \quad 5 \\
\end{array}
\]

c) \[\sim 9--8\]

To be sure, with \[\sim 9\] we retain the same harmony for both the ascending and descending forms of the passing tone figure:

Example 156.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
n_{10} \quad 9 \quad 8 \quad 8 \quad 9 \quad 10 \\
\end{array}
\]

However, the third-space between the octave and the tenth becomes understandable only when we assume the tenth to be the beginning interval as it occurs in the descending passage. In this matter, what is actually brought to the ear is decisive. If, with the ascending passing tone figure, we first think of the octave, then we run the risk of initially equating it to the root-tone, thinking of a prime, whereby we believe the ascent is from the root-tone to the third instead of to the tenth. In contrast, in the descending figure, where the octave appears after a genuine ninth, this sound as an octave can no longer be obliterated. Thus, the inference about the actual pitch-range over the root-tone (i.e., in the third-space between the tenth and octave) is forcefully supported. This was precisely why, in Kontrapunkt I, I gave preference to the descending passing tone over the ascending passing tone with \[9--8\], and why I distinguished \[\sim 9--8\] from \[\sim 2--1\].

Even more strongly than two-part composition, three-part composition decrees the descending resolution. Here it is easiest to assign the third to the third voice. Its starting point seems to require downward movement no matter whether
the distance is a tenth (in the upper voice) or a third (in a middle voice):

Example 157.

With the third, the sonority also seems to be full enough since the dissonant passing tone aims for the interval of the octave which leads to the $\frac{8}{3}$, or $\frac{10}{8}$. +

An ascending figure with the third, however, would soon shift into a neighboring tone movement:

Example 158.

without the presence of the octave as the starting point to protect us against it. For, as I said, within a totally independent voice leading, as in strict counterpoint, what actually sounds affects us more strongly than what we might merely imagine. In addition, there would appear, as a consequence, a doubled third on the upbeat, which must be regarded as less acceptable since other better results are possible. ++

The addition of a fifth to $\frac{9}{8}$--8 would make the sonority seem even emptier in the descending passage:

---

+See Chapter 1, § 14, above.

++Cf., Chapter 1, § 14.
Example 159.

The perception of the third would not be sufficient to fill out the emptiness present when the octave, and with it the [92] empty \(\text{\textit{8}}\) harmony, awaits us on the upbeat. The objection (already offered in reference to Example 156) to an imagined octave starting point with the ascending figure also holds true for \(\text{\textit{9-8}}\):

Example 160.

The addition of an octave with the descending figure would lead to the effect of a neighboring tone:

Example 161.

On the other hand, with the ascending figure the octave would be the starting point:

Example 162.
but would presuppose nothing less than $\frac{8}{8}$.

It is also possible to add a sixth, whereby, in the case of a descending figure:

Example 163.

![Example 163](image)

we encounter the $\frac{8}{6}$, a sonority that is not the most acceptable, but which would have to be imagined as the prerequisite in the ascending figure:

Example 164.

![Example 164](image)

[93] From the standpoint of three-part composition, the suitability of the tenth to mark the precise space above the 8 as well as to enter into favorable combinations with 10 (or 3) and 6 decides in favor of the assumption of a descending passing tone figure with $\sim 9-8$. Yet we must not forget that beyond such an autonomous view of voice leading, the ascending resolution of $\sim 9-10$ is less objectionable in strict counterpoint than the ascending resolutions of $\sim 7-8$ or $\sim 4-5$ in the upper counterpoint. This is, indeed, the reason why in free composition, where harmonic progression can establish the path on which the voice leading embarks, the $\sim 9$ can more easily resolve either upward or downward

---

*See Chapter 1, § 14.

**See a) and b).
than the 7 or 4. However, in free composition, 9--10 is felt merely as a second before a third and 2--3 as a real 9--10 syncopation. Thus, free composition admits the danger and confirms the fact that an octave, imagined as the beginning point of the passing tone figure can be more readily mistaken for a prime than an actual, sounding octave.

d) 2--1:

The voice leading of two-part composition often finds itself in the situation of being forced to permit the 2--1.† The prime on the upbeat, which presumes a necessity in the voice leading, has a much more damaging effect than on the downbeat, but, because of the dissonant second, the downbeat seems to be sufficiently full as far as sonority is concerned. In this case (as with 9--8) only the descending figure can be accepted, that is, only with the third as the starting point of the passing tone figure:

Example 165.

\[\ldots\]

This comes from the fact that, inversely, with the ascending passing tone it would be undesirable to think of a prime on the downbeat:

Example 166.

\[\ldots\]

†Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 352.
In this sense, the urge to add the third as a beginning point in \(2-1\) is more strongly pronounced than in \(9-8\). On the other hand, seeking protection from the neighboring tone effect:

Example 167.

However, three-part composition also decides in favor of the descending figure, again as with \(9-8\), because of the better suitability of a third before the prime. It does this in spite of the danger of a neighboring tone effect, against which protection is sought in the same manner as in two-part composition (through contemplating 10-9-8):

Example 168.

*See Kontrapunkt I, pages 355 ff.*
e) 2--3:

The adverse effect of the ascending passing tone figure proves to be even more decisive with the under syncopations than with those that lie above. For, if the effect of a root-tone is automatically linked with the beginning tone of an ascending passing tone figure when it occurs in the lowest voice, then it is clear that least of all may such a figure be contemplated in the world of independent voice leading. We see this even in the 2--3 syncopation in two-part composition. If we assume the descending figure, then the harmony of the cantus firmus tone is preserved by the unison on the downbeat:

Example 169.

At least it is not abandoned, whereas when we achieve a tone at the endpoint of the figure, we do not know whether this is [95] the expected root of a harmony finally becoming complete on the upbeat, or -- and this undecided effect is discussed in § 2 under 3-- the root of a new harmony. On the other hand, what would give us the right to imagine in advance such a root-tone a third lower as the obligatory precondition with the ascending figure:

Example 170.
when there is no harmonic logic that could force us, under certain circumstances, to use it as we would in free composition? Moreover, in the ascending figure, would we still not attain a neighboring tone effect (see at N.B.)?

And now, three-part composition affirms the preference for the descending movement. If we give to the third voice an interval that forms a third at the beginning point of the figure—in the syncopated situation the numbers for the downbeat read \( \frac{4}{2} \)—then we achieve the \( \frac{5}{2} \) chord on the upbeat, as shown in the following example:

Example 171.

Yet, \( \frac{6}{3} \) can also be produced on the upbeat when we take an interval on the downbeat that relates as a fourth to the opening tone of the passing tone figure:

Example 172.

Therefore, it is expressed as a fifth, \( \frac{5}{2} \), in the syncopated situation. Countering a possible objection that a vertical fourth is dissonant, we must remark that in the reality of the setting (as in Example 172) it is not in the lowest position because of the added dissonant syncopation and is, therefore, consonant. As a consonant inversion of the fifth, it creates the effect that only one harmony is permissible, that is, the \( \frac{6}{3} \) on the upbeat.
The sixth as the starting point of the passing tone figure (that is, in the syncopated situation 7\over{3}) leads to the lower counterpoint's 7--8, which will be discussed under the heading g):

Example 173.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{not:} \\
3 \quad 8 \\
6 \quad 7 \quad 8
\end{array}
\]

In contrast, if we scrutinize \(4\over{2}\) or \(5\over{2}\) in the ascending passing tone figure:

Example 174.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{not:} \\
\text{or:} \\
4 \quad 3 \quad 5 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 6 \quad 2 \quad 1
\end{array}
\]

it becomes evident that the mental addition of the root-tone in the lower register can never be supported or justified. Moreover, in the second case, one would have to arrive at a fourth on the upbeat, which as one actually given and not one merely imagined is out of the question in the syncopation species.

f) 4--5:

The advantage of the descending over the ascending passing tone figure with the 4--5 in two-part composition:
Example 175.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example175.png}}
\end{array}
\]

is based on the fact that, in the former, the starting point asserts its own root-propensity but leaves open the prospect of another lower root-tone, while in the latter case, the lower root-tone, signifying the extreme boundary of the given [97] sonority, would have to be assumed from the very beginning. If we consider that in the case of both passing tone figures the starting points in the lower register must be contemplated and therefore influence the harmony, then we understand why the original question about the preference of the descending over the ascending passing tone figure must be posed. In the narrowest sense it should be phrased this way: which of the two figures that are to be imagined is the more natural? And, phrased in this fashion, the question can surely only be decided as it was at the outset.

Again, it is only three-part composition that finally decides in favor of the descending resolution. For, aside from the fact that we may not imagine a new root-tone in the lower register with the ascending passing tone figure, a neighboring tone effect would also originate:

Example 176.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{example176.png}}
\end{array}
\]

In contrast, the descending passing tone figure would offer
combinations that are far more favorable. The third voice might start at the beginning of the passing tone figure with a prime or octave:

Example 177.

In the syncopated situation, we have along with the 4-5 also the 2-3. Because of these intervals, the question must remain undecided as to whether we are dealing with only one harmony (to which the upbeat points) or with two harmonies (on the downbeat and upbeat), which produce the effect of an ambiguity as in the case of 7-6 in the upper counterpoint.

Because of the 6, it is forbidden to set the fifth along with the fourth:

Example 178.

Concerning the impossibility of assigning the sixth to the third voice at the beginning (that is, the seventh above the passing tone), see g) below.

[98] g) 7-8

For reasons already mentioned several times, the descending passing tone figure would always be preferred over the ascending one with 7 in the lower counterpoint of a two-part composition:
Example 179.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{not:} \\
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{7} & \text{8} & \text{6} & \text{7} & \text{8} & \text{8} & \text{7} & \text{6}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

if, ultimately, the former were not ruled out because the lower counterpoint unexpectedly becomes in reality an upper one. For, if we were to imagine the under-sixth as the beginning of the passing tone figure, we would, without intending to, instantly invert the sixth into a third and thus conceive the root-tone again in the lower register:

Example 180.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{?} & \text{?} & \text{6} & \text{7} & \text{8} & \text{3} & \text{2} & \text{1}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

On the other hand, the originally planned passing tone figure in the lower counterpoint would spontaneously appear as \(\text{2--1}\) or \(\text{9--8}\) in the upper counterpoint (if not as a neighboring tone). Even if we should imagine an under-sixth, it is impossible to exclude from our imagination the true root-tone created by inversion. For, with the impulse of the inversion our imagination independently produces the true root-tone in the low register, and if we demand this as a matter of course with the ascending passing tone figure, then the \(\text{7--6}\) would also stand for \(\text{2--3}\) in the upper counterpoint.

The immutability of these ways of perceiving, and therefore the inconceivability of the \(\text{7--8}\) syncopation in the lower counterpoint is first shown in three-part composition:
Example 181.

It is this compulsion of the inversion with the \(7/8\) syncopation that strict counterpoint must ban from its realm. Caring only for purity and preservation of the original concepts, it may not permit, with \(9/8\), the use of another extended form of the same idea, just as, to cite a similar case, it does not permit with the fifth its consonant inversion, the fourth, in an excessively low register.


The strict adoption in three-part writing of syncopation concepts gained from two-part composition means that as long as the syncopation is in the middle or upper voice, we need to regard the relation to the bass, but not the further syncopation relationships to the third voice. In spite of three-voice texture, there is at any given point, just as in two-part composition, only one syncopation: \(7/6, 4/3, 9/8, 2/1\), and certainly not a second additional one against the filler interval. This is also the case with the lower syncopations \(2/3\) and \(4/5\). Here, too, we need to consider the syncopation calculated from the lowest voice, but not, in addition, the interval from the second to the third voice. Yet, we must avoid being misled by the appearance of \(4/5\). Since it is also the case in
three-part composition that all intervals may be conceived only with the lowest voice, the homogeneity of the syncopation is already anchored in this principle. 

Quite often the understanding as well as the designation of the lower-voice syncopations in three-part counterpoint creates difficulties for learners. We can eliminate them in the easiest fashion by impressing on the students that they should take particular care with a representation:

Example 182.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{not:} \\
\text{\includegraphics[width=2cm]{example.png}}
\end{array}
\]

\begin{align*}
&\text{toward which they are inclined to test and define the dissonant suspension tone as well as the resolution tone on the basis of the scale-degree association of free composition, and indeed, to consider each element separately with regard to its own relationship to the tones placed above. I particularly want to warn them not to be confused by the expression that describes the situation as follows: "The second resolves itself." These words quite often create the idea that the content and basis of the syncopation is only a single tone, namely, the dissonant suspension (which "resolves itself"), whereas the completion of the concept according to the compositional reality requires two different tones to be identified in two different intervals. Thus, the syncopation must be described rather as a phenomenon in which, to use the above example, a consonant third follows a dissonant second. For similar linguistic reasons, many beginners find it difficult to understand the concept of the interval for which, again, in the designation of two tones, we find only one name or one number. But, that is precisely the deeper meaning. It is the happy charge of language to reproduce with one word the relationship of two things to one another. To come back to the syncopation, how does it express precisely its ultimate secret with a term that seems to contradict its true essence? If we consider that the dissonant syncopation represents a passing tone figure, and remember that this (see Example 90) points up the concept of a nodal point (therefore a beginning and end belong to the same horizontal harmony), then we understand that from this an effect flows as if the beginning and end of the passing tone figure were to merge totally. Thus, when we name the one, we mean} 
\end{align*}
§ 5.--2. The Prohibition against Doubling the Tone of Resolution as an Expression of the Unaltered Purity of the Syncopation Concept also in Three-Part Composition.

Repeatedly, we had the opportunity in § 3 to show how the doubling of the tone of resolution, for example, \( \overrightarrow{7-6} \), \( \overrightarrow{4-3} \), \( \overrightarrow{9-8} \), or \( \overrightarrow{7-8} \) leads to the unacceptable effect of a neighboring tone, an inversion, or the like. Therefore, the prohibition against doubling the tone of resolution seeks even more justifiably to suppress such effects, when, as we have shown above, other intervals offer a more favorable effect. It is important to emphasize these circumstances in the following manner: the consistent character and unaltered purity of the individual syncopation concepts is responsible for the fact that in three-part composition as in two-part, only \( \overrightarrow{9-8} \) or \( \overrightarrow{2-1} \) can produce a duplication of the resolution tone (in the lower voice). In contrast, all other dissonant syncopations lead to different intervals such as \( 6 \), \( 3 \), or \( 5 \). This purity of the concepts would be impaired, however, if the third voice, merely to exercise its right for doubling, were permitted to double the tone of resolution.

In other words: in the first, second, and third species of three-part composition, the voice leading may, under certain circumstances, bring about \( \overrightarrow{6} \) and \( \overrightarrow{3} \). But, in the syncopation species, the syncopating voice (in addition to the other and vice versa. In the last analysis, the unity of the passing tone figure originates from the unity of the triad concept. But how this triad concept, in spite of the triplexity (1, 3, 5 partials) displayed in one tone, signifies a unity remains the incomprehensible secret of nature, the trace of which, as we see, also echoes in human language.

\[ ^{+}\text{Cf. Chapter 1, § 14.} \]
outer-voice structure) appears significant enough to produce* the impression that we must circumscribe the proper two-part composition only with it and the bass. That is the reason why the use of the syncopation would be futile if the third "filler voice" were also to sound the tone of resolution with the suspension.


a) \( \sim 7-6 \):

It is especially important to be aware that the still undecided effect of the \( \sim 7-6 \) syncopation in strict counter-[101] point,++ may, in free composition, be wrested into an unequivocal effect for each situation. There, on some occasions, the seventh is only an event of the horizontal line, a true passing tone (as, for example, in the seventh-chord), which, no matter whether it appears tied or untied, already presupposes that at the end of the passing tone figure the harmony will change.+++ On other occasions, however, the seventh exhibits, as a vertical event, the effect of a suspension encompassing three beats (\( \sim 7-6 \)) regardless of whether \( 7 \) is actually tied over (\( \sim 7-6 \)) or (seemingly) appears freely (7-6) wherein its resolution is found still in the same harmony, that is, in relation to the sustaining tone.++++

Indeed, there are few insights in the art of music that are so revealing and beneficial as this understanding of the difference between the seventh in strict counterpoint

*See § 1, above.
++See § 2, above.
+++See Der freie Satz, the section on the seventh.
++++See Der freie Satz, the section on syncopation.
and the seventh in free composition, and in the latter, between the seventh as a passing tone and as a suspension.

The nature of the dissonance causes the sixth in \( \tilde{7}-6 \) to be more forcefully indicated than in \( 5-6 \); with the consonant fifth we can still think of skipping away and, therefore, the pathway to the six is much less fixed.

b) \( \tilde{9}-8 \):

It is due to the expansion of the harmony that in three-part composition the syncopations \( \tilde{9}-8 \) and \( \tilde{2}-1 \) in the upper counterpoint and \( \tilde{4}-5 \) in the lower (which in two-part composition are more tolerated than welcome)\(^+\) already manifest a more convincing effect (as \( \tilde{9}-8 \), \( \tilde{9}-8 \) and \( \tilde{4}-5 \)). Certain reservations apply to these syncopations, but only with regard to the intervals of resolution, \( 8 (1) \) and \( 5 \)--particularly if they appear in the outer-voice structure where they can easily create difficulties in the voice leading.

c) \( \tilde{2}-3 \):

The \( \tilde{2}-3 \) and \( \tilde{2}-1 \) are totally different concepts. The \( \tilde{2}-3 \) syncopation belongs to the lower counterpoint, while the \( \tilde{2}-1 \) belongs to the upper counterpoint.

\[ \text{[102]} \]

The lower syncopation \( \tilde{2}-3 \) makes two complete triads possible. Indeed, with \( \tilde{4} \) it leads to \( \tilde{5} \), and with \( \tilde{5} \) to \( \tilde{6} \).

Whether we may also use the diminished fifth with \( \tilde{4}-5 \) on the upbeat:

\[ \text{[Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 358.]} \]
Example 183.

\[ \text{Example 183.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\frac{1}{4}
\end{array} \]

depends upon the strictness of view to which the teacher and student have voluntarily agreed. We must hear the differences in effect and learn to judge which one originates from the various positions of the diminished fifth or the differences in the accompanying circumstances.

Applied to the downbeat, the diminished fifth should suggest the characteristic effect of a passing tone which, as I shall show later,\(^+\) is always inseparably connected with it. In strict counterpoint, where the principle of consonance must care for the balance of the harmonies, where the fundamental conceptions demand the strictest purity and logic, and where the dissonance can appear only on the upbeat, the passing tone is forbidden on the downbeat. This was already explained in the first species of both two-part and three-part counterpoint.\(^++\)

(Some theorists, for example, Albrechtsberger,\(^+++\) occasionally permit the diminished fifth on the downbeat although its passing tone effect necessitates a merger of two beats.)

A similar effect appears when, in connection with a consonant downbeat, the diminished fifth is produced on the upbeat.\(^++++\) In such a case—Albrechtsberger grants it as a "license"—the effect of the passing tone stands in the fore-

---

\(^+\)See Der freie Satz, the section dealing with the seventh.

\(^++\)Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 237.

\(^+++\)See quote in Kontrapunkt I, page 347.

\(^++++\)See Kontrapunkt I, page 347, Example 408, the succession 3-5\(\text{b}\).
ground, again forcing a merger of two beats.

It is different with the diminished fifth that is on the upbeat in connection with the dissonant syncopation \( \sim 2-3 \) or \( \sim 4-5 \). Here, the syncopations \( \sim 2-3 \) or \( \sim 4-5 \) push themselves so strongly into the foreground that, in comparison, the passing tone effect of the diminished fifth remains in the background. And, because of this blending in the effects (that of the foreground effect of the syncopation and the background effect of the merely passing diminished fifth), the latter, although it contradicts total strictness [103] and the combining of the \( \sim 2-3 \) with 5 can lead to a complete triad \( (5-6) \), may, if you will, be ultimately allowed. Being aware of this, it would have to be figuratively evaluated for the succession as a pure fifth in the sense that it could be just as suitable as a pure fifth* for the preparation of a following dissonance.

We must leave it to the voice leading alone to make the distinction whether there is a necessity to deviate from strict practice. At the cadence formation, the diminished fifth may be quite suitable** inasmuch as, here, only the resolution into the tonic harmony is impending. Thus, the hidden passing tone effect may come through unhindered, and, with it, the necessity of falsifying the diminished fifth for the purpose of resolving the syncopations into a consonance disappears.

d) \( \sim 4-5 \)

In contrast, the lower syncopation \( \sim 4-5 \) has only one possible resolution: \( (4-5) \) \( 2-3 \). This is connected with the fifth of the upbeat whose essence receives a most suitable illumin-

*See Example 186, below.

**See § 10, below.
ation by this means.+

e) Finally, we can glean from the above discussion that strict three-part counterpoint does not offer the opportunity to use $\frac{6}{5}$, $\frac{6}{2}$ or $\frac{7}{5}$. The meaning of this preliminary remark will become clear in the course of the presentation.++

As the objective for syncopation exercises, Fux presents (p. 104):

[Alois.] The ligatures here constitute the main objective about which you can gain a thorough understanding through such practice. That is the reason I particularly recommend this practice to you as the finest in composition.+++

Fux reveals the incompleteness of his view with the following thought (p. 103):

[Alois.] You must remember that we are concerned here with learning and with a type of exercise in which each measure has a ligature. Therefore, it is not necessary to observe the other concordances that we have mentioned elsewhere and will speak of in the future. We judge a free composition differently since no law prevents us assigning each dissonance its own concordance.

With these mysterious words, Fux hints at the construction of the seventh chord in free composition. But, very little is to be gained from this hint for a true understanding of the concept of the seventh chord.++++

In regard to this question concerning which intervals should be set with the individual dissonant syncopations, Fux remarks (p. 99):

[104] Even though it seems strange, the third part should provide the same concordance it would have had were the ligature not present. The following examples illustrate this truth:

---

+Cf. Chapter 1, §11.

++See Section VI.

+++Cf. the quotes in Kontrapunkt I, pages 377-380!

++++Cf. below, Chapter 4, §2, the quote from Fux.
We can see that in both examples the third voice maintains the same concordance, without the ligature interfering. This is also true with ligatures in the bass or lowest voice; for example:

We must not overlook that Fux expressly thinks of only dissonant syncopations. Perhaps he did this unconsciously. At any rate, the reader has been informed that the result in the case of the consonant syncopations is not the same as in that of dissonant ones.

Finally, let me point out that Fux, in his few lessons, occasionally uses: \(\text{7-6} - \text{7-6} - \text{4-3} - \text{9-8}\), \(\text{2-1} + \text{2-3} - \text{2-3} - \text{4-5}\), \(\text{3-} - \text{4-5'} - 5-6' - 2-3\) (whereby the diminished fifth is also used). Can we assume from this that he would also have used \(\text{9-8} - \text{4-3}\), or would he have permitted only \(\text{9-8}\) and \(\text{4-3}\) ?

---

*Table XI, Figure 3 is quoted in *Kontrapunkt 1*, page 386.

**See Table XII, Fig. 3. (*31)**

***Cf. Chapter 2, Example 116, No. 2.**
Nowhere does Fux express any prohibition against doubling the tone of resolution. For an alluded reference see Chapter 4, § 2.

Finally, it is necessary to mention that in this species of three-part composition, Fux shows a figure lasting two measures: \( \frac{6}{5} - \frac{4}{5} \) with the related phenomenon of an extended construction involving several tied dissonances. More about that appears in a later section.

It would lead us astray here to refute Albrechtsberger's superfluous as well as misleading summary listing of the numerous possible ties in free composition, especially since he, misunderstanding the true nature of extension, binds free composition to senselessly strict rules. From the rest of his scattered remarks, let me point out a few more items. For example, on page 105 ff. he criticizes the formation:

[105] Example 185.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\frac{3}{2} \quad \frac{7}{1} \\
\end{array}
\]

with the words: "The (first) mistake is the fifth, \( A \), in the second measure, instead of the third, \( f \), with the held ninth." From this it follows that he had nothing to say against the \( \frac{3}{2} \) , or \( \frac{10}{2} \). We already mentioned in Chapter 2, § 7 that he basically permits the diminished fifth on the upbeat. It is, however, worth mentioning that he uses the diminished fifth for the preparation of a dissonant syncopation on page 108.

---

*Table XI, Figures 7 and 8. (*32)

**See Section VI.

***Page 100 ff.; cf. also, Kontrapunkt I, pages 347-348.

****See also, § 10 below.
Example 186.

\[ \text{Example 186.} \]

In Nottebohm we find Albrechtsberger's correction regarding Beethoven's violation of the prohibition against doubling the tone of resolution.\(^{+}\) In addition, the following remark appears (in regard to four-part composition):

No tied fourth can be turned into a third and no seventh into a sixth. Beneath \(9-8\) we may use \(8\) when needed, but it is better to use \(5\) or \(6\). \(^{3}\)

With this he expresses, most clearly, the prohibition against doubling the tone of resolution.

Obviously, it can be traced back to Fux when Albrechtsberger, too, gives instruction in three-part, fourth species counterpoint to use \(6-15\) (see pages 99-100).\(^{++}\)

Without naming Fux expressly, Cherubini uses his ideas, in addition to his examples. But beyond that, he states in his second rule:

All dissonances—the second, fourth, seventh, and ninth—may be used here. The second must be accompanied by the perfect fourth and placed in the lower voice only:

Example 187.

\[ \text{Example 187.} \]

We see that Cherubini, unhesitatingly, permits the diminished fifth on the upbeat. Or, must we understand the above example only from the standpoint of a closing formula even when the author does not clearly state this limitation?

There are cases in which the second may be accompanied by the fifth. This manner is actually more suitable to the true principles of strict counterpoint than the

\(^{+}\)See pages 53 and 56.

\(^{++}\)About that, see Section VI, below.
former because, to a certain degree, these principles prohibit the diminished fifth, which would not be possible if we accepted the procedure just shown. As a dissonance, the fourth should be accompanied by the fifth and placed in the upper or one of the middle voices.\[106\] The seventh should be accompanied by the third and resolved to the sixth. It may be used only in the two uppermost voices.\[**\] The ninth should be accompanied by the third and resolved to the octave. We may place it in the upper or the middle voice.\[****\]

From this it is easy to understand how much these rules lack correctness and completeness.

Cherubini even goes further than Fux and Albrechtsberger when he, at the end of syncopation species, in addition to $\frac{\text{\textsuperscript{6}}}{\text{\textsuperscript{4}}} - \frac{\text{\textsuperscript{5}}}{\text{\textsuperscript{4}}} -$, also shows examples of combinations of fourth and second as well as fourth and third species\[******\] (Example 114).

In an excellently structured discussion, Bellermann comes to specific evaluations with regard to the composition of dissonant syncopations. I shall reproduce his main points here in abbreviated form next to each of the single figures (p. 212 ff.).

\[\text{\textsuperscript{7}-}\text{\textsuperscript{6}}\]
\[3 -: \ "Most Suitable."\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{7}-}\text{\textsuperscript{6}}\]
\[8 -: \ "In this combination, the octave appears as the upper or middle voice. The former sounds fuller and better since the voices are closer together here than when the seventh is placed above the octave. Yet, in many cases, the second combination is justified by the voice leading."\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{4}-}\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\]
\[5 -: \ "It is the best."\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{+}Example 104. (*33)}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{++}Example 105. (*34)}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{+++}Example 106. (*35)}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{++++}Example 107. (*36)}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{+++++}All about this, see Section VI, below.}\]
"In place of the fifth we can sometimes set the octave or the sixth of the bass for the sake of a flowing voice leading."

"By the better composers of the 15th and 16th centuries, it is used almost without exception."

"In rare cases the sixth is also used, although this is even less pleasant than the other one."

Sounds empty and is therefore to be totally avoided in the following contrapuntal exercises."

"These are the best."

"The voice leading can now and then demand that the two upper voices form an octave."

To this we must add that Bellermann does not mention the filler voice with $2\text{-}1$, since he considers $2\text{-}1$ the same as $9\text{-}8$. Instead, he says (p. 215):

It can easily happen that the dissonance designated as a ninth actually is only a second, and that, conversely, the dissonance designated as a second is actually placed a ninth from the voice with which it is dissonant.

How Bellermann judges the diminished fifth at $4\text{-}5$ has been explained at the conclusion of second species in three-part composition.

Finally, let me reproduce here Bellermann's evasion with respect to the $9\text{-}8$ syncopation [p. 214 f.]:

With few exceptions, the ninth in strict vocal composition is used as a dissonance appearing only against the bass (the lowest voice of the sonority), therefore, not between the upper and middle voices or the two middle voices as is possible in composition for four or more voices, or as it is quite frequently

$^+$See Kontrapunkt I, page 357.

$^{++}$See Chapter 2, § 7, above.
used by the classical composers of the last century; for example:

Example 188.

\[ \text{Example notation here} \]

Nevertheless, when, for the sake of a flowing melody in the individual voices, the older masters do use them between two upper voices, we see their duration limited to a quarter note, as in the example above at "B".

With this remark Bellermann obviously intended to express his view about the prohibition against doubling the tone of resolution. But, on the other hand, it is all the more regrettable that he did not address the difficult question of the free style of "classical composers" and "older masters," for, to bring this up as evidence for the strict style is a most reprehensible error.

Finally, following Fux's dictates, Bellermann discusses \( \frac{6}{5} - \frac{4}{5} \frac{5}{4} - \frac{3}{4} \) (under the heading of "consonant fourth") in three-part, fourth species counterpoint. But, going beyond Fux (not, however, until he comes to four-part, fourth species counterpart), he speaks of the "resolution of dissonance in the moving voice," which leads him to the combinations of fourth and second species, or fourth and third species. I mention this only in passing and reserve a more detailed discussion of these voice leadings for Section VI for reasons of my own order of presentation.


Two examples of Fux can show how the expanding of the basic rules, under certain circumstances, opens new possibilities in the syncopation species in three-part composition. Fux gives the following examples and explanation (p. 109):
Example 189. a) Table XI, Fig. 10; b) Table XII, Fig. 1.

[108] Aloys. Why did you apply a rest in the bass voice in the first measure of the last example?

Joseph. Because I saw that no ligature could be applied and thought that the space should not be filled with another species of counterpoint; I resorted to using a rest.

Aloys. Your ideas do not displease me, but it could have been done differently. Here, in the first measure, the tenor takes the place of the bass—this can be done not only by the tenor but also the alto, and in fact, even possibly by the discant. If we take the lowest voice as the foundation, and, according to its properties, set the rest of the tones above it, it may be the lowest voice no matter which one it turns out to be.

But another time, he prefers to set:

Example 190. a) Table XIII, Fig. 2; b) Table XIII, Fig. 1.

He explains this license with the following words (p. 104):

+Table XII, Figure 1. [Example 189b.]
[Aloys.] The first measure of the last example could have been made better.† For, between the alto and the discant there are direct, hidden fifths, which being easily heard, should be avoided in three-part composition. Here, this situation may be managed by means of a rest in the alto, as follows.++

To this compare Albrechtsberger's beginning of a lesson in four-part, fourth species counterpoint (p. 145)—printed there as No. 7 of the lessons. It shows the "license," according to which the syncopation is omitted in the first measure.

MIDDLE

§ 8. The Postulates of Three-Part Composition Coming into Effect in the Syncopation Species.

After the exclusion of a voice leading that would violate the prohibition of doubling the tone of resolution, the efficacy of the main postulates of three-part composition remains otherwise unchanged in the syncopation species, except that here the postulate of triad completeness naturally undergoes changes.

With dissonant syncopations it is only the upbeat that can (and therefore must) admit a complete triad, so that the above postulate will be transferred to the upbeat. We get to: $\frac{5}{3}$ by $\downarrow 4 \frac{3}{5}$, $\downarrow 2 \frac{5}{3}$, $\updownarrow 4 \frac{3}{5}$; and to $\frac{6}{3}$ by $\updownarrow 7 \frac{6}{3}$, $\downarrow 4 \frac{3}{6}$, $\uparrow 2 \frac{6}{3}$.

However, the voice leading does not always permit the complete triad to follow in such a way. It often leads to incomplete chords: $\frac{8}{3}$ by $\downarrow 4 \frac{3}{8}$, $\downarrow 9 \frac{8}{3}$; $\frac{8}{6}$ by $\updownarrow 7 \frac{6}{8}$, $\downarrow 9 \frac{8}{6}$.

†Table XIII, Figure 1. [Example 190b.]
++Table XIII, Figure 2. [Example 190a.]
In contrast, the consonant syncopations make it easily possible to retain the guiding principles cited above in Chapter 2, § 2, that is, to give the complete triad where feasible to the downbeat, or to use the upbeat for the completion of the triad (without detriment to the right to disregard triad completeness).

Albrechtsberger remarks (p. 103):

The upbeat, however, must always have a perfect or imperfect triad, \( \frac{5}{3} \) or \( \frac{6}{3} \), or a doubled consonant dyad, such as \( \frac{8}{3} \) or \( \frac{3}{6} \), or at least one of these incomplete chords: \( \frac{5}{3}, \frac{5}{1}, \frac{8}{5}, \frac{8}{6} \).

We read in particular (p. 105):

... (*37) because on the downbeat the fifth with the octave sounds too empty and, as we have said, hollow chords are to be used only on the upbeat.

In Cherubini's lessons* (by the way, the first lesson of the example is the same as Fux's Table XII, Figure 5) we all-too-often find even on the downbeat the empty \( \frac{8}{3} \) chord whose effect is not improved by the fact that the \( \frac{5}{3} \) upbeat brings about completeness.


In syncopation species of three-part composition, fifth-successions can appear not only as in two-part composition, ++ i.e., \( 5\uparrow 6-5\uparrow 6-5 \) in the upper counterpoint and \( 5\uparrow 4-5\uparrow 4-5 \) in the lower, but also as \( 7\uparrow 5-6 \) when the syncopating voice is the middle one. That the downbeat fifth successions feasible in two-part composition (i.e., \( 6\uparrow 5-6\uparrow 5-6 \) in the lower counterpoint) must be discarded totally in three-part composition is explained by the prohibition of the unavoidable voice leading.

---

*Page 40, Example 113.
++See Kontrapunkt I, page 379 ff.
Example 191.

By way of detail, this must be said:

1. The fulfillment of the complete triads as they become evident on the upbeat in \( 5 \overline{6} \overline{6} \overline{5} \).

Example 192.

must mark the sixth as a suspension in a much stronger way than in two-part composition. Because of that, the application of such a voice leading in three-part composition must be more sharply limited than in two-part composition unless, due to the continuing necessity of syncopation, the complete triad \( 6 \overline{3} \) offers a sufficient and total counter-balance. I must add, that with the syncopating middle voice (see Example 192b), the outer-voice structure progresses in thirds, thereby notably improving the effect—an advantage that is naturally lacking in two-part composition.

2. With \( 4-5 \overline{4-5} \) in the lower counterpoint:

\[ \text{Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 381.} \]
the fulfillment of the triad completeness is added here in three-part composition as mitigation of the constraints that are most evident in an example in which the cantus firmus moves by step. The afterbeat fifths and the triad completeness improve the effect even when, as in 193b, the succession in question belongs to the outer-voice structure.

How free composition frequently uses this voice leading to shift unavoidable open fifth successions, at least to afterbeats, will be shown in Der freie Satz.

3. When, in 7-6→7-6, the third lies in the upper voice:

Example 194.

we have fifth-successions between the upper and middle voices that must be permitted partly because we have to allow similar successions in two-part composition (i.e., 4-5→4-5) and in three-part composition even in the outer-voice structure, but mostly because the thirds of the outer-voice structure also help to improve the effect in connection with the triad completeness.

+See under point 2 above.
4. In the ascending syncopation $6^\uparrow \overline{5-6}^\downarrow \overline{6-5}$.

Example 195.

\[ \text{etc.} \]

the fifth-successions from downbeat to downbeat ($\frac{5}{3}$) are improved by the intervening sixths ($\frac{6}{3}$). To be sure, the suspension effect seems to be weakened by the ascending direction. The particular effect of successions of this sort expresses itself even in the realm of strict counterpoint. The fifths on the downbeat and the sixths on the upbeat assert themselves almost equally. Inasmuch as the consonant fifths do not totally fit the role of suspensions, they are emphasized by their fulfillment of the root-propensity of the lowest tone. On the other hand, it is precisely the tying-over that subjugates a strong emphasis of the sixths on the upbeat.

With the tying-over, which naturally refers to the upbeat in strict counterpoint lessons, the effect of a harmonic change in $\overline{5|6}$ $\overline{5|6}$ 5 (see below, 1) or in $\overline{6|5}$ $\overline{6|5}$ 6 (see below, 4) being linked in strict counterpoint to the succession 5-6 or 6-5, recedes into the background without disappearing altogether.

In Der freie Satz, it will be shown how free composition utilizes the ambiguity of these successions under numbers 1 and 4 (which through contrary direction may be regarded as counterparts), in order to place, according to need (particularly of the fundamental line) sometimes the fifth and sometimes the sixth in the foreground.

Neither Fux nor Albrechtsberger seem to have scruples about the application of $\overline{6}$ $\overline{5|6}$ 5, $\overline{4}$ $\overline{5|4}$ 5 or fifth successions that accompany $\overline{3}_{7-6}$ as can be seen in the lessons.
\section*{The Closing Formulas.}

With regard to the closing formulas, we adhere to the rule proposed in Kontrapunkt I, page 392. If the cantus firmus does not permit a strict application of the leading tone, it is advisable to assign it to another voice; for example:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Example 196.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Good:}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Forbidden:}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Better:}
\end{quote}

The effects of syncopating the descending leading tone are shown here:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Example 197.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
a) Two voices:
\begin{enumerate}
\item Major:
\begin{quote}
\textbf{1.}
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
\textbf{2.}
\end{quote}
\item Minor:
\begin{quote}
\textbf{3.}
\end{quote}
\begin{quote}
\textbf{4.}
\end{quote}
\end{enumerate}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
+Cf. Kontrapunkt I, Examples 452-454.
\end{quote}
b) Three voices:

1. Major:

2. Major:

3. Major:

4. Minor:

5. Minor:

6. Minor:

Such a syncopation lacks sufficient force and is often inadmissible. In Example 197a, the form at 2 shows that the consonant fifth does not have to point to a cadence, since we may also skip away from it; forms 3 and 4 produce the non-diatonic [113] intervals of the diminished fourth and augmented fifth which we have to reject. (Even though the augmented fourth is a diatonic interval, its application is limited in strict counterpoint.)

In Example 197b, only number 3 has a convincing strength and that is because of the 2-3. The forms in minor (4, 5, 6) all suffer from non-diatonic intervals. Therefore, it is advisable to avoid the syncopation of the descending leading tone.

Under no circumstances may the syncopation lead to the dominant root:

Example 198.
As we have seen, the diminished fifth may be applied in the penultimate measure.+

A closing formula such as the following is forbidden for reasons given above in Example 66:

Example 199.

Albrechtsberger writes (p. 103):

The ending or last measure can have the three principal tones, or the key-defining third and octave. The penultimate measure must have \( \frac{5}{4} \) when the bass or lowest voice has the dominant, \( \frac{7}{3} \) when the lowest voice has the cantus firmus, or \( \frac{4}{3} \) or \( \frac{5}{6} \) when ties are used.

On page 105 (text, page 106) Albrechtsberger criticizes this closing formula:

Example 200.

"because the tied fourth, \( \frac{4}{3} \), must be used there."++

In spite of the fifth rule on page 39, which is the same as Albrechtsberger's above, we find Cherubini using the following closing formula (Lesson 2, p. 40):

---

+See Chapter 2, § 7, above.

Example 201.

Example 202.

LESSONS

Example 202.
Soprano (Phrygian)  

Fux, Table XIII, Fig. 4.

3. Alto: C.f.

Bass

[115]

Albrechtsberger, page 107.


Bass

5.

Tenor

Bass

[116]

Soprano

Alto. C.f.

Bass

H. Schenker
Remarks Concerning These Lessons

About 1. There is uninterrupted movement by tenths between the bass (cantus firmus) and the soprano. Furthermore (with few exceptions), fifth-successions in the upper and middle voices are evaded by a chain of 7--6's.

About 2. In measures 5-6, there are ascending successions with emphasis on the sixths: \( \frac{5}{3} \mid \frac{6}{3} \). The almost uninterrupted thirds in the bass and middle voice (meas. 3-10) do not work well and are excessive.

About 3. In measures 1-2 there are afterbeat octave-successions (8\(^{\uparrow}\)6 8) between the alto and bass; for more about that see Kontrapunkt I, page 381.
CHAPTER 5

FIFTH SPECIES: MIXED COUNTERPOINT

§ 1. Recollection and Extension of Some Older Principles.

1. The beginning may be commenced only with second or fourth species, but not with third species as for example:

Example 203.

\[ \text{Example 203.} \]

This is tied in with the fundamental significance of half notes as the natural subdivision of the cantus firmus's whole notes. An opening like the one in Example 203 would be misleading and would therefore constitute a contradiction of styles.

[117] For a cantus firmus beginning with a skip of a fourth in major mode, only second species is initially usable in the lower counterpoint:

Example 204.

\[ \text{Example 204.} \]

It is different in minor (see below, Lesson 4).

2. In the mixture species, we should avoid rhythmic monotony such as \( \text{Example 204.} \), especially if it creates an equally threatening motivic monotony, as for example:

\[ \text{Example 204.} \]

+Cf. Kontrapunkt I, pages 401-402.
When facing this sort of danger, it is advisable to use a
pattern like: \( \text{
But, a formation such as:

Example 207.

\[ \text{c.f.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Z} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{ll} \\
\end{array} \]

[118] is forbidden not only because the eighth notes occupy an unsuitable position, but also because in the broad sense the rhythm \[ \underline{d,} \underline{d} \text{ or } \underline{d,} \underline{d} \] lies concealed, and both these rhythms are forbidden.

4. Already in Kontrapunkt I, page 425, we mentioned a less natural, even though extended type of resolution of a dissonant syncopation involving quarter and eighth notes in which the dissonant syncopation appears to resolve on the second quarter note so that the upbeat is free for a continuation of movement. According to experience, the application of this extended type poses considerable difficulties for learners even if they are fully aware of the differences compared to the natural forms. To aid in this matter I offer these remarks: not too far removed from the naturally ordered forms are expressions such as these:

Example 208.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 209.}
\end{array} \]

We gladly overlook their slight irregularity for the sake of the clear extraction of:
whose all-too-colorful rhythm is eliminated by that extension. The fact that the eighth notes in Example 209 are perceived as a natural embellishment of the skip of a third also contributes greatly to the good effect of the extension. Accordingly, phrases like the following:

Example 210.

must be considered far-fetched because, as in the first instance, the embellishment of the skip of a third is totally lacking, or, as in the second, it has been displaced ($b^\flat - g$). A case like the one offered by Fux in one of his lessons is even more far-fetched:

Example 211.

[119] Here, the use of the eighth notes is clearly inspired by the fact that in the second measure there were more eighths than are permissible.

A neighboring tone configuration becomes acceptable because of what was said with regard to Example 208:

---

Example 212.

only it must not be so opaque as, for example:

Example 213.

Let me mention here that at the conclusion of the fifth species, Albrechtsberger offers two examples of combined species lessons on pages 119-120 (for the first time). They are combinations of second and third as well as third and fourth species. Likewise, Cherubini (who has already presented examples of species combinations in two places) appends to the conclusion of the fifth species some combined species lessons* that illustrate the combination of second and fifth species as well as the simultaneous use of fifth species in two counterpoints.

*See Example 115.
LESSONS

Example 214.

1. Alto: C.f.

Fux, Table XIII, Fig. 5.


Fux, Table XIII, Fig. 7.
Remarks Concerning These Lessons

About 2. In measure 1 the tie was eliminated because of the difficulty it brings about. Measures 2 and 5 show \( \text{\textdagger} \); the text above discussed this. The eighth notes in measures 3 and 4 may be permitted as embellishments of the skip of a third, but the monotony is not permitted.

About 3. In measure 4 there is embellishment of a fourth-skip. In measure 8 there is a "modulation" into F major.

About 4. Concerning the N.B. in measure 5, see Kontrapunkt I, page 325.
SECTION FOUR

FOUR-PART COMPOSITION

Semper idem, sed no eodem modo.

CHAPTER 1

FIRST SPECIES: NOTE AGAINST NOTE

GENERAL COMMENTS

§ 1. Doublings.

Within the framework of the overtone series, the original, natural order of the intervals including the octave is:

$$\begin{align*}
&\frac{7}{8} + \\
&\frac{5}{6}
\end{align*}$$

However, in strict counterpoint, as in free composition, where an artificial, artistic voice leading regulates the process, any other ordering is also welcome as long as the 8, 5, and 3 remain.

Whereas in three-part composition a solitary doubling makes the chord incomplete (for example $\frac{8}{3}, \frac{8}{6}$), in four-part composition, in contrast, such a solitary doubling does not impair the completeness of the triad:

Example 215.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Example 215} & \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 215} \\
\text{Example 215} \\
\text{Example 215}
\end{array}
\end{align*}\]

+Cf. Harmonielehre, p. 34.
Rather, two doublings are needed to make a four-voice triad incomplete, for example $3^8$ or $6^8$.

To this introduction, all that remains to be added is this discussion of the value of the doublings: The best doubling involves the octave, inasmuch as it alone corresponds to the demands of nature: $3^5$ and $6^5$.

Thereafter doublings of 1 and 5 are possible: $3^1$, $6^1$, and $5^3$. In doubling with imperfect consonances, we should prefer doubling the third in complete triads, $3^3$, over doubling the sixth, $6^3$.

If, in spite of the four-voice texture, the triad should still be incomplete, then, according to the principles stated in Kontrapunkt I, the doubling must involve the imperfect consonances 3 and 6: $3^8$, $6^8$, and not the perfect consonances: $3^5$, $6^5$.

Fux speaks about the necessity of doubling in four-part composition (p. 106 ff.):

[Aloys.] That the state of the harmonic triad should be perfect in a composition, as mentioned above, is evident. It is clear the additional fourth voice has no choice but to double a consonance that is already contained in the other three voices—some dissonant combinations are exempted. While there is considerable difference between the unison and the octave with regard to the interval and register, this is not at all expressed by the designation. For, the unison as well as the octave are called c, and the octave can almost be taken to be a repeated unison. Therefore, a relationship of four parts will as a rule consist of the third, fifth, and octave.

---

+See Section III, Chapter 1, § 14.

++See Section II, Chapter 1, § 22.
Concerning the "natural order" of intervals, in Fux we read (p. 108):

Joseph. What is the proper place of the consonances?

Aloys. It is the order that originates from the harmonic division of the octave. It is clear that from this division the fifth is created first, and that further division of the fifth brings about the third. This is the order we should maintain in joining the consonances if other circumstances do not interfere, as, for example, the progression to the following measure. Here, I wish to give an example of the natural order of consonances:

Example 216. Table XIV, Fig. 3.

You see, first comes the fifth from the division of the octave, then next the octave, and finally the third or tenth which results from the division of the fifth.

Joseph. According to the arrangement of our modern keyboard, a third should be set before a fifth and the ordering of the four voices should be set in the following way:

Example 217. Table XIV, Fig. 4.

Aloys. So it seems, but actually this is not the case.

Fux cannot supply the reasons why this order cannot always be upheld or why it should not be sought after in a beginning formulation.

With regard to doublings, he explains on page 107:

Aloys. At a place where one cannot use an octave because of faulty progressions, the third is doubled, or less often the sixth.

Accordingly, in his lessons Fux adheres to triad completeness and doubling with 8 and 3 even though he does use other doublings such as 1, 5, or 6.
In the following passages Albrechtsberger speaks about the doublings to be used in four-part composition in connection with the first species of two-part composition (p. 26-27):

The same chords may be used in four-part composition with the addition of the fourth interval, which in most cases will be the perfect octave or perfect fifth, or the doubled third or the doubled sixth.

He adds, concerning four-part composition (p. 120):

Here, no other chord is permitted other than the perfect one with the major and minor third, and the chord of the major or minor sixth with the third (according to the key) and the perfect octave \[ \begin{align*}
&8
\end{align*} \]

and \[ \begin{align*}
&6
\end{align*} \]. In the latter, the position must not be arranged so that the sixth is minor and the third major because this would produce a false chord. We must, and frequently do, vary the perfect chord \[ \begin{align*}
&8
\end{align*} \] to \[ \begin{align*}
&3
\end{align*} \] or \[ \begin{align*}
&5
\end{align*} \] when the fifth is perfect and the third \[ \begin{align*}
&3
\end{align*} \] is not a leading tone. The same holds true for the imperfect sixth-chords: \[ \begin{align*}
&8
\end{align*} \] is varied to \[ \begin{align*}
&3
\end{align*} \] or \[ \begin{align*}
&6
\end{align*} \].

The two six-four chords \[ \begin{align*}
&b_6
\end{align*} \] and \[ \begin{align*}
&4
\end{align*} \] are still forbidden, as are all dissonant chords. Likewise, the Quarta fundata, which appears in the second inversion of the dominant seventh chord and is used on the second scale degree with a major sixth and minor third, is also forbidden; for example, \[ \begin{align*}
&3
\end{align*} \]. Like other dissonant chords, it is permitted in free composition.

But it is obvious that we can also find incomplete chords in his lessons (for example \[ \begin{align*}
&6
\end{align*} \], page 125).

Cherubini writes in Rule 1 (p. 42):

Since the \[ \begin{align*}
&5
\end{align*} \] and \[ \begin{align*}
&6
\end{align*} \] chords consist of only three members, it is necessary to double one of them in the added counterpoint. Thus, we double any of the members of the \[ \begin{align*}
&5
\end{align*} \] chord, in turn, according to the position of the parts, but chiefly the octave or third, less often the
unison or fifth. If we employ one or the other of the
chords in incomplete form, a procedure that is permis­
sible and often necessary, then we may double two
members or triple one. (The latter procedure should
be used only in an emergency.)

[125] Observation: Although it is sometimes tolerated, the
application of the unison in this species should be
avoided as much as possible, especially in the upper
voice. In the two lower voices the unison is per­
missible, but with limitations. It can be applied in
the first and last measures without any problem.

We can double any of the voices of the chord,
particularly the third, less often the others. In
general, the doubling of an interval, in each case,
depends upon taste and experience.

Observation: There is no positive reason why the
doubling of one or the other member of a chord should
be preferred. It seems certain that the third has
preference over all other intervals because it pro­
duces a fuller harmony. Everywhere, much depends on
the lucky choice of the interval to be doubled for a
more or less successful composition.

The acknowledgement of the independence of the voice leading
is to be praised in and of itself, but Cherubini would have
found a more reliable and clearer expression if he had been
acquainted with the ideas I developed in Chapter 1, §§ 4-14.
He would not have needed to deny the difference in doubling
values and would have only had to explain how doubling is
influenced by various bases of voice leading, already recog­
nized in lessons of strict counterpoint (and especially in
free composition).

Without citing him, Bellermann follows Fux's teach­
ings so exactly that he even repeats almost verbatim Fux's
explanations and interval order (see below).

§ 2. Concerning the Fundamental Importance of the
Outer-Voice Structure in Four-Part Composition.

Because the point cannot be overemphasized, we mention
again that, in four-part composition also, a good treatment
of the outer-voice structure (as the fundamentally important
two-part composition that continues) is a primary necessity
of good voice leading.
§ 3. The Open and Close Positions.

If the open position is in itself more natural than the close one, then the naturally prescribed register and range of the four singing voices, which stand a fifth or fourth from one another, provide further proof in four-part composition. To be sure, beyond all such references to nature, the voice leading ultimately gives judgment. In maintaining more legitimate individual necessities, it frequently renders an observance of nature's postulates quite undesirable. Through the effects of opposition, the voice leading finally sees to it that the open and close spacings are placed in a proper light in relation to one another.

In Example 116, Cherubini offers a listing of all the possible doublings which I reproduce here only to give the learner the practice of distinguishing between the outwardly open and close spacings as well as the internally open spacings:

[126] Example 218.

*See Chapter 1, § 21.*
Note, however, that Cherubini distinguishes between:

Example 219.

He calls the first one (219a) an "incomplete perfect triad with doubled third and prime." In contrast, he calls the second one (219b), strangely enough, an "incomplete imperfect chord with doubled third and octave." This insistence on a difference not present according to the reasons of voice leading can only be explained by the supposition that he is thinking of the same harmony on C in both cases (c-e-g). Thus, he assumes in 219a the lack of the fifth, g, and in 219b the lack of the root C. Actually, the assumption of such a harmony applies only in 219a, provided that we presume a C root. According to the same principle, in the case of 219b, we would have to presume E as root, not C. The assumption of the latter root reveals that a thought process borrowed from free composition and based on a sense of scale-degrees was inserted here, and this is misleading in the realm of strict counterpoint.

§ 4. The Effect of Continuous Third-Successions in the Two Lower Voices.

If we set the third voice in parallel thirds with the lowest voice, the ear will not be able to ignore the bad effect of such a voice leading. On the one hand, the long series of thirds creates the bad effect.++ On the other hand, the movement in parallel thirds of the third and fourth voices is all the more striking because of the contrast of the two upper voices. In view of the increased freedom of the voice movement, the particular lack of freedom of a progression of thirds continued in the lower voices in this manner must appear even more unmanageable, if not excessive.

†See Chapter 1, § 15.

Also consider that thirds sound darker in the lower register. This has its final mysterious basis in the fact that the third (as we know+) celebrates its birth in the third octave of the fundamental and, as such, points to more distant heights. Thus it does not belong in the close proximity of the fundamental where even the fifth should not be placed. And if, indeed, as might be objected, this instruction of nature addresses itself only to the thirds of actual [128] fundamentals, then, through some sort of transference, our ear may also perceive those thirds that are thirds only in the purely contrapuntal sense of an independent voice leading as similarly unpleasant and overly dark in effect. That is to say, in strict counterpoint the ear prefers not to make a distinction between Example 220a and b, and least of all when several thirds in the lower register follow each other without interruption:

Example 220.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(a)} & \quad \text{(b)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, the voice leading in a four-part composition must have variety, especially with regard to the distance between all the voices and more particularly between the third and fourth voice. In the application of this principle, under certain circumstances and because of contrast, a close leading of the voices will create a good effect when the third voice moves into close proximity to the lowest voice. Thus, the distance of the voices from one another is determined by the laws and circumstances of the

+Cf. Harmonielehre, p. 34.
voice leading, whereby variety and contrast can produce, in equal measure, a good effect for the modest as well as the wider distance of the voices.

Fux writes (p. 108):

[Aloys.] The third placed in the lower register and near the bass results in a dark and unclear sound. The greater the terms or numbers that determine an interval, the brighter the sound of the interval and the higher the register it requires. Furthermore, the essential values of the fifth, 2 and 3, yield 5 when added together. But, the values of the third, 4 and 5, yield 9. Therefore, according to natural ordering, the fifth should be set in the lower register, the third in the upper.

The remark above seems to contradict another on page 109-110 where Fux writes:

[Aloys.] By the way, we must note that the closer the parts are set together the more perfect the sound will be, according to the proverb: "A compressed power is stronger."

According to Mitzler, the translator of Fux, this sentence irritated him. This caused Mitzler to contradict Fux in a remark on page 110 and to explain:

I do not know whether it is correct to say that when two tones are set further apart they sound more pleasant than when they are close together. The chord chord c, g, e, f sounds better than c, e, g, c and in the latter, the tones are closer together than in the former. Due to the natural order of the consonances as they occur from the harmonic division, the tones likewise do not stand close together. We should decide, according to circumstance, and seek a compromise as to which is better.

In Fux we read on page 110:

Joseph. In the first two examples, I have, with reservation (contrary to your admonition, set the tenor so close to the bass that the thirds mostly occur in the low register. I have done this because I cannot find another way of doing it, due to the necessity of setting the cantus firmus by turns in all four voices. I submit it to your judgment and correction.

Aloys. It is true that this example, in which the cantus firmus had to be retained, has been used only for the purpose of practice and could not have been
done differently. It will be different when the invention is left to your own taste. How much experience these exercises provide will surprise you as time passes.

If we sum up, we must recognize that Fux has pointed out all the major ideas. He has mentioned the natural postulate of the open position and no less the good effect of the close position, and has finally discussed the effect of a good voice leading that resolves all apparent contradictions. However, I cannot spare him one reprimand! When he, justifiably, requires the law of nature for strict counterpoint, he, nevertheless, overlooks the fact that the nature statement refers only to genuine thirds. Which third does he mean when he speaks of a "third in proximity to the bass"? Does he mean the third of the actual root-tone (in the natural sense) or that of the voice leading after all?

In Rule 2 Cherubini states (p. 44):

The voices should not be spaced too far apart, and, especially in the lower register, they should not be placed too close together. Particularly, we should avoid a succession of thirds between the tenor and bass. The distance of the voices should, if possible, maintain the mean between an extremely open or close spacing.

And he follows this with the remark:

When the voices are placed too close together in the lower register, the effect is muddy; when they are too far apart, the effect is unclear.

BEGINNING

§ 5. The Formation of the Beginning.

First of all, we must discuss the principles of the completeness and the natural ordering of the triad. Yet, we must also leave room for the demands of voice leading and its influence on the configuration of the beginning, inasmuch as the beginning must at times be fashioned in a way that is not the most natural. That the $\frac{6}{4}$ remains excluded is obvious.

We read in Fux (p. 108):

... (*38) it is important to see first whether we can progress correctly from the first measure consti-
tuted in this order to the second, third, or even the fourth measure. If we cannot, then we must rearrange the consonances of the first measure in such a way that we can progress easily and without error to the following measures.

With this Fux wants to set free the formations of the first measure, deviating from the natural order $\frac{8}{3}$; he merely uses a free arrangement of these intervals. In no way does the above statement reject chord completeness.

Albrechtsberger writes (p. 120): "The first measure can easily have $\frac{8}{3}$ or $\frac{5}{3}$."

Cherubini writes in his Rule 6 (p. 45):

We should apply a complete chord in the first measure; however, considerations for the melody and voice leading, etc., can also release us from this obligation. We may begin with the unison in all the voices when this is acceptable to the voice leading. The preceding rule may also apply to the last measure of a work and involve the combinations in the previous example.

We can see how Cherubini goes beyond Fux in this point; Fux does not consider such beginnings either in his text or his lessons.

On page 238 Bellermann repeats Fux's ideas in almost the same words.

MIDDLE


Naturally, voice crossing is not wrong in four-part composition. Frequently it guarantees good voice leading and prevents the occurrence of all sorts of mistakes.

We should mention that not only may we cross adjacent voices but, under certain circumstances, we may also cross voices situated further apart, such as the soprano and tenor.

---

*See § 1, above.

**Example 117. (*39)
or alto and bass.

Occasionally, Fux crosses the bass that bears the cantus firmus, and the tenor:

Example 221. Table XIV, Fig. 7.

Albrechtsberger (p. 147) not only crosses the second soprano and alto at one place, but also the second soprano and the tenor bearing the cantus firmus:

Example 222.

Cf. Cherubini's Rule 3 on page 44.


In contrast to three-part composition, it is the increased number of voices in four-part composition that by itself demands more freedom in the settings. A voice might have no place to go if it were to follow the rule for the rule's sake.

*Cf. also, Table XX, Fig. 3, meas. 1-2, and Table XXI, Fig. 2, meas. 6-7. (*40)

**Cf. page 148, meas. 5 and page 150, meas. 6. (*41)
Furthermore, because it is clearly superior to three-voice texture in its quality of sound, four-voice texture more readily enables the bad effect of forbidden successions to recede into the background. Finally, we are led to licenses in four-part composition because here, just by the nature of the exercises, the whole note must be retained throughout. Due to this constraint, we can forget about the possibility of improving the relationship of the voices through all those means offered by free composition.

With all licenses, however, be they advantageous to the composition for whatever reason, we must obey experience first of all; each deviation from the flowing melody in the upper voice appears more pronounced than it would in a middle or bass voice. This is an experience that is already true in regular situations but even more so in forbidden successions. On the other hand, the bass voice, in anticipation of genuine root-tones (i.e., the scale-degrees of free composition) should be assigned stronger movements than the upper voice, which, due to its noticeable height, should always keep the flowing song, the melody.

Fux offered this warning (p. 107):

[Aloys.] The rules of the progressions and motions mentioned in the first book must be adhered to as much as possible so that attention is paid to the relationships of the parts to the bass, as well as to their interrelationships.+

Therefore, we find places in his lessons such as:

+ Similar comments are on page 109, etc.
Example 223. a) Table XIV, Fig. 5; b) Table XV, Fig. 3; c) Table XV, Fig. 2.

in which the upper voice, moving by step, takes part in the incorrect progressions with the bass voice that moves by a fourth, fifth or a sixth. Other progressions, as for example:

Example 224. a) Table XV, Fig. 3; b) Table XV, Fig. 2; c) Table XV, Fig. 5; d) Table XVII, Fig. 5; e) Table XIX, Fig. 1.

not only show skips in the lower voice (even an octave), but also skips in the upper voices (third, fifth).

It is clear that even the middle voices may demand a greater freedom; for example, Fux writes:
Example 225.  a) Table XVIII, Fig. 1; b) Table XVIII, Fig. 1; c) Table XXI, Fig. 2.

[133] With regard to the following voice leading:

Example 226. Table XVII, Fig. 1.

Fux remarks:\[Aloys\] This progression could not be any different because of the necessity to use whole notes (\(*\)42) and therefore must be tolerated. It could be easily improved if the whole note in the tenor could be divided thus:

\[\text{See pages } 112-113.\]
Looking back, he adds the remark:

[Aloys.] This is also true for the examples from
the previous species, in which much is found that
would be considered faulty if it were not necessary
to use unmixed whole notes.

And a little further along he explains:

[Aloys.] I said it once and now I repeat: because
the whole notes must be retained here, progressions of
this sort have to be tolerated. They cannot always be
avoided, even in free composition. They are more bear­
able in the middle voices than in the outer ones, as
you have already noted.

It is clear that with these later remarks, Fux points to the
combining of the species.+

As with Fux (p. 112-113), we also find in Albrechtsberger
the basic idea expressed with regard to four-part,
second species counterpoint (p. 127):

All these mistakes and also the previously dis­
cussed licenses in first species (whereby the upper­
most voice skips) are easily avoided in free compo­
sition by using several notes in contrary motion
instead of sustained notes in the filler voice.

According to Albrechtsberger, the licenses nec­
essarily granted in strict counterpoint can be ordered as
follows (p. 121-122):

Permitted are the hidden fifths, octaves, and
unisons that do not sound unpleasant and that occur
where the upper of the two apparently incorrect
voices moves stepwise ascending or descending. Still,
such liberties are most easily tolerated in the middle
voices. However, the licenses must involve no skip

+See Section VI, below.
larger than the perfect fifth in the upper voice . . . . (*43) It must be observed that if the uppermost voice does use the license of a skip, at least one, or better two, of the other three voices must move in contrary direction.

To that he adds the following examples on pages 122-123:

Example 228.

[134]

Skips by:

and from the lessons++:

Example 229.

Further, we read (p. 122): . . . (*44) in the lowest and in the middle voice there can be a skip of a sixth or octave. These examples are from pages 122-123:

---

+Cf. Example 224, above.

++See page 124.
and these examples are from the lessons:

Example 231.

+Cf., on the other hand, pages 84-85!
On the same page he also writes: "When the bass skips up or down a fourth or up a sixth, hidden octaves or fifths in direct motion are permitted." These examples are from pages 121-122:

Example 232.

Obviously, the spirit of free composition has already entered into these examples. The scale-degrees moving by fifths and thirds suggest the skips of a fourth, or a sixth in the bass. In contrast, on page 123 we find the following example labeled "bad":

Example 233.

[136] Compare this to the last two measures of the example on page 150:
Unclear, however, is a remark taken from Albrechtsberger's instruction to Beethoven (p. 122) and quoted in Nottebohm on pages 54-55:

The descending licenses are better than the ascending ones. In the upper voice licenses permit at most a skip of a fifth; in the bass and middle voices there can be skips of a fourth, sixth, or octave. With skips up or down a fourth or up a sixth, hidden fifths and octaves result.

Indeed, in spite of this remark (p. 55), Beethoven's lesson (No. 20 in Nottebohm) shows a license in which the soprano skips a sixth while the tenor moves by step. (*45) Albrechtsberger, nevertheless, accepts it.

Cherubini focuses the prohibition on the relationship of the two outer voices which permit the use of a license only in dire emergency.

Concerning the license of fifths in contrary motion (antiparallels), he states in his fourth rule (p. 44):

. . . (46) but, we tolerate two fifths in contrary motion among the three upper voices or the two middle voices and the bass. Sometimes they are tolerated in the two upper voices, but we must use this rarely and only if there is no other choice.

In the fifth rule he speaks of nonparallel direct progressions:

In the middle voices and between a middle and an outer voice, it is permissible to approach a perfect consonance in direct motion. However, it is a mistake that can be improved upon by avoiding the bigger mistake of allowing this procedure between the outer voices.

Thus, it does not contradict his viewpoint when he uses the following voice leading in his lessons:
Cherubini leaves all these rules unexplained. We may find one clarification, perhaps, in his introductory words (p. 42): 

If the rules of three-part counterpoint are not so strict as those in two-part, then they are almost unnecessary in the type of counterpoint discussed here. In this respect, we often find in the old classical masters, particularly Palestrina, examples which at first glance appear to be mistakes, or at least evidence of excessive licenses. Nevertheless, the various difficulties those places posed for the composer and the normal use of the masters, prove by their treatment that these passages are only favored liberties of strict rules. This easing of the rules increases in accordance to the number of voices. Thus, what at first glance appear to be mistakes, turn out to be allowable.
Here, I spare myself, following the stated purpose of the text, the refuting of all the mistakes in these words of Cherubini; it must suffice that I mention only a few. The reference to some places in Palestrina with the empty expression of "favored liberties of strict rules" and of an "easing of the rules . . . in accordance to the number of voices," and the unfortunate expression at the end: "what at first glance appear to be mistakes, turn out to be allowable." Where so many proofs are possible, use of these phrases and words is a more disastrous mistake. How such phrases delude the student, how they seem to be informative, how they seem to give something, to be of help, when, in fact, they only confuse the student.

CLOSING

§ 8. The Formation of the Closing.

In the face of four-voice texture, we can recognize the necessity for including the third in the last chord, even though special circumstances of the voice leading or intentional archaisms suggest or even force us to avoid the third and stay with another sonority, for example 8/5.

In particular, I wish to mention that when the bass has the descending leading tone, doubling of the third takes place best with the 6/3-chord in the penultimate measure, whereby both thirds move apart by step:

Example 237.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 237.} \\
\end{array} \]

Faced with such a solution, however, another is prohibited:
Example 238.

To insist on the less acceptable one, because it is possible, can never be elevated to the level of an artistic judgment.

To be sure, under certain circumstances in the situation in question, a descending leading tone may be doubled, in which case there are different ways of leading into the last chord:

Example 239.

[139] In Example 239a we see how the third in the penultimate chord is forced to climb to the fifth of the last chord because the third of the last chord is already provided for by the octave doubling of the leading tone. It is the opposite in 239b, where the octave of the leading tone must go to the fifth because the third in the penultimate chord leads downwards to the third in the last chord.

*See Example 66.*
Fux's opinion with reference to the third (p. 92), was cited in Chapter 1, § 27.

Albrechtsberger supplies us with a table of different cadence formulas (p. 121):

Example 240.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{C.f.} & - & - & - & - & - \\
\text{C.f.} & - & - & - & - & - \\
\text{C.f.} & - & - & - & - & - \\
\end{array}
\]

He accompanies these with the following comments:

The last measure, which should be perfect, may have \( \frac{8}{5} \) or \( \frac{5}{3} \) only when the cantus firmus is set in the lowest voice. When it is set in the upper voice, the last measure has only \( \frac{8}{8} \) or \( \frac{8}{3} \) because the cantus firmus moves to the principal key in its termination, while the major third, which, in the penultimate measure is taken with the fifth and octave, above the dominant of the tonic, also ascends to the principal key, as can be seen in the examples. When the cantus firmus is in the lowest voice, the penultimate measure is \( \frac{5}{b_3} \) or \( \frac{6}{b_3} \).

In addition, on page 126 we read: "Going against the ancient rules, the following cadences are constructed because the leading tone does not ascend at the end; for example:
Example 241.

A closing formula in a lesson of Beethoven is set as follows (Nottebohm, p. 55, No. 20):

Example 242.

and is revised by Albrechtsberger as follows:

Example 243.

With justification, Nottebohm comments on the revision:

In the penultimate measure the cadence is not constructed according to the rules. Albrechtsberger wants (see p. 120 ff.) the bass to have the dominant of the key when the cantus firmus is in an upper voice. He also alters an interval which leads away from the key shortly before the cadence.

Bellermann discusses (from a historical point of view) the question of the major or minor third at the cadence (p. 239):
Composers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and later in Bach’s time preferred the perfect consonances at the cadence, that is, the octave and fifth instead of the complete triad. However, when they did set the complete triad in multi-linear textures, they raised the third of those scales that have a minor third (Dorian, Phrygian, and Aeolian). They did this because the major triad provides a more consonant tonal combination than the minor. To this day this raising of the note has been preserved without exception in Phrygian. For the same reason, these composers avoided beginning a composition with a minor triad. To be sure, the minor triad would be effectively used in the middle of a composition, but it is very difficult if the singers should have to begin with it. This must be remembered even nowadays with regard to unaccompanied song. The final chord with only the octave and the major or minor third and no fifth rarely can be found in the classical times of the sixteenth century. Raising the third in the first and final chord was sufficient for the older composers.

[141] In addition, let me include here what Bellermann says about the cadence in four-part composition (with the same praiseworthy thoroughness he employed in three-part composition) [p. 240]:

Cadences in which the bass has the descending leading tone are the most difficult for beginners in composition. Above this bass we must set the six-three chord with a minor third and major sixth (and in Phrygian, the major third and major sixth). In this tonal combination or accompaniment of the descending leading tone, it is best to double the third as shown in the examples above. We can, however, double the bass note in an upper octave, resolving it upward to the third of the key and resolving the third above the bass upward to the fifth of the key. This method of cadencing is perfectly fine, but we do not find it frequently used by older composers. When doubling the descending leading tone, they preferred to resolve the third above the descending leading tone to the third of the key and the octave downward by skip of a fifth to the dominant of the key, whereby, to be sure, hidden fifths are created. However, these were frequently written at the cadence by all the better composers of the past and present. Therefore, we must

\[ \text{**Cadences in Dorian, Ionian, Aeolian, and Phrygian follow. (§47)} \]
consider them as necessary and perfectly acceptable exceptions to the strict rule.*

As can be seen in the examples, the doubling of the descending leading tone is naturally forbidden in Phrygian where the voice in question moves from f to g# (an augmented second) or from f to b (a diminished fifth). The augmented second is entirely bad and unusable in this situation. At a cadence, however, the interval from F to B has been used without hesitation by later masters such as Bach, Handel, Graun, and their contemporaries. Strict a cappella music, however, must avoid this interval as much as possible.

LESSONS

Example 244.

1. [Alto: C.f.]

2. [Soprano: C.f.]

3. [Soprano]

*+Cadence formulas follow in Dorian, Mixolydian, Aeolian, and Phrygian. (*48)
SECOND SPECIES: TWO NOTES AGAINST ONE

§ 1. A Reminder of Some Older Principles.

1. Where and how we must strive for triad completeness is decided by the same principles established for the second species, two and three-part composition.

2. Here again, as in the second species of two and three-part composition, the neighboring tone must be avoided more often than used. (We find them in neither Albrechtsberger's nor Cherubini's lessons.)

3. How we speak of a change of harmony or a consonant passing tone (consonant neighboring tone) at 5--6 or 6--5 is decided according to the principles laid down in Chapter 2, § 3. In all cases, however, one must determine whether it is the fifth, or the sixth that forms a dissonant passing tone:

Example 245.

4. Voice leadings like these by Cherubini must be considered incorrect in strict counterpoint:

---

\(^{+}\)Cf. below, Lessons No. 1, meas. 7; No. 4, meas. 2, 5, 11, and 13; in addition, in Albrechtsberger page 132, meas. 1 and 5.
Example 246.

In Example 246a the ascending leading tone is set on the downbeat instead of properly on the upbeat. In 246b we see a doubling of the ascending leading tone, which could have easily been avoided.

5. In the opening, we must refrain from using the six-four chord even though we might intend to complete the regular form later on the downbeat. Albrechtsberger explicitly mentions this on page 129:

Example 247.

On page 148 he writes: "In both major and minor keys, the six-four chord is forbidden at the opening."
LESSONS

Example 248.

1. Alto: C.f.  Fux. Table XVI, Fig. 2.
   Soprano
   Bass

   Tenor
   Tenor

2. Soprano  Fux. Table XVI, Fig. 3.
   Alto: C.f.  Bass
   Bass
Fux, Table XVI, Fig. 4.

Albrechtsberger, page 131.


CHAPTER 3
THIRD SPECIES: FOUR NOTES AGAINST ONE

§ 1. A Reminder of Some Older Principles.

1. Here, as in the third species of three-part composition, quarter notes make the neighboring tone somewhat more useful than in second species.

In most cases, Fux uses them in the penultimate measure in conjunction with the cadence. Albrechtsberger uses them more often and also outside of the cadence.† Cherubini even permits them at the change of measure.‡

2. To the question of doubling belongs the following remark by Fux+++ (which deals with the fourth measure of Lesson No. 1 given below):

   Joseph. With your permission my teacher, I must ask you why you have doubled the third in the fourth measure? Could it have been set in the following way with a unison instead of a third in the tenor?

[147] Example 249. Table XVII, Fig. 2.

   Aloys. Certainly it could have been done this way except that the fullness of sonority suffers considerably with a unison on the downbeat. In addition, the third (i.e., the tenth), which occurs only in passing in the discant would be too weak because it is not heard continuously.

Here it is advisable to refer to second species also.

† See below, Lesson No. 4, meas. 2; No. 5, meas. 2, 10.

‡ See page 48, Lesson No. 3, meas. 5-6.

+++ See page 112.
LESSONS

Example 250.

Fux, Table XVII. Fig. 1.

1. Soprano

Alto: C.f.

Tenor

Bass

Fux, Table XVII. Fig. 5.

2. Soprano

Alto: C.f.

Tenor

Bass


1. A Reminder of Some Older Principles.

1. The prohibition against doubling the tone of resolution remains in effect in four-part composition even if it might have been easier to mollify the bad effect by expressing completeness with the three other parts. The doubling would produce the effect of a neighboring tone, which we discussed already in Section III, Chapter 4, § 3.

2. In spite of the four-voice texture, it remains true that the consonance preparing a potentially dissonant syncopation is still not able to exert such a determined thrust upon the following harmony that the paths of the voices would appear to be predetermined (as it happens in free composition). Therefore, in four-part composition syncopation always demands a descending resolution.

3. The open position of the outer voices is required by the syncopation \( \nearrow 4-3 \) in the upper voice or \( \nearrow 2-3 \) in the lower voice if these syncopations are constituents of the outer-voice structure.\(^+\)

4. As domicile of the complete triad, we use the downbeat in connection with the consonant syncopation, the upbeat with the dissonant. Yet, in spite of the four-voice texture, we can do without a complete triad if the voice leading demands it.

5. For reasons of voice leading, the unison often proves to be necessary. That is the reason it may be applied here with more justification than in three-part composition.

\(^+\)Cf. Section III, Chapter 1, § 21.
6. On the basis of the compulsion of voice leading, even a closing formation like this could be justified occasionally:

Example 251.

Here the passing tone 8-7 (not a suspension!) becomes evident for the first time.

§ 2. The Completions of the Dissonant Syncopations.

With \( \sim 7-6 \), \( \sim 7-6 \) and \( \sim 7-6 \) lead to complete triads while \( \sim 7-6 \) leads to an incomplete one.

With \( \sim 4-3 \) we get complete triads \( \sim 4-3 \), \( \sim 4-3 \) and even \( \sim 4-3 \); only \( \sim 4-3 \) makes the triad incomplete.

With \( \sim 9-8 \), the triads \( \sim 9-8 \), \( \sim 9-8 \) become complete, while \( \sim 9-8 \) and \( \sim 9-8 \) lead to incomplete triads.

In the case of \( \sim 2-3 \) with \( \sim 2-3 \) and \( \sim 2-3 \), or \( \sim 2-3 \), \( \sim 2-3 \), we get complete triads; however, we can never have a resolution result since \( \sim 7-8 \) is forbidden. Furthermore, since \( \sim 3 \) is better than \( \sim 5 \), \( \sim 2-3 \) is better than \( \sim 4-5 \). Finally, we must remember that with \( \sim 2-3 \), when \( \sim 4-5 \) is added, we are threatened by a diminished fifth on the upbeat, under certain circumstances. This application falls under the statements made in Section III, Chapter 4, § 6.
With 4-5 a complete triad must in any case be produced: 2-3 or 4-5, but, to be sure, without the octave.

As in three-part composition, in four-part it is somehow possible to arrive at 7-6, 6-6, or 5-4-3, or 5 by totally strict methods.

Fux writes (p. 115):

... (*49) they (the ligatures) demand the consonance which would have been used if the ligatures were eliminated, for the reason cited (in three-part composition). The ligature is nothing more than a postponement of the following note; this changes nothing in the consideration of the consonance.++

Fux adds as an example in Table XIX, Figures 2, 3, 4:

[152] 7-6 6-6 4-3 9-8 5-, 8-, and 8-, which does not prevent him from yielding to the necessity of voice leading in other combinations, as he does in the lessons below.

It is typical of Fux that already in four-part strict composition he permits the division of another voice into half notes,+++ a method which I reserve for a special species combination.++++ The mere fact that the old master uses this division in lessons here,+++++ forces me to present his reason to the reader at this point rather than later. First he explains (p. 115):

[Aloys.] The examples will clarify the matter.++++++

These examples clearly show that the same consonances

+Cf. Section III, Chapter 4, § 6 (under e).
+**Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 346.
+++Cf. Example 227.
++++See Section VI, below.
+++++Cf. Lessons No. 2 and 4, below.
++++++Table XIX, Figures 2, 3, and 4.(*50)
are used no matter whether the notes are tied or not.

Joseph. Does this rule always hold true, master?

Aloys. No, not in all cases of this species in which the ligatures must sound well together with three whole notes in one measure. It cannot be used when the tied seven combines with the fifth, for example:

Example 252. Table XIX, Fig. 5.

\[ 
\begin{align*}
\text{Example 252. Table XIX, Fig. 5.} \\
\text{Since the resolution of the ligature creates a forbidden dissonance with the tenor, it has to be avoided.} \\
\text{Joseph. What can we do in this case?} \\
\text{Aloys. The whole note in the tenor must be divided, for example:} \\
\text{Example 253. Table XIX, Fig. 6.} \\
\text{Joseph. But, we are not supposed to divide a whole note in this species.} \\
\text{Aloys. It is permitted where it is feasible. As the examples will teach you, there are times when we cannot avoid division when necessity demands it. Therefore, the rule in this species that ligatures should invariably be accompanied by three whole notes cannot be so strictly observed.}
\]

Joseph. If the seventh is accompanied by the octave, no division of the whole note need be made, as your previous example shows.\textsuperscript{+}

\textsuperscript{+}Table XIX, Figure 4.
Aloys. That applies only in this case, however, where nothing prevents the octave being used instead of the fifth. On the other hand, there are a number of instances when we must necessarily use the fifth to avoid a succession of octaves because of the preceding notes. Then, the whole note must be divided. The following examples will illustrate this. (*51)

We further read in Fux (p. 116):

[Aloys.] Now, to the rest of the examples+ which clearly show that, in four-part composition, the ligature cannot be coupled with three whole notes as this species requires; or, if that is still possible, they cannot always result in a harmony correct according to the rules.

Joseph. In these examples I see why several whole notes have been divided. But I cannot find that the harmony is, as you indicated, wanting.

Aloys. Can't you see in the sixth measure of the first example that the downbeat lacks the fifth, the fifth which is so necessary for a complete harmony? In addition to that, in the fifth measure of the last example the second is doubled while the sixth, which is required for a complete harmony, is missing, as the following example shows:

Example 254. Table XX, Fig. 4.

Finally, the fourth is doubled in the sixth measure of the same example, although as a rule, the second should be doubled rather than the fourth.

Joseph. Why should the second be doubled rather than the fourth?

Aloys. This depends not so much on the second or fourth as upon the complete harmony. Since the full harmony consists of a combination of the third, fifth, and octave, it is clear that the harmony here does not have all its parts. Here, however, I do not speak of the first part of the measure containing the second--for this under no circumstances allows the

+He means the lessons given below No. 2-4 [Example 262].
presence of the octave—but to the second part of the measure where the octave is lacking, for example:

Example 255. Table XX, Fig. 5.

Such lapses from the strictness of this species are [154] allowed. These exercises are of considerable use for the student because they not only show the correct way to write a composition, but also how he may depart occasionally—when necessity demands—from the strict rules.

When we see how Fux uses a division in a situation not governed by urgent necessity, as in measure 3 of Lesson 4 [Example 162], then we must acknowledge that he does not base it on a certain uniform law which he applies to division. The lack of clearly defined insight in this matter is the reason he falls into contradiction so easily and gets caught up in confused thinking, as we see it now. Thus, it is unquestionably true that a syncopation lesson can be carried out without division, in spite of its burdensome restraints. However, Fux is now determined to inform the student about division procedure. He illustrates it at this point in his teaching not because there is no alternative, but because he was convinced, more by opportunity than inner relationship, that the best place to settle the matter is here in the fourth species of strict four-part composition.

Fux's main problem arises when he tries to obtain a more lucid justification from the concept of a "complete harmony." It happens that he circumscribes two totally different sonorities with the same concept. He does this with a triad (as in the case of measure 6 in both the second and fourth lessons) as well as with a seventh-chord (in measure 5 of the fourth lesson). Overlooking the fact that for the seventh-chord such a designation is not as valid as it is for the triad, Fux should have pondered the invoking of the concept of the seventh-chord in strict counterpoint if he wished to preserve the true task of the latter in the sense of a legitimate theory of voice leading. And it was even

+One might sooner consider pertinent the explanation that was previously quoted. See Section III, Chapter 4, § 6, page 103.
less permissible to open the first decisive path to the difficult concept of the seventh-chord and then settle for such a superficial remark and false designation. To say it clearly, all of Fux's errors, as they appear in his false interpretation of the cause of a division problem, further in his inadequate solution of the place in question, and finally in his chaotic treatment of the concepts, all of these have their origin in his inadequate insight into the essence of the seventh-chord. The other ways by which this extension can be gained and clarified, I, myself, shall first show in Section VI.

So, briefly, only one thing remains to be remembered at this moment concerning the explanation given by Fux about the sixth measures of Lessons 2 and 4 (see above). In the first case, we get the idea that Fux possibly wants to express the prohibition against doubling the resolution tone when he points out the fifth cannot be applied because of \(-6--5\). However, it is obvious that \(-4\) can never lead to a resolution with an octave in three and four-part composition. The prerequisite for such an octave would be the \(-7--8\) syncopation in the lower counterpoint, which is not permitted.

As with Fux, mention must be made of Albrechtsberger's use of half notes in a second voice: \(-7, 6 \quad 5, 4 \quad \text{"due to emergency."}^+\)

He offers a listing of all sorts of combinations (pp. 137-139) but there is no need to reproduce it here. Only permit me to quote his remark concerning the \(-2--3\) syncopation (p. 136):

To the tied second (here, the only tied dissonance used in the lower voice) belongs the doubled perfect fifth, or a perfect fifth and the second itself doubled, especially when the fundamental tone resolves down a half-step. At this resolution we get a very agreeable sixth-chord without the octave, that is, \(6 \quad 6\) or \(3 \quad 3\). If we double the perfect fourth with a tied \(3 \quad 3\) major or minor second (which is permitted) then this suspension must resolve down by whole-step, so that in the resolution, a minor or major third appears with two perfect, not imperfect, fifths.

Accordingly, he gives the following examples on page 139:

---

^+See below, Lessons 5 and 7.
Example 256.

In Beethoven's study book Albrechtsberger writes:

In all species of four-part composition, and also in fourth and fifth species when no dissonant ligature is used, the downbeat, or strong part of the measure, must have complete chords. Only on the upbeats, the weak parts of the measure, are incomplete chords permissible. To the incomplete chords also belong those in which three voices have the same note or when they are in octaves.

His improvement is as follows:

Example 257.

A crass transgression of strict counterpoint can be found on pages 139-140:

By the way, we tie consonances with their perfect or imperfect accompaniments if no dissonant ligature can be used. Very often, for the sake of a smooth line, the third or sixth is doubled when it is not the leading tone. We only have to note that if we double the sixth, it must not resolve to the pure fifth because on the upbeat, where only perfect or sixth-chords may occur, the six-five chord, $\text{b}_5^6$, would be created.

When, however, the sixth resolves into the diminished fifth, it may be tolerated because this chord, $\text{b}_5^6$, is not valid.

---

*See Nottebohm, page 56.*
so strongly dissonant. For example:

Example 258.

![Example 258](image)

It is clear that here we deal with a genuine tied-over seventh in the passing tone figure* and not with a genuine suspension or a syncopation of strict counterpoint. To permit or even tolerate a passing tone of this type in strict counterpoint means to confuse the concepts to the detriment of the teacher as well as the learner.

From a remark of Albrechtsberger we can clearly understand that he was totally conscious of the concept of the prominence of the passing seventh in all these cases. Referring to the next example:

Example 259.

![Example 259](image)

he says:

The N.B. above the alto on the note G (meas. 10) points out that in order to obtain constant ligatures, we may use on the upbeat in free composition this Quarta fundata which originates from the second inversion of the dominant seventh chord. This seventh, as well as the diminished fifth, may turn out to be unprepared on the unaccented beat of the measure:

*See Section VI, Part II, below.
Example 260.

\[ \text{Example 261.} \]

[157] And when he reserves the voice leading on page 142 expressly for free composition, he admits the transgression of which he has become guilty in his remark on page 139. From the very beginning, Albrechtsberger assigns, for obvious reasons, the following to "free counterpoint":

Cherubini (page 50, Example 120) not only takes the method of division with all its new effects from Fux, he also shows in Examples 121-122 tied dissonances which were already shown in three-part, fourth species counterpoint; now, however, he shows them in various four-part examples. We shall speak of these later.
LESSONS

Example 262.
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CHAPTER 5

FIFTH SPECIES: MIXED COUNTERPOINT

LESSONS

Example 263.

1.

Soprano

Alto: C.f.

Tenor

Bass

Fux, Table XX. Fig. 5.

2.

Soprano

Alto

Tenor

Bass

Fux, Table XXI. Fig. 2.
Albrechtsberger, page 147.

Soprano I

Soprano II

"license"

Tenor

Bass

---

H. Schenker

Alto

Tenor: C.f.

Bass

---
SECTION FIVE

FIVE, SIX, SEVEN, AND EIGHT-PART COMPOSITION

Semper idem, sed non eodem modo.

§ 1. General Comments,

From the very beginning we should understand that in multi-linear composition we are forced to use voice crossing more frequently than in three and four-part writing.

With regard to doubling, we are constrained by the inexorable compulsion of the voice leading even though its value differences require even less consideration than in four-part writing. Yet, we must avoid the doubling of the ascending leading tone.

By the same token, as the difficulties of voice leading increase because of the greater number of voices, we find fewer and fewer occasions to use the basic laws of contra-puntal voice leading in their fullest severity. Not only do they yield no further extension of basic concepts, but we are even prevented from recognizing them in their original purity because of the greater number of voices. As a result, it is not especially important to make use of exercises in multi-linear composition. Thus, I give only a few lessons below.

Fux writes (p. 197):

[Aloys.] I certainly had every intention to include a discussion of composition in more than four voices. However, since, as you can see, I am prevented because I am ill and confined to a bed, I shall do it at another time and publish a special treatment of it if God gives me life and good health. You can learn everything else you need to know without a master. Meanwhile, be assured that the person who can compose a quartet has already gained entrance to
composition with more voices; for, as the number of
the voices increase, the strictness of the rules is
less rigorously observed.

Albrechtsberger provides some short rules with regard
to five-part composition in his Chapter 32 (p. 362 ff.). For
use in strict counterpoint (he teaches strict as well as free
composition in this chapter) let me pass on the following
remark: "First double the perfect consonances then the
imperfect."+ Concerning the next example:

Example 264.

he writes:

The E as a doubled bass tone in C major is possible;
but in F major it is wrong. B in the last example is
a leading tone in C major.++

In Chapter 33 Albrechtsberger provides for the first time
examples "with chorales in strict counterpoint."+++ Cherubini offers exercises from five to eight-part
composition in Examples 133-137, of which I show Examples
directions for totally free five to eight-voice choral compo-
sitions which do not belong there at all.++++

---

+Examples on page 363. (*52)
++Cf. also, page 366.

+++See his lessons below. He closes them with a combined
species exercise in which he uses first, second, third, and
fourth species with the cantus firmus. About the latter lesson,
see the next section.

++++See page 55 and Example 138, "a double choir in
florid counterpoint without a given subject." (*53)
Bellermann does not even try to use a cantus firmus with five to eight-part composition. Instead, he immediately offers several examples of free composition in the works of Goudimel, Palestrina, etc., on which he comments extensively.

LESSONS

Example 265.

1. C.f.
   Soprano
   Alto
   Tenor
   Bass
   Albrechtsberger, page 371.

2. C.f.
   Soprano I
   Soprano II
   Alto
   Tenor
   Bass
   Cherubini, Example 133.

+See pages 416-444. (*54)
Albrechtsberger, page 373.

5.
Sop.
Alto
Tenor 1
Tenor II
Bass

[167]

6.
Sop.
Alto
Tenor 1
Tenor II
Bass

Albrechtsberger, page 374.
In the textbooks of Fux, Albrechtsberger, Cherubini, and Bellermann that I use here as sources, we occasionally find interspersed in the principal material exercises in which two, three, or several counterpoints move simultaneously in different species with the cantus firmus. Observing the main principles of strict counterpoint, according to which the downbeat remains consonant at all times (except in the case of the dissonant syncopation), the dissonant passing tone always appears on the upbeat between two consonances. Furthermore, we find the instruction for a figure: $\frac{6}{5} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{5}{4} - \frac{3}{4}$, or for a simultaneous division of a second voice into half notes in fourth species whereby especially the resolution of the dissonant syncopation takes on various new shapes. A first glance shows already that these scattered remarks and tenets fit only very loosely in a general plan and are merely occasional directions that in no way originate in specific insights derived from a simple formula. Actually, these theorists always tried to do justice to certain familiar phenomena and formulas of free composition. Since they knew no logical, artistic bridges by which to connect them, they thought it sufficient to insert, at random, these phenomena into their theories with or without an explanation. They, therefore, would have been the last ones to realize how actually they only damaged their theory of strict counterpoint without, however, establishing the theory of free composition (as they must surely have intended).
When I now turn to these same phenomena in the following discussion, it would seem as if I only wanted to give them a more suitable place in my entire presentation and the necessary completion in the formal sense. In fact, however, I am concerned with something much more important. I want to clarify the still unrecognized laws concealed in those voice leadings and point out how they must be understood merely as extensions of fundamental laws in spite of their new appearance.

[172] In particular, it is my desire to determine the laws of a multi-linear passing tone figure as it appears for the first time in the combinations and to prove how passing tone figures, rooted in primary laws, insist upon a self-reliant composition proper to them also in free composition, although there, to be sure, in even more manifold form. In this sense, in Part One, "COMBINING THE FIVE SPECIES WITH A CANTUS PIRMUS CONTINUING AS A BASIS," the first two chapters are dedicated to clarifying the laws of multi-linear passing tone figures that the combination of two or more counterpoints of second and third species gives rise to.

The inclusion of fourth species in the combinations--see Chapter 3, Part One--shows that, with complete unchangeability of original concepts, the dissonant syncopations can lead to all sorts of extensions because of the additional special circumstances which even more clearly reveal the still obscure differences in strict counterpoint between suspensions, in the narrower sense, and ties in the broader, proven sense, and particularly the seventh-chord in its first outlines. In this chapter we ultimately see the tying-over revealed as a purely rhythmic, primordial phenomenon. This explains how a tying-over can now be applied also to dissonant passing tones. Part Two, "A TYING-OVER OF THE DISSONANCE," is dedicated to the highly significant recognition of this extension.
Finally, in Part Three (the final section), "ELLIPSIS OF A VOICE AS A BRIDGE TO FREE COMPOSITION," I shall discuss the obvious consequence of how a voice progressing in whole notes can be mentally eliminated from combined species composition even when the counterpoints in the disposition of the combined species lessons could originate only with the help of that voice. It will be shown that it is possible to infer, from the progression of two or more counterpoints of second, third, fourth, or fifth species (in arbitrary combination), one voice in whole notes which binds and explains them. We need only assume the voice in whole notes as a place holder of scale-degrees in free composition in order to understand what value is gained by such an elision as a bridge to free composition.

In conclusion, for a better overview, let me give the scheme for presenting the mixture lessons in Part One. Number 1 means the whole note (in a three-part composition the cantus firmus; in a four-part composition 1 1 means the cantus firmus and another voice). Numbers 2, 3, 4, and 5 represent the second, third, fourth and fifth species:

Chapter 1: A. 1 2 2
       B. 1 1 2 2
       C. 1 2 2 2

Chapter 2 A. 1 2 3
       B. 1 1 2 3
       C. 1 2 2 3
       D. 1 3 3
       E. 1 1 3 3
       F. 1 2 3 3
       G. 1 3 3 3

Chapter 3: A. 1 2 4
       B. 1 1 2 4
       C. 1 2 2 4

Chapter 4: 1 5 5
       H. 1 4 4
       etc.
SECTION SIX

PART ONE

COMBINING THE FIVE SPECIES WITH A CANTUS FIRMUS CONTINUING AS A BASIS

CHAPTER 1

COMBINATION OF TWO OR THREE COUNTERPOINTS IN SECOND SPECIES

A. THREE-PART COMPOSITION

TWO COUNTERPOINTS IN SECOND SPECIES:  \( \text{c.f. o} \)

§ 1. General Characteristics of This Combination.

If two counterpoints in half notes are in opposition to the cantus firmus, there is on the one hand the opportunity for novel voice leadings, particularly passing tone figures that could not be produced in strict three-part counterpoint. On the other hand, by virtue of the lack of rhythmic contrast of the two counterpoints, the richness of possibilities must remain limited, as will be shown by the contrast of combinations that exhibit rhythmic variety.

Following the order of the presentation observed up to now, I shall try, if at all possible, to point out the difference between a strict and natural voice leading and one less strict. I do this not to suggest that preference should be given to the former, but to point out that we do stay close to the basic laws of strict voice leading and that we do not abolish them in less strict writing but move forward through their extension.
§ 2. The Strict Organization of the Composition.

If the composition is to be managed according to total strictness, we must take care that the half notes on the up-beat are either both consonant or both dissonant to the cantus firmus.

[175] 1. In the first case when both half notes on the up-beat are consonant with the cantus firmus, it is precisely the fundamental law of consonance that justifies the structure. In individual cases, the following possibilities can arise:

a) With the complete triad on the downbeat, $\frac{5}{3}$ or $\frac{6}{3}$, the up-beat can continue the harmony$^+$ or sometimes it can also lead to a new one.$^{++}$

With reference to the change of harmony, we observe that here not only can there be $5--6$ or $6--5$, as in strict counterpoint,$^{+++}$ but a type beyond $5--6$ which was not possible in strict counterpoint, for example:

Example 266.

This is a type of harmonic change which, for the first time, produces the novelty that with a cantus firmus the two harmonies are removed from one another by a fifth, while in strict counterpoint (at $5--6$) they are a third apart.

---

$^+$Cf. below, Lesson 1, meas. 9; Lesson 2, meas. 6

[Example 283].

$^{++}$Cf. Lesson 2, meas. 4.

$^{+++}$Cf. Lesson 2, meas. 9-10.
That the interval succession of 5--6 (or 6--5) may sometimes produce the effect of a consonant passing or neighboring tone+ can be seen here as well as in strict counterpoint.++

In addition, the effect of 5--6 or 6--5 can be produced, for the first time, by voice exchange:+++ 

Example 267.

\[ \text{\begin{music}
\hspace{1em}
\sStaff 
\middle D2 \sF4 \sA4 \sD4 
\middle F4 \sA4 \sD4 
\middle A4 \sD4 
\middle D4 \sF4 \sA4 \sD4 
\end{music}} \]

We must not overlook the fact that such an effect usually arises automatically from the voice leading so that the voice exchange is unintentional, whereas, free composition uses this method quite consciously. In this sense we can justifiably speak of a voice exchange.

b) With the incomplete triad on the downbeat, the upbeat may complete it or leave it as it was, incomplete.++++ Or, it may bring about a change of harmony, for example:

Example 268.

\[ \text{\begin{music}
\hspace{1em}
\sStaff 
\middle F3 \sA4 \sD4 \sF4 
\middle A4 \sD4 \sF4 
\middle D4 \sF4 \sA4 \sD4 
\middle F4 \sA4 \sD4 
\end{music}} \]

2. If the half notes on the upbeat are dissonant passing tones, they must adhere to the rules as strict counter-

---

+Section III, Chapter 2, § 3.

++ Cf. Lesson 1, meas. 2, 5, and 6.

+++ Cf. Lesson 1, meas. 7.

++++ See below, Lesson 1, meas. 1; Lesson 2, meas. 3.
point states them so that, precisely in this strict regulation, the contrast with free composition becomes evident when the passing tone, as an extension of the strict rule, reveals also freer phenomena. Therefore, it is forbidden to skip from a dissonant passing tone in our combination, as for example:

Example 269.

Already, on the basis of this voice leading that must adhere to strict rules, it becomes evident that the dissonant passing tones of both counterpoints represent an obligatory two-part structure in which the passing tones must be consonant with each other (as in first species two-part writing):

Example 270.

If the progression in fourths is to be rejected, as for example:

Example 271.

from which, however, we must distinguish:

Example 272.
then, the reason for this+ can be sought in the fact that the cantus firmus does not have the power to eliminate the dissonant effect of the harmonic fourth since it, being stationary, merely represents a kind of oblique motion. It is as though, in spite of the cantus firmus, the structure of the passing tones alone is present and the fourth would remain exposed in the low register and would, therefore, sound dissonant.

It is equally obvious that we may combine a neighboring tone with a passing tone, and sometimes we may even combine two neighboring tones:

Example 273.

With the prerequisites of strictness required here, it is easily understood that a fifth-succession with passing tones must be forbidden because of the 5—5. (Consider Example 271 with the half notes inverted.)

§ 3. The Less Strict Organization.

Another original effect is created when a dissonant passing tone collides with a consonant skip.++ Even if the conduct of the former as well as the latter conforms exactly to strict counterpoint, the discrepancy of the operative law creates, nevertheless, a contradiction that can be resolved only in one way: the dissonant nature of the passing tone eliminates the corresponding consonant effect of the skip. In this case, the victory of the dissonant passing tone can

---

+Cf. Kontrapunkt I, page 155; and here, Section III, Chapter 1, § 23.

++Cf. Lesson 1, meas. 4, 6, 8.
be explained by the fact that it causes\textsuperscript{*} the harmony of the
downbeat to be affirmed and continued in a much stronger
fashion; that is, it guarantees the harmonic unity of the
measure much more emphatically than a consonant half note.
Therefore, we can say that the dissonant passing tone, because
of its superior influence, gathers the consonant skip into its
own dissonance. That is why it seems reasonable, in such a
situation, to speak of the horizontalization of a skip, that
is, to speak of a skip as only a passing tone, a "skipping
passing tone."\textsuperscript{++}

[178] The voice leading just presented must be distinguished
from a case such as Lesson 1, measures 2 and 10. There, a
consonant passing tone coincides with a consonant skip in the
other counterpoint, but neither counterpoint needs justifi-
cation because each is consonant with the cantus firmus.

Yet, with regard to the first-mentioned dissonant
passing tones, it is also evident that their construction
(despite the unquestionable authorization of the [other]
counterpoint) does not tolerate skips yielding a second (*55),
fourth, or seventh, simply because they make consonant inter-
vals with the cantus firmus, as for example:

Example 274.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example274.png}
\caption{Example 274.}
\end{figure}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{+}] Cf., Section II, Chapter 2, \S 2.
\item[\textsuperscript{++}] As will be shown in Section VII, the so-called
skipping passing tones also arise from similar causes in free
composition. When they occur in the bass, they often have
such a confusing effect that they are difficult to recognize
as passing tones.
Thus, after excluding seconds, fourths, and sevenths, we again arrive at that strict, two-part structure of the passing tones which came under discussion in the preceding paragraphs.

The fact that a fifth may be used here in certain cases, rests on the capacity of a skip to provide the required contrary motion—however, direct motion is also permissible in a situation such as:

Example 275.

\[ \text{(Example 275)} \]

Accordingly, the voice leading in Example 276a:

Example 276.

\[ \text{(Example 276)} \]

is excluded only because of the skip into the seventh, which is best exposed as in 276b where there can be no objection.

Also, the joining of a dissonant passing tone with a harmonic change must be rejected; for example:

Example 277.

\[ \text{(Example 277)} \]

since this causes uncertainty and obscurity. In such a case, we would have to adhere to the harmony on the downbeat as the one for the measure because of the dissonant passing tone, while, on the other hand, the harmonic change would demand the

\[ ^{+}\text{See Lesson No. 1, meas. 4.} \]
recognition of a new harmony in the same measure. Even free composition is able to maintain only one sonority at one place. A voice leading such as the one in Example 277a would only be easily understood as a passing tone in a D chord (first inversion) because we can hear c as a second passing tone (likewise coming directly from d, or derived through substitution).


1. We could explain the setting of passing tones--since its intervals follow their own laws--as a two-part structure complete in itself, if occasional situations, such as this:

Example 278.

\[\text{\begin{figure}}\]

did not inevitably draw our attention to the third voice and therefore to three-part composition.

The appearance of the $6_3$ chord on the upbeat demands particular attention:

Example 279.

\[\text{\begin{figure}}\]

Predicated upon the favorable circumstances of the cantus firmus, this phenomenon offers the first occasion to realize how it readily joins another $6_3$ chord on the downbeat. If this tendency of the voice leading is understandable, inasmuch as there is hardly a more suitable voice leading in three voices than to progress in direct motion with $6_3$ chords, then it would not have to be mentioned at all if it were not for the
[180] need to point to a new possibility in our combinations—a possibility that favors the \( \frac{5}{3} \) progressions in a manner which is unknown in the first species of strict three and four-part counterpoint. There, the progression from \( \frac{6}{3} \) to \( \frac{6}{3} \) could not occur because the whole note was used; here, it is now possible in the combinations to use the upbeat for this. This shows the particular elasticity of the \( \frac{6}{3} \) chord which can be flowingly effective on the upbeat as well as from downbeat to downbeat. We have an inkling of how precisely the \( \frac{6}{3} \), endowed with such a property, must extend to the core of the composition of passing tones, concerning which we can detect here the first trace.

Disregarding such situations which naturally point to three-voice texture, the composition of passing tones forms a state within a state due to its isolated two-voice character, and we understand why it does not tolerate continuous thirds or sixths, as in any strict, two-part composition.

2. Obviously, the composition of passing tones does not counteract the two-part structure of the outer voices in any way. In association with a third voice, and still more with two, passing tones turn out to be more effective when they fall together with the outer-voice structure, that is, when the outer voices themselves produce the passing tones; standing in the foreground, they derive their true justification and expressiveness from the effect of the passing tones. Less effective is the passing-tone structure that involves only one outer voice; the effect is weakest when it appears in the middle voices, which is possible in four-part composition. Concerning these latter situations we can say with justification, the better the composition of the outer voices, the better the composition of passing tones. This is the basis of the rule that is so extraordinarily important to free composition: we must pay attention to the bass, as the lowest voice of the outer-voice structure, since with it stands or falls the quality of the middle voices (and also the passing
3. The consonance which binds passing tones (inclusive of those that skip) justifies their composition not only outwardly but also improves their inner meaning as passing tones. Secondly, the passing tones express their intent even more emphatically individually, and they dissonate with the stationary tone (or against the tone which is only thought to be stationary as free composition knows it) more strongly because they are consonant with one another. The addition of more voices strengthens the passing tone as such, whereby its conditional independence, as a structure, appears in the proper light.

§ 5. The Lack of Scale-Degree Implication in the Chords in Combined Species Composition.

In Section III, Chapter 2, § 2, we discussed the sense in which the concept of compositional unfolding might be applied to second species. Obviously, with the further growth in half notes, as happens here in the second contrapuntal voice, the effect of a compositional unfolding must be heightened. In spite of that, all attainable increase of unfolding is still not capable of lending to the chords the sort of ultimate definiteness that can be granted only in free composition by means of scale-degrees. How easily we fall victim to illusion may be seen in this case, for example:

Example 280.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{F} \\
\text{G} \\
\text{E} \\
\text{F} \\
\end{array} \]

of a continuing root-tone F, with the succession 5–6, or in this case:
Example 281.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(C - - ?)}
\end{array}
\]

of a stationary root-tone C with the passing tone 8--7.

Or, do we make claim, for example:

Example 282.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(B7 - - ?)}
\end{array}
\]

[182] of the sum total of a B\(^7\) chord? Be that as it may, we have a personal feeling that would like to hear the different effects created by the voice leading of free composition. This feeling must be sternly repressed. We must evaluate what takes place on the upbeat strictly according to the voice leading. For, precisely because scale-degrees are lacking, it happens that in spite of the increase of material the passing-tone structure seeks refuge in the law of consonance. It attains through this law, without qualification, a clarity not attainable even in a freer voice leading because of the lack of scale-degrees. To be sure, merely by the effects created through an independent voice leading, we can clarify that law. That is the reason free composition follows similar paths in order to fulfill dissonant concepts by means of simulated consonance, a technique whose usefulness will be shown later in connection with free composition.
Example 283.

1. Soprano

2. Soprano: C.f.
B. FOUR-PART COMPOSITION

ONE COUNTERPOINT IN FIRST SPECIES AND TWO IN SECOND SPECIES:

\[ \begin{align*}
  & d \quad \cdot \\
  & \cdot \quad \cdot \\
  & \cdot \quad \cdot \\
  \quad \text{c.f.} \\
\end{align*} \]

\( \frac{6}{3} \). The Opportunity for an Abundance of Formations in the Composition of Passing Tones; and Harmonic Change.

This combination benefits the inclination of the formations described above in \( \frac{6}{3} \) all the more since here, in addition to the cantus firmus, another voice collaborates in whole notes. In conjunction with the two other voices in halves, it helps to free the conduct of the \( \frac{6}{3} \) chords from the cantus firmus; for example:

Example 284.

Yet, considering the composition of passing tones themselves, the \( \frac{4}{4} \) is not possible other than, for example:

Example 285.

Here, because they are not too low, these cannot be considered real \( \frac{4}{4} \) formations.

The more sharply the consonance seems to be profiled here by the downbeat, the more we realize the contradiction,

\[ \text{---} \]

\( ^{+} \text{Cf., in contrast, Example 271.} \)
shown in Example 277, of associating a harmonic change with a [184] dissonant passing tone. Compare Example 286a with 286b, which is permissible without objection:

Example 286.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a)} & \text{b)} \\
(6 - 5r) & 6 - 5 \\
\end{array}
\]

In the closing formulation of the lesson offered in Example 288, we can hear a suggestion of the degree-progression II-V-I. This further contributes to strengthening the belief that the scale-degrees have their origin in voice leading.+

However, other closings are possible; for example:

Example 287.

\[\text{c.f.}\]

\[\text{c.f.}\]

\[\text{c.f.}\]

\[\text{c.f.}\]

+See pages 49-50.
[185] C. FOUR-PART COMPOSITION

THREE COUNTERPOINTS IN SECOND SPECIES:

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Soprano} & \text{Alto: C.f.} & \text{Tenor} & \text{Bass} \\
\hline
\text{c.f.} & \text{c.f.} & \text{c.f.} & \text{c.f.}
\end{array} \]

§ 7. The \( \frac{6}{3} \) and \( \frac{6}{4} \) Formations.

When three counterpoints progress in half notes, we find—as if it were a three-part composition within a composition—a still more favorable occasion for \( \frac{6}{3} \) formations than was the case in the preceding combination. Thus, carried through by three voices, the intent for passing motion appears to be asserted threefold, and its effect, therefore, is also threefold; for example:

Example 289.

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\text{c.f.} & \text{c.f.} & \text{c.f.} & \text{c.f.}
\end{array} \]
The question of whether the construction of the passing tones could permit the $\text{6}_4$ here has to be answered as follows: with a stricter realization we might actually have to reject a passing tone figure like this:

Example 290.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 290a.} \\
\text{c.f.} \\
\end{array}
\]

probably for the same reason we rejected the succession of fourths in three-part species combinations. However, it cannot be denied that the three-voice character of the $\text{6}_4$ chord, being fuller and more complete in comparison to the "naked" fourths, at least signifies a mutual advantage. In this sense we may permit a passing tone figure of this sort, especially one with the close position in Example 290a.++

Here, too, a closing formation reminds us of the succession II-V-I:

Example 291.

It is self-evident that in all other respects the achievements of the preceding combinations find no further improvement here, and it is also self-evident that a further development must founder against the equilibrium in the rhythm

++How this situation with such passing tone figures is seen in other combinations and in free composition will be discussed below in Chapter 2, \S 10, and in Section VII.

---

+See Example 271.
of the half notes; this was intimated, for the first time, in § 1.

LESSON

Example 292.
CHAPTER 2

INCLUSION OF THIRD SPECIES

A. THREE-PART COMPOSITION

ONE COUNTERPOINT IN SECOND SPECIES AND ONE IN THIRD SPECIES:

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow \\
\downarrow & \downarrow & \circ & \circ \\
\end{array}\]

c.f.  

§ 1. General Characteristics of This Combination.

In contrast to the combination types of the first chapter, the ones to be treated in this chapter show the new aspect of rhythmic contrast of the counterpoints. This contrast is less likely to demand a sacrifice from the half and quarter notes. It guarantees their character and [187] strengthens them so that, by overcoming the contrast, unity is expressed. In particular, the half note once again affirms itself as the determining rhythmic subdivision of the cantus firmus.\(^+\) In contrast to the half note, the quarter notes appear to be the last permissible diminution in strict counterpoint. It is also the half notes that decide the consonant continuation of the harmony, the change of harmony, the fourth-space, etc. The contrast of the rhythm makes it possible for the quarter note to be dissonant against the half note on the upbeat, a new phenomenon that strongly expresses the difference between this combination and the previous ones.

\(^+\)See Kontrapunkt I, page 421.
§ 2. The Strict Organization.

The principles according to which a stricter organization of the combinations is to be carried out are the same as those of three-part combinations in Chapter 1, A, § 2. Briefly, let me say the following:

The upbeat may continue the harmony of the downbeat with a consonance.∗

A change of harmony may be produced by the succession 5--6 (6--5), ** but it may also be created in another way.*** Under certain circumstances, a harmonic change may occur at the second quarter note, as in Lesson No. 3, meas. 7. This is contingent upon the quarter note**** making a double rhythmic group possible, for the purpose of the formulation of the neighboring tone, or for another similar reason. The defining of a harmonic change, in contrast to a consonant passing tone or neighboring tone phenomenon at 5--6 (6--5) falls under the same criteria as in Chapter 1, A, § 2.***** Concerning the 5--6 in the fourth-space, see below § 4.

In the application of dissonant passing tones, strict execution demands that the passing tones****** be consonant with each other if both are dissonant with the cantus firmus.******* Accordingly, with a voice leading such as this:

∗See below, Lesson No. 1, meas. 1, 2, etc.

++See, for example, Lesson No. 1, meas. 8, 9, here at a nota cambiata through voice exchange; furthermore, see Lesson No. 2, meas. 5; Lesson No. 3, meas. 5, 7, etc.

+++ Cf., for example, Lesson No. 4, meas. 4, etc.

++++See Section III, Chapter 3, § 2.

+++++Cf. Lesson No. 3, meas. 10, etc.

++++++Cf. Chapter 1, A, § 2.

+++++++See Lesson No. 1, meas. 6; Lesson No. 4, meas. 2.
Example 293.

\[ \text{[188]} \] we would have transgressed the rule because the second half note of the first measure, dissonant with the cantus firmus, is skipped into in an unauthorized way. Such a voice leading can easily be explained in free composition when the second half note has either the rank of an independent scale-degree (in our example I-IV\textsuperscript{7}-V\textsuperscript{#}) or the status of a neighboring tone (\textsuperscript{g} before \textsuperscript{a}).

§ 3. The Less Strict Organization.

A less strict organization of the combination leads to an extension of the structure of passing tones,\textsuperscript{+} as has been explained in the first chapter. The extension permits a dissonant clash to occur on the upbeat. Let us begin with the simplest example:

Example 294.

We recognize the reasons for justifying such an extension in the following circumstances.

Most important is the fact that, due to its skip and its consonant relationship to the cantus firmus, the half note on the upbeat induces us to regard the harmony of the downbeat as valid also for the upbeat.

\textsuperscript{+}Cf. Chapter 1, § 2 and § 3.
Add to this the fact that the harmony on the downbeat also finds its justification in the realm of the quarter note. By means of the second quarter note, the consonant buttress, as it were, becomes doubly strong.

Then, it is the contrast of the rhythmic values in the contrapuntal voices—the quarter note here, the half note there—that makes the passing tone stand out so much stronger than it would with half note against half note.

And if the quarter notes—to mention this point at last—carrying out a passing tone from the second to the fourth quarter note make use of a strict rule inherent to them anyway, what question could be raised, with such an assertion of clarity and unity, against a dissonant clash? Let us note also how, because of the articulated second half note, the dissonant passing tone simultaneously provides new support for the concept of the accented passing tone, whose embryo we encountered in two-part composition. Thus, it emphasizes the passing tone effect above all, whereby the vertical effect (especially that of a suspension) completely recedes, or is negated.

But how the good effect, in the above example, Example 294, has been achieved, especially by means of the skip to the consonant, second half note, can be seen best if I show, in contrast, the increased difficulties for the voice leading in another example where the second half note is a passing dissonance:

Example 295.

\[^{+}See \textit{Kontrapunkt I}, page 298.\]
If I remind the reader that a dissonant passing tone underlines the harmony of the downbeat more clearly than the consonant one and that accordingly the quarter notes here have no choice but to enter into the unity of the harmony, then we have to say the following in regard to the different structurings of our example: The dissonant clash in Example 295a+ can be justified only when, for irrefutable reasons, $\frac{5}{3}$ is used at the following downbeat. However, when a $\frac{6}{3}$ is possible on the following downbeat, the voice leading in 295b takes precedence. Corresponding to the strictest rule, it leads to the same goal with a better effect than the voice leading in 295c which shows a dissonant clash on the upbeat. Yet, this latter structuring is bad not merely because a better possibility exists in 295b. The bad effect is caused by the violation of the passing-tone law inasmuch as the third quarter note, carried along by the dissonant half note in the passing-tone design,++ now loses the right to the consonant skip. (This also provides additional evidence of the touchiness of the fundamental rule concerning the dissonant passing tone.)

Yet, the justification for a dissonant clash on the upbeat is not limited merely to the more natural cases where the measure preserves harmonic unity. This freedom may also be granted at a change of harmony whereby we get a more artistic voice leading than in the above-mentioned cases; for example:

Example 296.

[190]

Yet, strict practice demands the consonance of the two passing tones; see § 2, above.

++Cf. Chapter 1, A, § 3.
The justification for such a style is given naturally with the passing tone figure stretching from the second to the fourth quarter notes. For if, in this arrangement, we know in advance which tone must arrive as the fourth quarter note, we can easily relate it to the second half note. In this case, the clash on the third quarter note is accepted all the more readily because we recognize its origin as coming from the passing tone formation.+

§ 4. Passing Tones in the Fourth-Space.

That quarter notes can express the fourth-space, just as in the third species of three and four-part counterpoint, is obvious. A consonant upbeat, for example:

Example 297.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Example 297.} \\
\text{a) } & \quad \text{b) } \\
\end{align*}
\]

eeds no further justification. Only the question of whether the upbeat may also be dissonant becomes significant. After the viewpoints discussed in § 3, nothing can be said against a voice leading such as:

Example 298.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Example 298.} \\
\text{a) } & \quad \text{b) } \\
\end{align*}
\]

+To solve the puzzle of so many different voice leadings in free composition, the knowledge of the relationship just described is often particularly effective and useful:
In both cases the half notes are consonant with the cantus firmus and therefore guarantee sufficiently the unity of the total harmony. This harmony is also affirmed in its own way by the fourth-space.

How much, in other situations, the fourth-space contributes to the clarity of the effect is evident from the fact that a voice leading such as the one in Example 299a:

Example 299.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 299.} \\
[191]
\end{array}
\]

will never satisfy anyone. We need only apply the law of passing tones in the fourth-space:

Example 300.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 300.}
\end{array}
\]

in order to recognize immediately, due to the better effect, the cause of the mistake committed in Example 299a. In contrast, in Example 299b we see with the same chord a passing tone in the third-space that allows the downward skip.

With a voice leading such as:

Example 301.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 301.}
\end{array}
\]

*Cf. to this, Lesson 4, meas. 5.*
we touch upon the composing-out of a seventh-chord inasmuch as the sum of the fourth, $f-b$, is heard (augmented to be sure, but strictly diatonic). The unconditionally conceived consonance of the downbeat alone (which is taken in the light of the discussion in Chapter 1, A, § 5, as a true $\frac{8}{3}$ and not the $\frac{7}{3}$ it might seem to be in retrospect) causes us to permit such voice leading in our composition. To be exact, a similar effect leads to the voice leading that Bellermann applies at the end of his lesson* and which I offer here once again for reason of clarity:

Example 302.

\[ \text{\textit{\textbf{Example 302.}}} \]

Here, the fourth quarter note conceives $\frac{6}{3}$ (after it has brought itself into agreement with the second half note and the cantus firmus)** as belonging in retrospect to the fourth-space $b-f$, as if the beginning tone were already represented on the downbeat: $\text{(b)} \ a-g-f$.

In contrast to the fourth-space in Examples 297a, 298a and b, and 300, which remain*** in the same harmony at the beginning and end, the fourth-space in Examples 297b, 301, and 302, show, despite all differences of the effect, the common characteristic that their harmonies at the beginning are different from those at the end. (They even remind us of II-V-I.) In that we must detect the extension of the "nodal

* See Lesson No. 3, below.
** Cf. Example 296.
*** Cf. Example 117.
point" concept. No more than the concept of the third-space, in which the passing tone takes place, is obliterated by the fact that it with beginning and end belongs to two harmonies, is the concept of the fourth-space obliterated by a similar occurrence.

Fux speaks about this kind of combination in his conclusion of three-part, third species counterpoint (p. 98 ff.):

[Alloys.] I can hardly describe how much more charming and praiseworthy the composition becomes through the threefold variety of note values. Therefore, I seriously recommend this exercise to you, with the threefold or fourfold transformation that has served us well.

This is all Fux has to say about this matter. I already took the occasion above to point out some details relative to his example (Example 305, No. 1), so nothing more need be said about it here.

Albrechtsberger, too, who mentions this combination—with combinations in general—at the end of three-part composition after completing fifth species, neglects to offer a more detailed explanation and simply declares (p. 119):

When we make from the first five species two, over a cantus firmus, then such a synthetic example belongs to fifth species and it gives us a taste of free composition where in each voice other notes can be set.

Let us note here that Albrechtsberger, as we can see by a correction of one of Beethoven's lessons reproduced by Nottebohm (p. 53) finds it better to circumvent a non-parallel direct succession with a neighboring tone where it (as here) is excessive:

Example 303.

+See page 59, Example 90, and compare to that page 76, Examples 123 and 125.
However, concerning his skipping into the seventh in measure 10 of his example below, one can read my opinion about it in *Kontrapunkt I*, page 317.

[193] The combination in question here is discussed by Cherubini on page 35: "We must pay attention that the voice carrying the half notes begins after the one in quarter notes":

Example 304.

I need not mention that such a formulation of the beginning corresponds to strict rules. Still, Cherubini adds:

In this mixture of the two species it is almost impossible for one of the voices not to skip. We must, therefore, discard the rule which chiefly prescribes a flowing melody.

Bellermann, who approaches species combinations for the first time in three-part, fourth species counterpoint states (p. 210):

In structuring three-part composition in this way, we may not use passing dissonance in the voices singing in half notes if we want to avoid creating the unpleasant harshness against the added quarter-note motion. Thus, the lessons present many problems, and it becomes difficult to provide a flowing, stepwise movement to the half notes (which must also be consonant with the cantus firmus). In regard to the quarter notes, it is very easy to write in a flowing manner. However, here we must take care that the third quarter note is consonant with both the cantus firmus and the counterpoint singing in half notes. An exception to this may be made only by the fourth when it, as in measure 11 of the last example, is accompanied by the sixth.

Stated clearly and emphatically, Bellermann's opinion represents an unnecessary strictness with regard to unconditional adherence to consonance on the upbeat. Above all, he should not have disregarded the fact that the two counterpoints may

+ Example 305, No. 2.

++ He means the lesson cited below as No. 3 [Example 305].
be granted the right of dissonant passing tones even from the strictest point of view. This knowledge would have eliminated his need to make an "exception" of the $\frac{6}{4}$ structure, and it would have spared his criticizing as a "very bad sounding combination" the two passing tones dissonant against the cantus firmus but consonant with one another in Fux's lesson cited in Example 305, No. 1, meas. 6. Where the self-delusion of the theorist can lead: He hears a sonorous combination as being pleasant as well as "bad sounding," according to the rules, without having any idea that the only dissonance existing here is between his theory and truth:

LESSONS

Example 305.

+ Cf. Example 302, above.
B. FOUR-PART COMPOSITION

ONE COUNTERPOINT EACH IN FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD SPECIES:

\[ \begin{align*}
  &\text{\textbullet} \quad \text{\textbullet} \quad \text{\textbullet} \\
  &\text{\textbullet} \quad \text{\textbullet} \quad \text{\textbullet} \\
  &\text{\textbullet} \\
  &\text{\textbullet} \\
\end{align*} \]

c.f.

\[ \text{\textbullet} \]

§5. General Characteristics of This Combination.

In this combination the half notes are forced to skip when the quarter notes flow contrapuntally; and vice versa, a flowing half-note structure causes the quarter-note motion to have skips.

As for the rest, particularly in reference to the dissonant passing tone on the upbeat, the same principles are observed as in the comparable three-part species combination (A), so that here, too, we must not object to the following passing-tone constructions which are more or less strictly designed:

Example 306:
C. FOUR-PART COMPOSITION

TWO COUNTERPOINTS IN SECOND SPECIES, ONE IN THIRD SPECIES:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C.~F.~C.}\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{F.~C.}\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C.~F.~C.}\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C.~F.~C.}\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C.~F.~C.}\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C.~F.~C.}\end{array} \\
\end{array} \]

§ 6. In the Construction of the Passing Tones, the Two Counterpoints in Half Notes Represent a Comparatively Independent Composition.

Only in their relationship to one another do the passing half notes remain totally regulated by consonance. This results from their lack of rhythmic contrast. On the upbeat, the two half notes may be dissonant to the third quarter note if they are at least consonant with one another (except for a $\frac{5}{3}$ on the upbeat, in which, owing to the bass, they form a hidden fourth).++

---

† According to Chapter 1.

++ Cf. below, Lesson No. 2, meas. 9 [Example 308].
If, on the one hand, the compulsion of the voice leading naturally leads to successions of thirds and sixths in the half notes, then, on the other hand, we must, to insure a good effect, be on our guard in the face of the threatening monotony in that situation.

That this combination gives rise to frequent $\frac{6}{3}$ and $\frac{6}{4}$ structures is obvious.

Example 308.
Remarks Concerning These Lessons

About 1. In measure 3, a voice leading such as the following would be inadmissible:

Example 309.

[198] because the relationship of the two half notes to the cantus firmus prohibits making a skip. In contrast, with the degree-progression II-V7 in C major, free composition can justify such a voice leading without hesitation.

In measure 4, examples such as the following can emphasize different effects:

Example 310.
In Example 310a, the upbeat is completely consonant; in 310b, c, and d, the half notes are consonant with one another, to be sure, but are dissonant with the third quarter note. (In 310b and c, only one half note is dissonant, whereas both half notes are dissonant in 310d.) In 310e the half notes are dissonant with one another. If we disregard the correct voice leading in 310a, among all the others only 310b could be considered acceptable. If measure 6 were written in this way:

Example 311.

\[
\text{Example 311.}
\]

the sixth succession works vainly, due to the excessive harshness to be eliminated.

About 2. In measures 2 and 3 the half notes are dissonant, showing why they are to be avoided in such lessons:

Example 312.

\[
\text{Example 312.}
\]

[199] D. THREE-PART COMPOSITION
TWO COUNTERPOINTS IN THIRD SPECIES:

\[
\text{Example 312.}
\]

\[
\text{Example 312.}
\]

c.f. ○

§ 7. The Consonant Structure of the Quarter Notes.
What was said in Chapter 1, A, § 2 and § 3 about the setting of half notes holds true for the setting of quarter notes in this combination. That is to say, because of the lack of rhythmic contrast, they must, in all circumstances, be consonant with one another if they are dissonant with the cantus firmus. This is the case whether both are dissonant at the same time or only one is dissonant (quarter notes have more occasion for this) while the other progresses by step or by skip in a consonant interval with the cantus firmus.

More so than with the half notes in the type of combination described in "C" (§ 6), there exists here the danger of incessant successions of thirds and sixths, which must be avoided with the utmost care.

Since two counterpoints in this combination use quarter notes, we can see, even better than in the earlier combination types, how passing tones and neighboring tones are inclined to occur in pairs rather than individually. This does not exclude the possibility that the quarter notes of a different designation (passing tone, neighboring tone, harmonic tone) may enter into a consonant relationship to one another, a possibility that not only increases the variety of the intervals but frequently gets the voice leading out of embarrassing situations.
LESSON

Example 313.

![Musical staff with example 313.]

[200] Remarks Concerning These Lessons

If the voice leadings in measure 2 were the following, they would have to be criticized:

Example 314.

![Musical staff with example 314.]

In Example 314a the voice leading is overloaded by the dissonant clash at the second quarter note and by the harmonic change immediately following on the third quarter note. (Note, in contrast, the better structuring of a similar design in measure 9 where on the second beat the quarter notes are consonant.) A consonance on the third quarter note, as it appears in 314b, belongs to free composition, which permits skipping away from a neighboring tone. In 314c, the dissonant third quarter note of the middle voice is skipped into; this goes against strict rules. In measure 4, the following voice leadings would be unsuitable:
In Example 315a the quarter note on the second beat forms a dissonance; in 315b a dissonance is skipped into. In 315c a dissonant passing tone in the middle voice on the second quarter note and a dissonant neighboring tone in the top voice on the third quarter note follow each other so quickly that the ear is overpowered by these events and recognizes them only after the fact. Therefore, it is recommended that one avoid such a voice leading even though it otherwise corresponds to the rules. In measure 6 the composition of quarter note fourths, for example:

Example 316.

[201] is obviously wrong for the same reasons as those given in regard to Example 271. To write as in Example 317a would be wrong in measures 7 and 8 because of the skipping away from the neighboring tone. In contrast, the interlocking of two cambiata figures in 317b is quite possible:

Example 317.
E. FOUR-PART COMPOSITION

ONE COUNTERPOINT IN FIRST SPECIES, TWO COUNTERPOINTS IN THIRD SPECIES:

\[ \text{Example 318.} \]

\[ \text{H. Schenker} \]

\$8. The Continuous Importance of the Structure of the Quarter Notes.

Concerning the application of quarter notes in this type of combination, we must repeat what we said in \$7 in reference to the previous combination.

LESSON

Example 318.
FOUR-PART COMPOSITION

ONE COUNTERPOINT IN SECOND SPECIES, TWO COUNTERPOINTS IN THIRD SPECIES:

\[ \text{c.f. O} \]

§ 9. When They are Consonant with One Another, the Quarter Notes Assert Themselves as a Composition Against the Half Notes.

This combination represents a counterpart to the one described in § 6. That is, just as the passing half notes there were in contrast to the quarter notes, here the quarter notes, in contrast to the half notes, maintain their own structure, to a degree.

LESSON

Example 319.
G. FOUR-PART COMPOSITION

THREE COUNTERPOINTS IN QUARTER-NOTES:

\[
\begin{align*}
&J \quad J \\
&J \quad J \\
&J \quad J
\end{align*}
\]

c.f. 0

§ 10. As in the Structure of Passing Tones, the Quarter Notes Particularly Lead to $\frac{6}{3}$ and $\frac{6}{4}$ Formations.

A three-part structure in quarter notes greatly increases the opportunity for $\frac{6}{3}$ and $\frac{6}{4}$ successions. And, in this situation we can find strong affirmation of the fact that it is totally irrelevant to the concept of dissonant passing tones whether or not these consist of $\frac{6}{3}$ or $\frac{6}{4}$ formations.† The decision whether we have to use $\frac{6}{3}$ or $\frac{6}{4}$ in a given instance depends simply on the disposition at the starting point. That is to say, if at the starting point of the passage the three voices mutually form a $\frac{6}{3}$ or $\frac{6}{4}$ chord, then the decision for or against the $\frac{6}{3}$ or $\frac{6}{4}$ makes itself known.++. (This experience is of particular value in free composition.)

§ 11. Passing and Neighboring-Tone Harmonies.

Because of its greater rhythmic flexibility, the three-part structure of quarter notes presented in this kind of combination can show better than any other combination how a passing tone or neighboring tone can transfer its effect to

† Cf. Section III, Chapter 2, page 60.

++ Cf. Examples 289 and 290.
the rest of the consonantly linked quarter notes. It thereby elevates the total consonant clang to the level of a passing-tone or neighboring-tone harmony which benefits the passing-tone or neighboring-tone effect all the more.†

But, we are not yet permitted to declare, as for example in Lesson No. 1, measure 7 (fourth beat) the consonant harmony, as such, a passing-tone harmony. Here, because of the lack of scale-degrees, we are forced to perceive the sonorities only as what they are according to their voice leading. It is a different matter with such sonorities in free composition where we often strive to produce dissonant effects by means of a detour through consonant sonorities.++

LESSONS

Example 320.

+ Cf., for example, Lesson No. 1, meas. 1, beat three; meas. 2, beat 2; meas. 5, beat 2.

++ Cf. page 182.
CHAPTER 3

INCLUSION OF SYNCOPATION SPECIES IN THE COMBINATIONS

A. THREE-PART COMPOSITION

ONE COUNTERPOINT IN SECOND SPECIES AND ONE COUNTERPOINT IN FOURTH SPECIES:

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{\( \downarrow \quad \downarrow \)} \\
&\text{\( \downarrow \quad \downarrow \)} \\
&\text{\( \text{c.f.} \quad \text{o} \)}
\end{align*} \]

§ 1. General Comments.

By adding to the syncopating voice a second voice that moves in half notes, we can gain highly significant advantages. There are now new resolution possibilities for all the syncopation types taken over from strict counterpoint, as well as new syncopation structures that appear here for the first time.


[205] As the following example shows, the motion of the second voice in half notes leads to sonorities that were not possible in the earlier forms of three or four-part composition:

Example 321.
At the same time, these few examples show that a conceptual unification of all resolution possibilities is unthinkable.

But, because of the particular importance of the matter, we must emphasize that with the 9--8 syncopation the progression of the lower voice in half notes makes it possible to avoid, in three and four-part composition, the previously inadmissible succession 8|9-8. This is why here we can tie 9--8 to the octave:

Example 322.

Example 323.

§ 3. New Syncopation Structures: \( \frac{7}{5}, \frac{6}{2}, \frac{6}{4}, \text{ and } \frac{6}{5} \).

To this group of new syncopation structures belong some new combinations in the syncopations taken over from strict counterpoint: \( \frac{7}{2}, \frac{2}{4}, \text{ and } \frac{4}{4}, \) as well as the totally new \( \frac{6}{5} \).

Thus, in \( \frac{7}{2} \), the progression of a second voice in half notes gives rise to the \( \frac{7}{5} \) since the fifth, as a consonance, can progress on the upbeat by a consonant interval (be it a third or sixth):

Example 323.

[206] In the same way, \( \frac{2}{2} \) may be used as \( \frac{6}{2} \) since once again the sixth may progress similarly by a consonant interval:
Example 324.

\[ \text{Example 324.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\underline{Example 324.}} \\
\text{\textbf{Example 324.}} \\
\end{array} \]

The same is true of \( \frac{7}{4} \) with \( \frac{6}{4} \).

Example 325.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\underline{Example 325}} \\
\text{\textbf{Example 325}} \\
\end{array} \]

In contrast, the \( \frac{6}{5} \) syncopation is entirely new.

Example 326.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\underline{Example 326}} \\
\text{\textbf{Example 326}} \\
\end{array} \]

With this construction the lower voice must move—thus, this syncopation joins the series of syncopations above—because the obligation of the preparation concerns only the fifth and not the sixth. This situation is caused by the fact that the preparation of the sixth, for example:

Example 327.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{\underline{Example 327}} \\
\text{\textbf{Example 327}} \\
\end{array} \]

would lead to a doubling of the resolution tone.\[ \text{\textsuperscript{+}} \] Whether

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{+}} \text{See above, Section III, Chapter 4, \textsection 3 and 5.} \]
or not the tied fifth relates to the sixth as a second or a seventh is totally irrelevant.+

§ 4. The General Effect of the Combination on the Character of the Syncopation.

[207] In the following paragraphs the effect of the combination on the character of syncopation is examined. It will be shown that the effect differs according to whether we deal with the 9--8, 4--3, or with the 7--6, 2--3, and 4--5 syncopations. In this difference, the intrinsic contrast of the two groups is shown as well. By this illustration we will better understand why I have designated the first group alone as "true" suspensions in Section III, Chapter 4, § 2.

§ 5.--A) On the 9--8 and 4--3 Specifically.

No matter whether the second half note continues the harmony of the downbeat, for example:

Example 328.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 328.} \\
\end{array}
\]

or brings about a new harmony:++

Example 329.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 329.} \\
\end{array}
\]

the content originally connected with 9--8, 4--3 in both

---

+See Example 326a and b.

++Cf. Example 321a and c.
the \(\sim9\) and \(\sim4\) syncopations is conceptually fulfilled on the downbeat, where the dissonance appears. For example, in the voice leading of our examples where the resolving upbeat presents an interval other than the expected 8 or 3, our perception maintains, in spite of such a resolution, the original intent of \(\sim9--8\) and \(\sim4--3\) in full purity. The character of the \(\sim9\) and \(\sim4\) syncopations remains totally untouched by the interval of the upbeat brought to the voice leading belatedly, so that we have no right to speak here of basic syncopations and possible subspecies types.

It would be wrong, however, to try to attribute the penetrating power of these two syncopations to the effect of scale-degrees, because these (the scale-degrees) are still totally missing in the species combinations. Rather, we have to see, in the voice leading of our examples, a contraction of two acts, an abbreviation which, without eliminating the original concept of \(\sim9--8\) or \(\sim4--3\), nevertheless causes a change in its outer appearance, and in this sense creates an extension.\(^+\)

The assumption of an abbreviation here is based only upon the voice leading, that is to say, upon that which the voice leading may at times bring about by the addition of a second voice moving in half notes, because, ultimately, it is permitted to bring it about. Therefore the assumption is not arbitrary. It is based upon the feeling that the result remains satisfactory even if the added voice makes no further movement. The result then is the fulfillment of the original \(\sim9--8\) and \(\sim4--3\) concept that we already know, whereby the certainty of our feeling is proven.

The new upbeat harmony created through the progression

\(^+\)In addition, this abbreviation may give us an idea of what I mean when I use the term "extension of an original concept" with so many other voice leadings.
of the second voice does not imply a conflict with the original \( 9--8 \) and \( 4--3 \) concept. It must be understood, rather, as a temporal succession, i.e., first the fulfillment of the original concept and then thereafter, a new harmony.

§ 6.-B) On the \( 7, 2, \) and \( 4. \)

Such an abbreviation, such a temporal succession in the syncopation group \( 7, 2, \) and \( 4 \) is unthinkable. The path to a new upbeat harmony cannot lead to the fulfillment of the original concept of suspension resolution in these as in the \( 9--8 \) or \( 4--3. \) In no way could we reach a consonant resolution of the suspension when the second voice does not move. Instead, we would reach new dissonant configurations: \( 7--8, 6--7, \) and \( 4--5, \) all of which oppose the original concept of \( 7, 2, 4. \) If the resolution of the suspension represents the unity of harmony, the inability to create a consonant resolution represents an opposition of two harmonies.

The addition of a 5 with \( 7, \) a 6 with \( 2 \) and again a 6 with \( 4 \) produces a contrasting dissonant harmony on the following upbeat. That is to say, they become more independent than is possible for other combinations of the same syncopations in strict counterpoint.

In all these cases it is as if the first two beats of a dissonant syncopation: \( \begin{array}{c} 8 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 7 \\ 7 \end{array} \) were to separate from the last in the following manner: \( \begin{array}{c} 8 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 7 \\ 7 \end{array} . \)

§ 7.-C) On the \( 5. \)

[209] In the case of the \( 5, \) the granting of autonomy to the downbeat harmony shows itself most blatantly, but for different reasons here than in the syncopations of the previous paragraphs. We know that in strict counterpoint this sonority

\[ ^* \text{Cf. page 85.} \]
cannot be used in the first species of three-part composition+ or in the syncopation species of two, three, or four-part composition where the resolution of the dissonant fifth would lead to a forbidden $\text{6/4}$ chord. From this we can deduce that the $\text{6/5}$ has nothing to do with the original tied fifth concept and cannot be mistaken for a real suspension or one clouded by a state of indecision awaiting the fifth of a triad.**

§ 8. The Embryonic Seventh-Chord.

If we line up the syncopations we have discussed in §§ 6 and 7: $\text{7/5, 6/2, 6/4, and 6/5}$, we can recognize sonorities that are exactly the same as the seventh-chord, or its inversions, in free composition. Now we can understand the effect of the independence of the harmony on the downbeat discussed in § 6 and § 7. With $\text{7/5, 6/2, and 6/4}$, must not the suspension effect $\text{7--6, 2--3, and 4--5}$ be thwarted by the 5 and 6 when these intervals coincide with the fifth of a seventh-chord that is so markedly different from a suspension? So it appears from the standpoint of free composition. However, if free composition reveals that the so-called seventh-chord**+ is nothing other than a triad (on which the passing seventh seems superimposed by abbreviation, but which shows no diminishing independence other than progressing to another equally independent sonority), then there exists a considerable difference between the seventh-chord of free composition and the above-mentioned syncopations. Above all, bear in mind that the species combinations, which advance

---

+See Section III, Chapter 1, § 3.
++Let us not overlook the fact that all the other syncopation concepts we know permit different combinations; only $\text{6/5}$ possesses a single one.
+++Cf. Der freie Satz, the section on the seventh.
these structures for the first time, cannot produce them except by tying them to a preparatory consonant harmony whereby, to be precise, only the method of strict counterpoint is heeded anew. The reason for this is as follows: in the species combinations for lack of scale-degrees—the cantus firmus being involved—the voice leading alone rules, since there is no force necessarily predetermining the path of the voices. As a result, with the passing seventh we hear its proper consonant starting point (as with any passing tone). This is the reason why we have to provide the dissonance on the downbeat in question with a consonant harmony at least on the preceding upbeat as a preparation. However, since (as in strict counterpoint*) the latter consonance does not allow us to fall prey to the elision of the consonant starting point at the syncopation dissonance, so, in the species combinations, the appearance of three beats presents itself and is now united with the actual 9--8 and 4--3 suspensions as well as with the other syncopations regardless of the different effect of the two groups. It is the unity of the outer appearance (f|f |f) which conceals the seventh-chord configuration in our species combination.

On the other hand, in spite of the effect of the three beats, other effects cannot be avoided that go with 5 at 7, with 6 at 2, with 6 at 4 and 5, which, as I said above, produce a sort of independence of the dissonant sonority of the downbeat in question as if the syncopation were to receive only two beats in all these cases. Precisely in this new secondary effect is hidden the idea of the seventh-chord in a mysteriously germinal way! Here, it draws its first nourishment from the state of indecision produced with 7--6, 2--3, and 4--5 (not, however, 6) and this cannot be alleviated since it is totally a matter of choice (as in

*See page 84 ff.
strict counterpoint) to add the named syncopations according to the rule of strict counterpoint with $\sim \frac{7}{3}$, $\sim \frac{4}{3}$, or $\sim \frac{4-5}{2-3}$. More than that, in free composition it is often difficult to detect the true meaning of the seventh—yet a definite decision can be reached through the many aids available. But how much less certain is the seventh in our species combination where we have to do without such aids and where the writing, obscured by the lack of scale-degrees, can never achieve the definiteness of a free composition! Because of this last residue of uncertainty, the above-named syncopation structures still adhere to strict counterpoint. At the same time, however, they already point to the world of the seventh-chord of free composition† because of the increased independence they enjoy.

Of all the syncopation structures named in this subsection, the $\sim \frac{6}{5}$ remains the most removed from strict counterpoint. Indeed, the tied fifth represents that real seventh which free composition has learned to incorporate and add to the chord as an abbreviation of the 8-7 passing tone. Thus, the fifth, born as a seventh, belongs to the concept of the passing tone despite the fact that in this species combination it creates the illusion of a suspension due to the tie. Thus, from the contrast of the original concept of strict counterpoint on the one hand and the $\sim \frac{6}{5}$ on the other, we can now recognize that chord consonance alone—in strict counterpoint circumscribed with $\frac{5}{3}$ and $\frac{6}{3}$—dominates the original concept of syncopation. I repeat again: In the beginning was consonance! It, alone, carries the original laws of the suspension! Whatever does not belong to these laws clearly points beyond the

†Compare to this the effect of apparent seventh-chords as they are created now and then by a detour around a consonant sonority in the combination types explained in the first and second chapter of this section; see pages 181 and 191.
boundary of 5 and 6 to a place where no new laws can be found, that is, laws of equal value to the law of consonance. Rather, they are merely extensions which, as for example $6_5$, are not suspensions at all but a passing seventh with which we assume the consonance (of the starting point). In strict counterpoint the fifth and sixth cannot be surpassed! All phenomena, no matter what traits they exhibit, come from them and flow back to them.

One point remains to be explained: why, in this combination we cannot find in addition to $6_5$ and $6_2$, the second inversion of the seventh-chord, $4_3$. This has to do with the fact that in an actual second inversion of the seventh-chord the fourth does not represent a dissonance because it coincides with the root-tone. Here, in this combination, it can be considered only as a tied dissonance. As a tied dissonance, however, it does not tolerate the third:

\[ \text{Example 330.} \]

\[ \text{not:} \]

\[ \text{i} \]

I shall show below in §15 how the inclusion of quarter notes in the composition of the combination will often yield the opportunity to apply even the $4_3$, at least in passing movement, on the second quarter note.

§ 9. The Inadmissibility of a Passing Tone that is Dissonant with the Resolution Tone.

A passing tone that would be dissonant to the resolution tone is better avoided in the lessons of this combination type for the following reasons:

\[ \text{+See pages 89-90.} \]
First: Here, only half notes stand against half notes and they cannot bear a dissonance on the upbeat according to the principles stated in Chapters 1 and 2.

Second: Since our lesson is burdened by the obligation to syncopate and to use a consonant preparation on the upbeat, it conforms best to the strict postulate if, on the upbeat, the second half note avoids a dissonant passing tone against the resolution tone.

To be sure, there is no objection to a passing tone being dissonant with the cantus firmus. It must, however, be consonant with the resolution tone. We find examples of this in Example 342, Lesson No. 1, meas. 8; Lesson No. 2, meas. 7. In the first example we can resort to the consideration of an abbreviation as the explanation,† as if the passing tone had taken place here after the completion of the \( ^\uparrow 6-5 \) resolution. In the second example, the passing tone is a dissonant diminished fifth with the cantus firmus, which not only should be tolerated but at times must be tolerated in syncopation species of strict counterpoint. Be that as it may, this combination type in itself offers very little occasion for passing tones, and therefore the second voice progressing in half notes is mostly restricted to skips if it is not in the lowest part where it has a chance to move stepwise.

§ 10. The Possibility of a Harmonic Change.

[213] That this combination type permits a harmonic change is clear from the above discussion.

How Fux uses the division of a second voice in half notes for the first time in four-part, fourth species counterpoint was already shown in Section IV, Chapter 4, § 2. It is therefore understandable that each species combination (to call it that for brevity although occasionally division

†Cf. above, § 5.
appears in the lessons and therefore does not represent a combination) is contained in a four-part context. However, Fux shows a three-part species combination in a three-voice fugue lesson on page 131. Because this composition is a fugue, it does not have a cantus firmus and deserves the designation combination (in my interpretation) even less than the four-part one did. He writes:

[Aloys.] We can avoid the formal cadence if we preserve the major third in the upper voice, and let the bass employ another consonance in place of the octave, as for example:

Example 331. Table XXIV, Fig. 5.

This is used more gracefully with more voices, for example:

Example 332. Table XXV, Fig. 1

In the example above, "à 3," we find our combination again and see how Fux obtains at an original \( \frac{4}{5} \) a departure of \( \frac{4}{6} \) which brings about a deceptive cadence on the downbeat of the next measure.+

With regard to a question concerning the fugue, Fux continues (p. 132 ff):

[Aloys.] Now we want to see how the formal cadence, with the help of the entering subject, can persist in a somewhat unusual interval, as can be seen in the following composition:

+Cf, Example 321, and Harmonielehre, page 182.
He establishes the $\frac{6}{5}$ here for the first time.

With apparent orderliness, Fux gives the following direction (p. 133):

[Aloys.] You can do that when I have shown how to set the bass against two voices that descend through the seventh and sixth or the second and third, whereby, the continuation of the voices is made much easier:

Example 334. Table XXVI, Fig. 1.

and:

Example 335. Table XXVI, Fig. 2.
These two examples are nothing other than combinations of different species (without a cantus firmus!) from which the syncopation draws considerable new advantage from the movement of a second voice in half notes. We also see used outside a "formal cadence" of a fugue. We see how $^9$ has a resolution on the upbeat not permitted in strict counterpoint, etc. Yet, here too, as with fourth species in four-part composition, we are still far-removed from drawing unified principles for the directions given above. Fux merely remarks [133]:

[Aloys.] We can see that the fifth and sixth can be set together and that the seventh resolves to the sixth and the second to the third. The same can be said of the fourth and fifth when they are presented together. These and others similar to them can help you within the subject statements as well as without, and they can pave the way for the fugue subject if it should enter.

It follows from this that Fux wants to recognize such combinations as belonging to an actual fugue composition, something that, according to my theory, is the same--namely, it belongs above all to free composition. This should strengthen the judgment I made already in regard to four-part, fourth species counterpoint about the way Fux introduces $^7$ and $^6$. Neither in strict counterpoint nor here in the fugue does he know how to find the proper path to seventh-chords. More precisely, he uses these forms in lessons and fugues but he does not know how to explain them clearly and as a consequence muddies the pristine beauty of strict counterpoint without gaining one useful, basic thought for the theory of seventh-chords and free composition in general.++

Albrechtsberger provides no examples of the species combination discussed here.

++ Cherubini first offers his example of this combination at the conclusion of three-part syncopation species. We spoke above about the consonant passing tone that appears

---

$^+$See above.

++Thus, we can finally explain the faulty voice leading in a two-part lesson which had a seventh on the upbeat that I mentioned in Kontrapunkt I, page 244.
in it. Nowhere does Cherubini mention how this combination makes possible new syncopation configurations such as: $\overline{9}$, $\overline{6}$, and $\overline{5}$. These he explains to his reader in connection with the fourth species of four-part composition.

As I mentioned above, Bellermann offers lessons* of the combination dealt with here** at the end of the fourth species of three-part composition within the framework of a special paragraph entitled "Resolution of Dissonance in Moving Voices." From this comes the following quote [p. 224]:

We have the freedom here to allow the consonant voices to continue freely if the dissonant tone (by means of resolution) proceeds downward by step creating a consonance, as may be seen in the following two-part example:

Example 336.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\begin{array}{cccc}
G & A & B & C \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\end{array}
\end{align*}
\]

[216] We must say, however, that the second should resolve to the third, the seventh to the sixth, etc., whenever we regard those progressions of the other consonant voices as incidental. Through such free progressions harmonic variety is created. We are put into the position of adding to the dissonant intervals also those tones through which a new dissonance would be created on the next upbeat if they were sustained; a situation which we have avoided until now since in three-part composition we could only move in whole notes.

Bellermann illustrates the $\overline{9}$, $\overline{6}$, and $\overline{5}$ in the following examples of which the first one uses syncopation in two voices--without a cantus firmus. In contrast, the last two examples could be considered fragments of regular exercises based upon a cantus firmus [p. 225].***

---

*See page 224 ff.

**See Below, Lessons No. 2 and No. 3.

***See below, Part III of this section.
Example 337.

Example 338.

Example 339.

In regard to the last example, we must explicitly remark that he leads the lower voice not only by step but also by skip in connection with the $\text{C}^\flat_5$. Then he writes (p. 226):

In this way many different combinations may be put together. Not all of them are to be counted, however, and I offer the following brief passage only as an example:

Example 340.

\[\text{Cf. also to } 6 \text{ in Bellermann, pages 216-217.}\]
By means of this method we can rectify passages otherwise forbidden. For example, we can prepare the ninth with the octave and then avoid the covered octaves by changing the bass note at the resolution as shown in the following two examples:

Example 341.

The composers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries did not like formations such as this. As a result they are forbidden in strict a cappella music.

Next, we see an excerpt from Handel's 

This "freedom" and a quotation from Kirnberger which Beller- mann criticizes as follows [227]:

I am of the opinion that we must look upon this way of applying a ninth in the freer style of writing as a freedom which should be used only in the rarest cases.

In spite of its merit, Bellermann's description lacks clarity since, instead of developing his thoughts gradually by means of lessons, he presents a general chapter that is not only tentative about all species combinations but also involves free composition. Set forth so generally in the syncopation species of three-part strict counterpoint, it disturbs the flow of the presentation and the logic of the structure. Therefore, we can only evaluate his bridge to the lessons of our species combination as paltry (p. 227):

We must insert here a lesson in which two voices move in half notes against a cantus firmus in whole notes. One moves in syncopated half notes and the other in ordinary half notes. (*57)

And of the lessons in question, Bellermann writes (p. 228):

This lesson is not without difficulty and to that extent is of great importance since in free composition the voices very frequently (!) move in a similar way and the resolution of the dissonance in the moving voices finds various applications and produces a considerable variety of harmony. Nevertheless, it appears that the voice moving in ordinary half notes has little freedom in its movement and is forced to make awkward skips.
He merely points out the similarity of movement in free [218] composition as the reason why the lesson should find its place here and nowhere else—all isn't that naive? Is it not rather the case that this lesson as any other must show the effects in themselves, which somehow in a suitably modified way experience a continuation in free composition? Concerning measure 7 of his first lesson (here, No. 2) for which I gave some explanation above, Bellermann remarks in a footnote: "The half note C# is to be considered a passing dissonance with the G of the cantus firmus."

**LESSONS**

Example 342.


   Tenor: C.f.

   Bass


   Alto

   Tenor
B. FOUR-PART COMPOSITION

ONE COUNTERPOINT EACH IN FIRST, SECOND, AND FOURTH SPECIES:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
 & d & d \\
 & d & d \\
 & & o \\
\end{array}
\]

c.r. o

\section*{11. The Effect of Four-Voice Texture on the Further Development of Individual Syncopations.}

The four-voice texture of this lesson makes it possible for several syncopations to attain completeness, for example: \(\frac{9}{5}, \frac{7}{3}, \text{or} \frac{6}{4}\). However, a complete \(\frac{6}{5}\) is only possible if we assume the voices cross, wherein the third proceeds by skip:

Example 343.

\[
\text{Example 343.}
\]

It is obvious that in the case of \(\frac{7}{5}, \frac{6}{4}\), and \(\frac{6}{2}\), the completeness and independence of the subsequent harmony on the upbeat \(\begin{array}{c}
\text{P} \\
\text{P} \\
\end{array}\) increases.\(^+\)

Let me remind the reader that Fux uses these formulations in lessons of strict four-part counterpoint through the process of division. We do not find in his works a true combined species lesson of this type. That Albrechtsberger and Cherubini follow Fux in this was already mentioned.

\(^+\)See § 8 above.
Example 344.

1. 

2. 

H. Schenker

C.f.
C. FOUR-PART COMPOSITION

TWO COUNTERPOINTS IN SECOND SPECIES, ONE COUNTERPOINT IN FOURTH SPECIES:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\end{array}
\]

\[c.f.\]

\section*{12. The Implicit Possibility of \(\frac{6}{5}\).}

In this species combination the circumstance of an additional counterpoint moving in half notes makes it possible for the \(\frac{6}{5}\) (in any position) to be completed by means of the third.

Example 345.

To the principles discussed under "A", "B", "C", are joined those of Chapter 2. At this point syncopations may be used in new and different extensions.

Note that all of these extensions are bound and dominated by the highest principles of the syncopation species of strict counterpoint, according to which the rhythm of half notes remains standard for the resolution of the syncopation. Here, under the protection of the resolution rhythm, the skipping passing tone, in particular, already attains the forms that are shown (to be sure, more plentifully) in free composition.

§ 14. The Laws Governing the Second and Fourth Quarter Note: A) Stepwise Movement.

The second or fourth quarter note may move stepwise:

1. As a passing tone without regard to the consonant or dissonant nature of the syncopation:

Example 346.
2. As a neighboring tone (upper or lower); for example:

Example 347.

\[ \text{Example 347.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\frac{5}{6} \quad \frac{5}{6} \\
\end{array} \]

And, it must be mentioned that at \( \frac{7}{6} \) even the lower octave of the dissonant suspension may act as a neighboring tone; for example:

Example 348.

\[ \text{Example 348.} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\frac{7}{6} \\
\end{array} \]

In such a case, the resolution maintains its half-note rhythm and the neighboring tone adheres to its orderliness. Therefore, we need not assume a relationship between the seventh and the neighboring tone, not even at the octave with its consonant effect that seems to eliminate the dissonant nature of the seventh. The syncopation concept is totally victorious over the neighboring tone on the second quarter note.+

3. As an aspect of the nota cambiata, we have to consider several possibilities with different effects. At:

Example 349.

\[ \text{Example 349.} \]

+See § 13, above.
--if we disregard the $\frac{8}{8}$ of the downbeats—the demands of the nota cambiata fall together with those of the syncopation in the most favorable way; while here, for example:

**Example 350.**

```
\begin{music}
\newStaff \newApple {c' \dow} \newApple {g \dow} \newApple {e' \dow} \newApple {c' \dow}
\newStaff \newApple {f' \dow} \newApple {c' \dow} \newApple {g' \dow} \newApple {e' \dow}
\end{music}
```

the last tone of the cambiata (on the downbeat of the second [224] measure) is inserted into the $\frac{4}{4}$–$\frac{3}{4}$ dissonant syncopation. And like this last example, we find with:

**Example 351.**

```
\begin{music}
\newStaff \newApple {c' \dow} \newApple {g \dow} \newApple {e' \dow} \newApple {c' \dow}
\newStaff \newApple {f' \dow} \newApple {c' \dow} \newApple {g' \dow} \newApple {e' \dow}
\end{music}
```

that the last tone of the cambiata merges into the $\frac{4}{2}$, thus a sonority that in some cases, as here, it may be heard as a seventh-chord.

Conversely, the beginning tone of the nota cambiata appears to be inserted into a dissonant syncopation in the following example:

**Example 352.**

```
\begin{music}
\newStaff \newApple {c' \dow} \newApple {g \dow} \newApple {e' \dow} \newApple {c' \dow}
\newStaff \newApple {f' \dow} \newApple {c' \dow} \newApple {g' \dow} \newApple {e' \dow}
\end{music}
```

---

*Section III, Chapter 3, § 3.*

**Cf. also, Example 370, Lesson No. 3, meas. 7–8.**
or even:

Example 353.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 353.}
\end{array} \]

where the nota cambiata originates in the \( \frac{6}{2} \) (of a seventh chord).

We can see from the last three examples that these two voice leading phenomena, the dissonant syncopation and the nota cambiata, are capable of being used together quite properly. At the downbeat we perceive only the predisposition of the dissonant syncopation; but this is enough to hear the expected resolution, therefore, to imagine the consonant sonority. The resolution takes place while the cambiata is still in motion. In closing, I wish to remind the reader that here, as elsewhere, the nota cambiata is possible from upbeat to upbeat.+

§ 15. -- B) Skips.

[225] On the second quarter note we may not skip into a tone that is the same as the suspended tone. Because the dissonance cannot be led upward, as for example:

Example 354.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 354.}
\end{array} \]

parallel primes or octaves would be inevitable. Likewise, it is not acceptable to skip into the resolution tone, in light of the prohibition against doubling the tone of resolution.

+For example, Bellermann page 233.
It is also inadmissible to skip into a second quarter note that would produce a new dissonance with the significance of a harmonic change, as for example:

Example 355.

As in strict counterpoint, the basic rhythm of the half notes demands* that here also the preparation and use of such a dissonance take place from the upbeat to the downbeat.

When Fux and Albrechtsberger use such a construction in their exercises, to be sure only on the fourth quarter note,** they do so either in regard to free composition or because at the fourth quarter the resolution of the dissonant syncopation is already exceeded, so that it is spared from the confusion caused by the new dissonance. Ultimately, it is due to the rhythm of the resolution that a dissonance which is similarly skipped into on the fourth quarter reduces to the concept of a skipping passing tone instead of an independent syncopation.

With the avoidance of tones falling under these prohibitions for the reasons mentioned above, a rather limited group of tones may be used in skipping to the second quarter note, all of which show the common stamp of conceptually belonging to the same triad or to $\tilde{7}$, $\tilde{4}$, and $\tilde{6}$. (These are the only possible representatives of the seventh-chord at this point.)

---

*See § 13, above.

**See Example 355, meas. 2 and 5; Example 370, Lesson No. 1, meas. 3.
In order to speak of syncopations leading to a triad, the second quarter note will either have to repeat the cantus firmus tone or complete the missing interval of the postponed triad; for example:

Example 356.

Such a skipping by the tone demanded by the triad concept is permitted if the quarter notes are in the lower voice. It does not matter which new intervals, consonant or dissonant, are created by the second quarter note in reference to the two remaining voices; for example:

Example 357.

Neither the $\begin{array}{c}5 \\ 7 \end{array}$ nor the $\begin{array}{c}5 \\ 6 \end{array}$ structure at the second quarter note of the examples is an impediment to the composition. Only the completion of the dissonant syncopation is decisive for both the effect and the conception of the phenomenon which the second quarter note as a passing tone places in the service of the rhythm moving in half notes. Therefore, its independent voice-leading value is reduced.

In contrast, a voice leading such as the following:
Example 358.

would have to be rejected inasmuch as a $\frac{9}{3}$ is created on the first quarter note; this directs our attention to $\frac{9}{3}$ according to the root-propensity of the lowest voice. [227] This presumption would contradict the construction of a new harmony at the second quarter note.

If we look closer at Examples 355 and 356, we will find that the tones that skip are the same ones that the syncopating voice might take hold of as an embellishment according to the strictest principles (only by a second, not by skipping a seventh). Here, therefore, with regard to these tones, we deal only with a sort of representation of the voice in half notes by the one in quarter notes.

If we want, we can go further and say that by means of subterfuge, the principles of four-part composition become effective inasmuch as the second quarter note takes that interval which may be used in a true four-part composition simultaneously with the remaining three tones. Thus, this construction of the species combination forces us to recognize that an increase in the types of movement (here, the blending of the whole note, syncopation, and quarter note) always presses toward a clearer composing-out of independent harmonic concepts. Under such complicated conditions, a voice progressing in quarter notes finds almost no other path than that of a thorough composing-out of a chord.

---

$^+$Even if in a higher octave as in Example 357.
b) At $\hat{7}_3$ and $\hat{4}_2$ a skip makes it possible to fill in a 5 or 6 later, for example:

Example 359.

It is clear that with the $\hat{6}_5$ the lower voice skips a third:

Example 360.

Yet, here a skip of a third upwards, which fills in the missing interval of a seventh-chord, is no less permissible:

Example 361.

since the configuration,* created by a skip to the second quarter note, has a totally different effect than the same $\hat{4}_3$ on the downbeat.** The difference between this way of skipping—simply filling in the missing interval in $\hat{7}_5$, $\hat{4}_2$, and $\hat{6}_5$—in contrast to those conceived by Fux and

---
* Cf. Example 359 at the *.
** See Example 330, above.
Albrechtsberger is obvious. In the first case we are dealing with the restoration of a missing interval, in the second case we are dealing with the harmless addition of a superfluous interval in the passing tone figure. We could also apply the skip as a fourth voice on the downbeat in Examples 359 to 361.

§ 16. The Law Governing the Third Quarter Note.

The second chapter defined the principles concerning the consonance or dissonance of the intervals between the second half note and the third quarter note. Accordingly, two possibilities are admissible:

Example 362.

It follows that this also, for example:

Example 363.

+Examples 335 and 370.
may no longer be rejected. If, in the last example, the resolution of the dissonant syncopation seems to take place too early, the cause lies only in the passing tone figure encompassing the second to the fourth quarter notes. In truth, its rhythm is the same as in any ordinary case. The dissimilarity with Example 355 is easily detected.

§ 17. A More Precise Definition of the Skipping Passing Tone.

From Chapter 1 ("A", § 3) we remember how the nature of a skipping passing tone was defined by means of the overriding effect of a dissonant passing tone moving along at the same time. Here also, when a syncopation is included in the combination, a stronger law, namely that of the syncopation rhythm, determines that the skipping quarter note is to be understood merely as a passing tone. As long as the dissonant syncopation is not resolved, as was already said in § 15 above, no independent evaluation of the relationship of the second quarter note to the syncopation is possible. It is as if the skipping interval were nothing but an actual passing tone, i.e., a (stepwise) neighboring tone. Therefore in Example 364a:

Example 364.

the second quarter note in no way eliminates the dissonant character of the \( \text{\textasciitilde}4-3 \) even though it is consonant with the other two voices. For the same reason, in cases such as those in Examples 360 and 361, the skip into the second quarter note does not cause any change in the conception of the syncopation established by the downbeat. Thus the configuration remains a
syncopation despite the skip of a third at the second quarter note. Such a conception of the skipping passing tone logically suggests that, at the second quarter note in the passing tone figure, not only the configuration \(^+\frac{4}{3}\) but also this one:

Example 365.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\(\downarrow 7\)}, \text{\(\downarrow 4\)}, \text{\(\downarrow 6\)}
\end{array}
\]

[230] must be declared admissible because the second quarter note plays such a small role in the dissonant relationship—just as, for example, in Examples 356 and 357.

We see that under the influence of a stronger law that undeniably defines the passing tone, i.e., the dissonant, passing half notes shown in Chapter 1 and a dissonant syncopation in this chapter, a skip (no matter whether consonant or dissonant) joins in with the principal effect of the stronger law as a passing tone.

In contrast to the phenomena of Chapter 1, the skipping passing tones associated with \(\downarrow 7\), \(\downarrow 4\), and \(\downarrow 6\) are a significant extension of this concept. By adding a fourth interval to these sonorities, they not only enhance, in spite of the given ties, the independent value of these configurations as seventh-chords more emphatically than could be the case so far, but they also show how a compositional unfolding embraces an ever-widening circle. Moreover, they show that when a stronger law demands it, even what harmony teaching calls an "arpeggiation" of a chord must, from the standpoint of pure voice leading, be evaluated as a mere passing tone, in spite of the skips.

\(^+\)See Examples 359 and 361.
Only by evaluating the situation can we judge whether the neighboring tone, because of the greater suppleness of its stepwise movement, is capable of rendering better service than a skipping passing tone.

Fux's example pertaining to this, which does not actually represent a combined species lesson, was previously cited under "A" in § 10, Example 335. We already spoke about the skipping passing tones in measures 2 and 5 in § 15.

Likewise, we treated the skipping passing tone in Albrechtsberger's lesson at the same place. He included it at the end of the fifth species of three-part composition, pages 119-120.

Bellermann is the only one of the teachers who endeavors to explain in detail the question of the present combination. Yet, his version is expressed so laboriously that we think we are dealing entirely with other questions, and there is the danger that we will miss the essence of his clarifications. He is correct when, under "1", he permits the application of a regular passing dissonance or a nota cambiata on the second quarter note. Yet, it is confusing when he explains under "2" [p. 229]:

It is another matter when we do not use a passing tone from the first to the second quarter note, for then in most cases—if not always—this involves a skip on the second quarter note. This second quarter note must then be consonant with the other two voices (the cantus firmus as well as the tied dissonance) as it is here:

---

+See Examples 347 and 348, above.
++Table XXVI, Figure 2.
+++See Example 370.
++++Page 229 ff.
+++++Here, and in the following, I present only a selection of the examples.
Or, it must take a unison or octave with the cantus firmus even though the voice in question skips into an interval that is dissonant with the tied half note, as here:

Example 367.
On the other hand, Example "E" should not be imitated. In the case of the ninth we would do better on the second quarter note to avoid an octave or unison with the cantus firmus because according to strict rules, this interval may be dissonant only with the bass.

And on page 231 Bellermann states:

Beyond these rules that must be observed strictly, only one freedom is permitted. Although I cannot cite an example by Palestrina, it appeared quite early. Later, with seventeenth-century composers, and then Bach and Handel, it was applied without hesitation. The freedom consists in this: if the dissonant fourth is on the downbeat in one of the upper voices and is accompanied only by an octave of the lower voice, as in the second measure in both of the following examples, "A", and "B":

Example 368.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Example 369.} & \\
\text{Example 369.} & \\
\text{He means the last one.}
\end{align*}
\]
If the quarter notes are in the bass, the fourth-skip is obviously forbidden because the fourth below the cantus firmus creates a new dissonance.

How much simpler and more understandably Bellermann could have said this if (as I have done above) he would have simply explained the real demands he makes of the second quarter note, specifically, that the skip must belong to the harmony of a triad or seventh-chord. He could have spared himself the inconsistency (p. 229) of accounting for the nota cambiata as conforming to "familiar rules" at one place and at another place (p. 230) of misinterpreting it and placing it instead in a totally false perspective ("not as a passing tone").+ Or, to show another example, he admits that a skip to the tied half note might also form a dissonance,** and yet, as may be seen at the end of the example reproduced here, he rejects a dissonance with the cantus firmus, whereby the configuration resembles a passing 4.3

Finally, I want to remind the reader of the closing formula that Bellermann uses in a lesson on page 234.+++

---

+See quote above.
++See above, the quote before Example 367.
+++See Kontrapunkt I, page 411.
Example 370.

Albrechtberger, op. 119-120.

Cherubini, Example 114.

E. FOUR-PART COMPOSITION

ONE COUNTERPOINT EACH IN FIRST, THIRD, AND FOURTH SPECIES:

§ 18. The Infeasibility of $\frac{6}{3}$ in This Species Combination.

We must remember the complete $\frac{6}{3}$ is totally unfeasible because of the counterpoint in whole notes, a fact which does not deny that this syncopation with a doubled sixth, $\frac{6}{6}$, is otherwise possible.

+See § 12, above.
Example 371.

1.

2.
F. FOUR-PART COMPOSITION

ONE COUNTERPOINT EACH IN SECOND, THIRD, AND FOURTH SPECIES:
\[ \text{c.f.} \]

§ 19. The \( \frac{6}{3} \) Is Feasible.

In this species combination the \( \frac{6}{3} \) is possible because of the half notes.

Fux shows such a species combination on page 138 in his original Latin version.† [237] At the conclusion of four-part, fifth species counterpoint, Albrechtsberger offers two lessons in this species combination which he follows with a similar five-part lesson.++ These three lessons are inserted in Example 375, numbers 2-4.

Expressly naming the composer this time, Cherubini presents an example by Fux;†† but with changes in the closing as follows:

Example 372.

That is to say, on the third quarter note he sets a passing dissonance in place of Fux's consonance without regard to the cross relation between \( f \) (the third quarter note) and the \( f\# \) in the final measure. (*58) In addition, he remarks:

---

†See Example 375, Lesson 1, below.

++See Chapter 33, "Example of Chorales in Strict Counterpoint."

††See Example 126, page 53.
One must begin the voice in quarter notes with a quarter rest; for example:

Example 373.

and the part in half notes with a rest of one and one-half measures in order to give more elegance to the entrance of each voice:

Example 374.

Bellermann concludes the syncopation species of four-part composition with the present species combination; he presents three examples on page 263 ff., the first of which is the example originating in Fux (and also used by Cherubini). (*59) Bellermann says of it: [p. 263] "This is a very difficult but noteworthy and useful exercise." And referring to the last example he states [p. 264]:

Due to the latter situation, namely that the bass voice has the syncopation, the task becomes even more difficult. The application of dissonance in this voice is more limited than in the upper voice. Thus, the reversal of the ninth, i.e., the seventh resolving to the octave, is forbidden (cf. above, page 197). And, if at all possible, the second resolving to the third must be accompanied by a sixth and fourth so that the composition will not sound too thin. Because of some difficulties in the next two examples, (*60) the even pace of the half notes in the alto has been twice interrupted by a syncopation.
Example 375.

1. Fux.

2. Albrechtsberger, p. 153
§ 20. Revival of the Quarter-Note Structure.

Since two counterpoints are in quarter notes in this species combination, the principles presented in Chapter 2 ("D"-"G") are once again applicable to their structure.
LESSON

Example 376.

[242] H. THREE-PART COMPOSITION
TWO COUNTERPARTS IN FOURTH SPECIES:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{d} & \text{d} \\
&\text{d} & \text{d} \\
&\text{c.f.} & \text{c.f.}
\end{align*}
\]

\$ 21. The Infeasibility of This Arrangement.

The carrying out of such a lesson proves impossible because of the constraints exerted both by the cantus firmus and the syncopation. If at some point it were possible to harmonize the syncopations in thirds or sixths, then, because of the progression of the cantus firmus, a continuation of the syncopation would be impossible. Just as it is easy to
convince oneself of this by a cursory experiment, so it is important to gain from it a deepened understanding of the principle presented at the beginning of this chapter, namely, that in each syncopation lesson the two-part structure of the syncopating voice and the bottom voice requires primary attention. However, that does not necessarily mean that this structure is always the basic structure of the outer voices. We now understand that two syncopating voices must create a conflict with the two-voice structure, and that their continuous competition must completely paralyze the progress of both. We surmise that a coupling of two syncopations is contingent upon the elimination of all constraints to the formulation of simultaneous syncopations. This would happen only in a lesson with mixed (fifth) species in two parts\(^*\) or one with the cantus firmus eliminated.

\(^*\)See Chapter 4, below.
CHAPTER 4

THE INCLUSION OF FIFTH SPECIES IN THE COMBINATIONS

§ 1. The Stylistic Conditions for an Inclusion of Fifth Species.

As we already know from three and four-part composition, the mixed species admits of several counterpoints in first species (whole notes). The other counterpoints are only chordal extensions of the cantus firmus whose whole-note rhythm they simply share. We may, however, consider it a stylistic contradiction when we add to a counterpoint of mixed species a counterpoint of another species (i.e., second, third, or fourth species). In the abstract, a combination of second and fifth species or third and fifth species (three-part composition) might be possible, but the possibility of their use—of which anyone can easily convince himself—proves nothing against the contradiction lying in the fact that the mixed species, by incorporating and mixing within itself all other species, naturally expresses freedom and diversity. This freedom and diversity makes the monotonous constraint of the half note, the quarter note, or the syncopation, which prevails in the remaining species as counterpoints, seem an uncomfortable, senseless contrast. When a voice moves with the freedom that fifth species allows (even if a cantus firmus is present), the remaining counterpoints would like to use such freedoms when they do not intend simply to support the rhythm of the cantus firmus in whole notes. In the following discussion I want to pay attention only to combined species lessons in which the mixed [fifth] species appears in at least two voices.
§ 2. The Combination of Two or Three Counterpoints of Fifth Species and the First Possibility of Simultaneous Syncopations.

A four-part lesson with one counterpoint in first species and two in fifth species, for example, allows the possibility of two simultaneous syncopations.

One should observe how the formulation of two counterpoints of mixed species exhibits a trend toward a continued exchange and replenishment of the rhythm of the counterpoints and thereby creates a diversely enlivened progression.+

Above all, in the case of a four-part lesson with three counterpoints in mixed species, every constraint seems to have disappeared, and, if the tones of the cantus firmus were not there, we could easily believe ourselves to be in the midst of a free composition.++

The last-cited of Cherubini's multi-linear examples do not reveal any rational reason why the author has still linked them to a cantus firmus.

In Albrechtsberger we find, among others, the following example (p. 143):

Example 377.

†See Example 378, Lesson No. 1.
‡‡See Example 378, Lesson No. 2.
These may be regarded, if you wish, as a fragment of a lesson with two counterpoints in mixed species.

Example 378.

LESSONS

Cherubini, p. 54, Example 130.

Cherubini, p. 54, Example 131.
Remarks Concerning These Lessons

The constraint that the cantus firmus exerts in lessons of this sort causes the voice leading to choose paths that it would not ordinarily take. It should not be necessary to add that Cherubini uses a dissonant clash on the upbeat. We will, however, mention that he frequently uses the rhythm, as well as whole notes. This is not, according to the strictest principles, permitted in fifth species, but makes it easier to produce the combination. (By the simultaneous leading of several voices according to the principles of fifth species, it becomes possible for the first time to
distribute the rhythm of four quarter notes per measure between two voices.) He also uses four half notes in succession in the same voice. The quarter rest in the middle of Lesson No. 2 (meas. 7) could be replaced with a tie; it represents, therefore, only a license in a superficial sense. Concerning the last lesson [here, No. 6], Cherubini remarks (p. 59):

The penultimate measure of the last example provides the application of a type of suspension that we must most emphatically bring to the attention of the student. The two parts designated by the "+" simultaneously produce the dissonant suspension and the retarded note (or consonance). In other words, the second soprano sounds the prepared and resolved fourth while the second tenor supplies the third. The only way to use these two intervals at the same time, when one seems to exclude the other, is just as given in the example. The voice creating the dissonance must follow its prescribed progression while the voice having the consonance progresses by step in the opposite direction without lingering on the consonance. This rule also holds true for the sixth that is to be sounded with the seventh, and for the octave that is to be sounded with the ninth, etc. We must observe that the two intervals are not to be placed in the same octave and that this should take place only in seven or eight-part composition:

Example 379. Cherubini, p. 59, Example 137.
[248] It would have been easier to say that in all of these cases we are dealing with a doubling of the resolution tone forbidden in strict counterpoint, which we could conditionally describe as \( \sim 9--8 \) in a middle voice. (The \( \sim 9--8 \) concept must be reckoned against the lowest voice as with any syncopation.) Free composition has sufficient cause to use this sort of voice-leading when we consider that its number of voices is unlimited and it cannot avoid strengthening the voices even if they are used in a context like that of Example 379. There, we understand it as a mere strengthening, and we test the strictness of the composition according to extensions, as I shall explain in more detail in Section VII.
PART TWO

CONCERNING A TYING-OVER OF THE DISSONANCE

§ 1. General Comments.

Two-part composition does not have the strength to use a voice leading such as:

Example 380.

because the cantus firmus may not remain the same for two measures. If one so desires, however, in three-part composition, a dissonance can be formed on the upbeat which may be considered a preparation for the following dissonance, thus making the following voice leading at least possible:

Example 381.

—See the prohibition of tone repetition in the cantus firmus, Kontrapunkt I, p. 63.
§ 2. The Assumptions for Such a Phenomenon.

The particular assumptions for this new phenomenon are these:

1. It requires two full measures.
2. The lowest voice has to be sustained through both measures, which by itself indicates that it does not bear the cantus firmus.
3. The cantus firmus must move in whole notes against the other voice (no matter whether above or below).
4. The required completion of $\frac{6}{5}$-$\frac{15}{4}$-$\frac{3}{4}$ indicates once again that, because of the tying-over in connection with a cantus firmus, our case would, in a certain sense, have to be categorized in fourth (syncopation) species.

§ 3. Explanation of the Individual Traits of the Concept.

The following discussion should serve to explain the individual traits of the concept.

The $\frac{6}{4}$ dissonance on the upbeat that is used to prepare the dissonance on the next downbeat violates the rules of strict counterpoint. This is the reason I avoided the discussion of this phenomenon in the syncopation species of strict three-part counterpoint. It does not belong in strict counterpoint (even less so than the ottava battuta and nota cambiata). If we want to remember it in the teaching of counterpoint for reasons of tradition, then conceptually, it belongs among the forms that are transitional to free composition in which the decisive circumstance is the fact that the $\frac{6}{5}$ is also on the downbeat— which we have learned to construct only in the species combinations.† (It is important to remember here that any other beginning such as $\frac{7}{3}$ or $\frac{7}{3}$ could not lead to $\frac{6}{5}$ as

†Cf. Section VI, Chapter 3, § 3.
long as we adhere to a cantus firmus and to whole notes in the third voice.)

Let us not overlook the fact that in other respects the opening of that two-measure unit, as well as the closing, complies totally to strict counterpoint by using only consonance for both the preparation of $\frac{6}{5}$ and the resolution of $\frac{5}{4}$. Thus, at least, the beginning and end of the figure form regular pillars on which the burden of the voice leading moving irregularly in between can be more easily supported.

Furthermore, the compulsion of the syncopation must be placed in perspective here, inasmuch as its thrust is backwards, at the same time when, by way of exception, the dissonant $\frac{6}{4}$ syncopation is also permitted on the upbeat—[250] since that is the only place it may occur. (Likewise, in free composition the compulsion of a rhythm introduced earlier sometimes makes demands on a progression that could not seem so convincing without such a compulsion.)

If we bear in mind that the $\frac{6}{5}$ syncopation would have to allow the bass to move on the upbeat, then we will understand that through its being sustained, the bass puts itself in contradiction with the principles governing the $\frac{6}{5}$. These principles take on a totally different meaning from those governing counterpoints in whole notes and thus tone repetition is usually permitted. Understood in this manner, the bass alone is the real culprit producing the irregularities of our example. It is not, as one might assume at first glance, the resolution of the fifth to the fourth, and the tying-over of the latter that are the only consequences of the sustained bass. (It is only because we instinctively know a contrapuntal voice in whole notes may be sustained

$^+$Cf. Section VI, Chapter 3, § 3.
that, in reality, the bass succeeds in placing the guilt upon the syncopating voice, even though it should not, strictly speaking, have been permitted to be sustained.) In that case it suits the rationalization test which can be made in the following way: take away the bass and observe that the two upper voices progress in regular syncopation forms, $\overbrace{7-6\overbrace{7-6}}$ and $\overbrace{2-3\overbrace{2-3}}$ respectively. On the basis of this test, we can understand the true meaning of a voice leading observed at $\overbrace{6}$; it is as if the bass has lost part of its true contrapuntal essence in contrast to the upper voices, which are otherwise regular. The sustained bass tone adheres rather to an end in itself, which to a degree puts it into conflict with the counterpoints moving above it. The organ point also finds its roots in just this kind of conflict, for beyond the voice leading it presents a purely harmonic aspect.

§ 4. The Effect of This Voice-Leading Configuration.

Being acquainted with the inevitable effect of the passing tone, we can now also perceive the passing tone effect of the dissonant $\frac{6}{4}$ chord that follows the $\overbrace{6}$. If the dissonant $\frac{6}{4}$ is followed in turn by a dissonance on the downbeat, then it is as if both dissonances represent just one passing tone figure. It is, ultimately, the unity of the basic voice which, by outwardly uniting the passing tones, inwardly assimilates them at the same time.

This unity is chiefly felt from a harmonic standpoint inasmuch as the ear conceives the final goal of the movement of the upbeat harmony (second measure of the example) toward which dissonance after dissonance, passing tone after passing tone have striven as a consonant goal. The sustained tone in the bass is only the welcome indicator of this higher harmonic unity.

When it is specifically placed at the end of a lesson,
we can see how our figure expresses a most gratifying cadential effect whereby the sustained bass tone is none other than the dominant:

Example 382.

![Musical notation]

The splendid cumulative effect of a sustained dominant tone before the cadence may have also given the first stimulus to the organ point.++

§ 5. A Related Voice-Leading Phenomenon

Those who grant the neighboring tone a place in counterpoint can, in a three-part setting, transform our figure as follows:

Example 383.

![Musical notation]

Here, it is again the sustained bass tone that creates from the two-measure phenomenon a higher unity equal to one measure while the syncopating voice carries out the neighboring tone in dod rhythm, which in strict counterpoint

*Cf. Example 388.

**See § 3, above.
we had reason to reserve for use in the form \( \begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{I}} \\ \underline{\text{I}} \\ \underline{\text{I}} \end{array} \).  
(Through our two-measure unit, that is, by means of the downbeats of the two measures, the rhythmical underlining of the upbeat is made possible—here imagined as an upbeat to the downbeat of the second measure within the unit stretched over two measures. This sort of underlining is impossible in strict counterpoint.)

To carry out the same voice leading in a four-part composition presents problems because there we do not have a situation favoring a \( \frac{6}{4} \) on the upbeat except for these:

Example 384.

![Example 384](image)

On the other hand, the following four-part example of Cherubini, though seeming to belong here, lacks the cantus firmus that is one of the conditions of our figure:

Example 385.

![Example 385](image)

6. The Dissonant Character of the \( \frac{6}{4} \) Remains Unchanged.

By using the \( \frac{6}{4} \) on the upbeat as we have discussed, we must not be tempted to think, as so many teachers do, that this configuration has the power to change the dissonant nature of the fourth or to eliminate it, that is, to reincarnate the fourth as a consonance. On the contrary, the fact remains that even this fourth must be considered a dissonance. If \( \frac{6}{4} \) were really consonant at this place, then we would be able to choose any path at will from here on, which is certainly not the case since the further path is bound to \( \frac{5}{4-3} \). It follows from this that we are dealing with a phenomenon totally alien to strict counterpoint, in effect one with a single purpose within the space of two measures which, precisely for that reason, presupposes the fourth on the upbeat as the driving dissonance. But, it does not inversely set it free as a consonance. It is as if the inner nature of the dissonance would not permit the deception of a change into a consonance; and as if the dissonant content of the fourth would have to continue on the downbeat and keep exerting its influence there before it could find final liberation in the consonance of the next upbeat.

Indeed, free composition interprets Example 382 (also 381) as an accented passing-tone phenomenon:

Example 386.

We understand, therefore, the thrust that this voice leading conveys.
§ 7. The Decidedly Basic Significance of the Previous Voice-Leading Configurations.

By far the most important conclusion we may derive from these phenomena is that, even with a cantus firmus, they show for the first time the possibility of a tied-over passing tone despite the dissonance, since the thrust of the passing tone predetermines the path to the final goal. And they show how, in view of the connection so strongly expressed between the passing tone and its extended path, the tie as such withdraws behind the passing tone. From the contrast of a tied-over dissonance we understand more easily why strict counterpoint must adhere exclusively to a consonant preparation of the dissonant syncopation which, at least in itself as a consonance, is not at all capable of exerting pressure on the following voice leading.+

[254] And if the tying-over of a dissonance with the cantus firmus is above all bound to a stricter precondition, as the origin of the 6 is bound to the sustained bass tone and the duration of two measures, then we have here a glimpse of the possible gaining of the further freedom of free composition. In free composition any chosen dissonance can be tied-over in a similar way and several such figures can follow in succession, etc., especially since it may use the scale-degree as a unity that can grant the widest ranging protection even to the most far-flung successions.

Finally, we must remember the difference existing between the 6 sonority of our example and one in a species combination which is a mere passing 6.++ While the latter 6 totally spends itself in a regular passing tone context, the former is not only a passing tone but also the preparation of

---

+See Section III, Chapter 4, § 3.
++See Examples 285, 291.
a syncopation as well, so that its effect finally comes to an end only with the resolution on the upbeat of the next measure.

Fux abruptly uses the following voice leading in a syncopation lesson in three-part counterpoint:

Example 387. Table XI, Fig. 7.

and explains it as follows (p. 103):

Joseph. I have not forgotten that the first part of the ligature must make a consonance. However, I have used a dissonance partly because I see that there is no alternative due to the necessity of using two half notes, and partly because I remember seeing similar examples by good composers.

Aloys. Your doubt is praiseworthy for it is a witness to your powers of observation. However, it does not matter that each measure totally agrees with the strictness of the rule. For, if we said that the first part of the ligature must be a consonance, that rule is relevant only for compositions in which the bass voice moves in every measure and not in those works where the lowest voice, or the bass, is sustained. In this latter case, a ligature that entails a dissonance is not only correct, but quite lovely, as the following example shows:

Example 388. Table XI, Fig. 8.
We see that Fux, too, considers the fourth a dissonance here. He does not mention the \( \frac{5}{4} \) syncopation as a precondition of this figure and he fails to offer any explanation of its meaning. That is the reason why the glimpse into a freer world which he provides with the last example lacks the desired clarity.

Similarly, Albrechtsberger teaches, in connection with the fourth species of three-part composition (p. 99):

It is permissible to use a six-four chord on the upbeat (although all upbeats should be consonant) but only as a resolution of the suspended six-five chord with a sustained bass or fundamental voice.

This directive does not avoid mentioning the \( \frac{5}{4} \) syncopation as the starting point of the example. If the second figure, which uses the neighboring tone is lacking, then we must remember that Albrechtsberger—and this is of particular importance with reference to the question here—uses the tied-over dissonance far beyond the examples presented in \( \# \# 1 \) and \( \# \# 5 \), that is: \( 6\frac{16}{4} - 3 \), \( 6\frac{5}{4}\frac{4}{3} \), \( 8\frac{7}{6} \frac{5}{4} - 3 \), and \( 6\frac{5}{4}\frac{4}{3} \).++ It was not his lot to understand and make others aware of the difference in effect of the tying-over of dissonances and consonances even when, in regard to the following example:

Example 389.

he writes (p. 140):

+See I, page 183.
++Examples follow. (*61)
+++Cf. pages 154-157.
This last example belongs to free composition because only there may we prepare the dissonant ligature with a dissonance and again resolve it deceptively into a dissonance.

Cherubini, adopting the thoughts of Fux (again in fourth species of three-part composition), writes Rule 4 (p. 38 ff.):

Such combinations may be used only when the lower voice retains the same tone through several measures and when the first dissonance is prepared by a consonance and the last one resolved by a consonance. Everything between those two points can alternately form a dissonance or consonance without having to follow the prescribed rules, provided that the non-syncopating voice retains the harmony. We call the held tone a pedal, or the whole example an organ point:

Example 390.

We may even apply an organ point in the middle of a piece for two or three measures when the given cantus permits it and when it is not otherwise possible to syncopate.++

On page 51 (Example 121) Cherubini offers two more examples of this in a four-voice texture:

---

+See the introductory sentence and [his] Example 109, a repetition of [my] Example 388.

++Example 111 follows which was quoted from Fux's Table 11, Figure 7; see above, my Example 387.
Example 391.

He follows this example with the remark:

If we eliminate the pedal from the two examples, we will see in the first one that the harmonic succession is nothing but a series of sevenths resolving to sixths and in the second nothing but a series of seconds.

Going beyond that he further explains:

We give other examples of different types of dissonance applied above a sustained bass tone. These examples are taken from Palestrina, and we can see from them that he has used the fourth without preparation so that it may prepare itself:

Example 392.
Anyone who was not already convinced by the words of the first rule offered, that Cherubini was not aware of the depth and meaning of the question, must now have his eyes opened by the last words cited here. He speaks indiscriminately of a fourth preparing itself, although in the first and third parts of the example a neighboring tone is used, in the second and fourth a passing tone. On the way to clarity and truth, the higher law of these phenomena could have been searched for behind the passing tone and neighboring tone: the tying-over of a dissonant interval and its effect could have been directed more to the continuation of the passing tone than to the syncopation.

Of all the teachers, Bellermann treats the phenomenon in question in the most extensive fashion in a special section on the fourth species of three-part composition. He writes (pp. 217-220):

Until now we have treated the fourth above the bass as a dissonance. We can make an exception here if it reaches the upbeat by stepwise motion (ascending or descending) while the bass sustains its tone before and after and if it becomes an actual dissonance on the following downbeat, thus preparing itself, and then resolves on the following thesis. This frequent and effective figure, particularly when used prior to a cadence (which must be regarded as the origin of the organ point that developed in later mensural music), can be best explained by some examples.

From Bellermann's words we can conclude that he does not know the inner reason for the "consonant fourth." Above all, we have to criticize his conception of the fourth as a consonant interval obtained by way of an "exception." The empty description is striking especially when he demands the stepwise entrance to the fourth. (He has no idea that [258] such a stepwise movement as well as that in the neighboring tone 3-4-3 is implicit in the concept; this also goes for the passing tone 6 - coming from 5.) The shortcomings of his conception show themselves more clearly in the additional examples that are drawn from free composition and in the subsequent discussion [p. 218]:

So that we will not be obliged to return to this subject, we must mention here that the consonant fourth on the thesis frequently appears also in composition for four or more parts, as for example:

---

*See above, Part I, Chapter 3, § 10.

**Examples follow.(*62)
Example 393.

In the second example, "B," we see the fourth approached by a skip in the quarter-note motion of the soprano. According to the rule to be observed for exercises it must be approached by step. This example comes from the motet "Homo natus de muliere" by Orlando Lassus.*

In truth, both examples illustrate the use of a neighboring tone. Nothing is changed by the occurrence of a 7-6-5 passing tone in the first case, or, in the second, a skip which serves only to continue the quarter-note movement, without, however, alleviating the stepwise motion (F-G) needed for the neighboring tone. Bellermann is not aware that with the above examples he is already speaking of a tied-over neighboring tone; in the following passage he addresses himself to the neighboring tone [p. 218]:

From this beautiful and natural use of the fourth, a figure developed early, in the pre-classical times (in the fifteenth century), that we should not imitate. In those older works we frequently find the fourth on the thesis forming a second or seventh with one of the other voices, for example:

Example 394.
In Example "B" we no longer have a fourth with the bass but a seventh that prepared itself.

By starting with these examples, how easy it would have been for Bellermann to refer to the whole question and give us an insight into the true essence of the "consonant fourth."

How easy it would have been to understand from these examples [259] that a fourth used in this way is not one which "prepares itself" but simply a neighboring tone that may also at times be a seventh. Finally, in Bellermann there follows a quote from Kirnberger's Kunst der reinen Satzes in der Musik and a historical overview of the use of similar configurations in Palestrina, Orlando Lassus, and Heinrich Isaac.†

†With examples.
PART III

ELLIPSIS OF A VOICE AS A BRIDGE TO FREE COMPOSITION

§ 1. The Result of an Ellipsis Especially in Species Combinations with Syncopations.

In order to put our thoughts in the clearest light, I want to show examples of species combinations with syncopations because these are the most suitable to the task. Let us recall Fux's examples cited in Section VI, Examples 334 and 335 and delete the third voice progressing in whole notes. (The fact that this voice does not represent an authentic cantus firmus and only more or less closely approximates one is irrelevant to the outcome.) The elision leads to the following voice-leading configurations:

Example 395.
or:

[260] It is clearly evident that voice leading such as this exceeds the strict limits of the concepts known to us from Sections II to V. Under no circumstances in a lesson on syncopation species, be it for two or more voices, could a non-syncopating voice move before the resolution has taken place. Vouching, here, for the correctness of the composition is not only our recognition of the derivation in this case but even more the circumstance that we might be compelled at other times to imagine a third voice progressing in whole notes. For the very treatment of the syncopations forces us to conclude that the composition in this form is not strictly suited to fundamental concepts. Thus, we must not mistake our composition for one having shorter note values, that is, one in which half notes fundamentally stand for whole notes. For even if we were to suppose that we could replace the shorter values with larger ones, the completion of the dissonant syncopation would still not comply to the requirements of strict counterpoint. The closing of these short compositional examples points only to a combination of two species with which we became acquainted in Section VI—there, however, under the actual sponsorship of a cantus firmus (that is, a voice in whole notes). According to the presentation made in that section, it must be clear that, just as in the original formu-
lations, we have in these examples the effect of abbreviation of two different inclinations: the total fulfillment of the syncopation concept and the progression of the bass. Yet, the far more important matter is the undeniable conclusion that it is possible to imagine the addition to voices set into motion according to the principles of two or more species, an additional voice that for the first time explains the voice leading and the underlying concepts, and completes, clarifies, and supports the harmonies.

§ 2. How a Bridge Is Built to Free Composition by This Means.

The same test can be made with species combinations not involving syncopation. With voice leadings of this sort, it is possible (despite the omission of the abbreviation which performs such an instructive duty) to strike out the voice in whole notes (the cantus firmus), whereby we arrive at a composition for which we can then infer still further voices in whole notes without knowledge of their origin.

By recognizing that according to this test we can find for the voices moving in various rhythms a unifying tone of greater value to interpret the movement and the voice leading, a bridge has now been established to free composition. At the same time, we have asserted that free composition, despite its variously transformed phenomena, is mysteriously tied to strict counterpoint by means of this ellipsis, as if by an umbilical chord. A composition created this way can always be supplemented with an additional voice (as if it were written) moving with the rest of the voices in this or that position, but only in longer values. In accordance with the character of free composition, it is usually led into the lower register by our musical instinct, supporting the upper voices and, most of all, giving a different meaning to the dissonance. One can guess, then, that it is the scale-degrees that complete the composition in this fashion. The
changes scale-degrees produce by such underpinning may best be illustrated in syncopations, as for example:

Example 396.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
a) 1, 2, 3. \\
b) 1, 2, \text{ or: } 1, 2, 3. \\
\end{array}
\]

§ 3. Caution Against False Conclusions.

Although all voice leading is based on fundamental concepts, it is still inadmissible to declare that structures like those in Example 396 are based directly on a fundamental concept. Purity of conception does not permit us to consider the fundamental concept and the extension as equivalent. Rather, the fundamental concept must be understood only in the implicit sense of strict counterpoint (with cantus firmus), so that its extension can be conceived in its special character at the moment.

Nevertheless, it would be wrong for us to assume that the ellipsis might justify the "modern" way of teaching counterpoint, according to which lessons are based from the outset only upon scale-degrees and, for example, a two-part composition is achieved by means of a reduction of a four-part one, that is to say, two voices are obtained through elision. The theory presented in my works starts with the fundamental concept of voice leading. Only after presenting the fundamental concept do I proceed to teach how it always proves out in free composition, even in situations where the run-of-the-

[262] mill instruction speaks of "exceptions" and the like.
Thus, my methodology stands in opposition to that which deals in advanced transformations of concepts and extensive elisions, simply because it is unable to determine the fundamental concept in an orderly fashion, and thus spreads a mantle of darkness over everything.

At the end of the fifth species of four-part composition, Fux writes (p. 120):

[Aloys.] Later I intend to direct you to imitation and to the understanding of fugues after we have set the cantus firmus aside for some time. It must be said in advance that some dissonances, without the limitations of the cantus firmus, can be resolved in other ways, for example, the ninth to a sixth, a seventh to a third, a fourth to a sixth and a third:

Example 397. Table XXI, Fig. 3.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\textbf{Joseph.}} & \quad \text{Why are these resolutions used without the cantus firmus and not also with the cantus firmus?}
\text{\textbf{Aloys.}} & \quad \text{Do you not see that both parts move at the resolution? This could not happen with the cantus firmus because it is inflexible. There is, thus, a perceptible difference in that these resolutions do not take place where oblique motion is unavoidable.}
\text{\textbf{Fux fails to provide any intimation of how these progressions that must be sanctioned by all composers and teachers are to be understood. Simply to say that the elimination of the cantus firmus makes the progression possible does not mean they are explained. Fux did not understand that in these and similar cases, nothing more is involved than extensions of fundamental laws of strict counterpoint that were achieved by the way of abbreviations or elisions of cantus firmi. In a word, he did not under-}
\end{align*}
\]
stand that strict counterpoint still prevails in such phenomena of free composition. This finally explains the master's inadequacies with respect to clarity and instructional application, without detriment, of course, to the everlasting gains that posterity can never take away from him.

Albrechtsberger, exactly following Fux on the theory of imitation, writes (p. 162 ff.):

[263] In strict counterpoint and also in fugues, we can resolve these four dissonant ligatures into other consonances when the other voice with which they are completed moves by a skip instead of awaiting the resolution in oblique motion:

Example 398.

Instead of speaking merely of a resolution through the progression of a lower voice, it would have been better had Albrechtsberger shown how such configurations, as situations from species combinations, could add voices (be they in the upper, middle, or lower voice), whereby the total unity would appear proven by strict counterpoint in regard to the fundamental concepts. That Albrechtsberger has the habit of

*See the Preface in Kontrapunkt I.
using a cantus firmus in contrapuntal exercises in free composition will have to be shown later.+

In regard to Bellermann's teaching about "the resolution of dissonance at a moving voice," see above, Section VI, Part I, Chapter 3, § 10. But for our purpose of finding a transition to free composition and showing the unity of fundamental concepts, it might be more beneficial to apply the test of a third, lower voice, to the beginning of the exercise cited in Example 336:

Example 399.
NOTES TO KONTRAPUNKT II

(*1) Schenker's edition of Op. 106 was never published as the autograph was, and is missing.

(*2) Schenker uses the reference "II³" here. This is his abbreviated form of Band II³ Kontrapunkt Fortsetzung: Der freie Satz (In Vorbereitung)—Counterpoint Continued: Free Composition (In preparation).

(*3) Schenker, when referring to the "last figuration," wrote 88. I have used 8 (or 3 instead of 33, etc.) throughout the translation.

(*4) "... as will be explained at another time."

(*5) "... in which the sixth appears. When the note mi stands in the bass, the sixth is preferred to other consonances, as I stated previously and intend to clarify again."

(*6) "... in this discussion. . . ."

(*7) "... as you can see in the following example:"

Table VII, Figure 9.

Table VII, Fig. 8 is:
(*8) "In addition, in this compositional type ..."

(*9) "... The reason for this will be given at another time."

(*10) "In order that you have no suspicion concerning this succession, ..."

(*11) "... But when the major third is added to the minor sixth, the triad becomes dissonant, and belongs to the same class of chords of the second, fourth, seventh, and ninth, along with all diminished or augmented intervals, and their accompaniment."

(*12) The beginning of the quote appears on page 14.
(Note *5).

(*13)
(*14) The example to which Albrechtsberger refers is:

(*15) "The three N.B.'s in the above example point out that . . ."

(*16) "The voices must be measured in relationship to one another, that is, the outer voices should not be more than two octaves from one another; . . ."

(*17)
(*18) "... if the treble were written an octave lower, and the fundamental an octave higher, two perfect fifths or a perfect fifth after a diminished fifth would occur in direct motion; for example:"

(*19)
(*20) C.f. Fux, Table VII, Figure 14.

(*21) The example to which Schenker refers is:

Meas. 5-8.

6 5 4 3 "License"
(*22) In response to Josephus's question, "Does anything else occur in this species that requires special attention?" Aloysius replies: "Nothing, . . ."

(*23) Fux, Table XI, Fig. 9.

(*24) "... The voices in half notes should begin after the rest on the weak beat; . . ."

(*25) Aloysius "At this point, you must recall what was said about this species in two-part composition and what was said about the use of the harmonic triad in three-part composition of whole notes against whole notes. There is, however, this to make things easier: . . ."

(*26) "good" "good" "good" "bad, when frequent"
(*36)

(*37) "The fourth mistake is the fifth, G, in the alto . . ." (The measures in question to which Albrechtsberger refers are:)

(*38) The sentence begins: Aloys. "Aside from the fact that any consonance should occupy its proper place in the natural order, if possible . . .:"

(*39)

(*40) a) Fux, Table XX, Fig. 3, ms. 1-2;
   b) Table XXI, Fig. 2, ms. 6-7.
(*41) page 148, meas. 5.

(*42) The German text reads "quarter note" [sic].

(*43) "... In the lowest and in the middle voice there can be a skip of a sixth or octaves. Hidden fifths or octaves may occur in direct movement when the bass skips upward or downward by a fourth, or upward by a sixth. . . ."

(*44) This is a portion of the missing quote above, (*43), and continued on page 133.

(*45) Nottebohm, No. 20.

(*46) "Without exception, octave and fifth successions in direct motion are forbidden in all voices; . . . ."

(*47)
(*48)

(*49) Aloys. "It remains to be explained which consonances accompany the ligatures in four-part composition. Concerning this matter, it was already discussed in three-part composition, that is, . . . ."

(*50)

Fux, Table XIX, Figure 2.
"without ligatures"

Fux, Table XIX, Figure 3.
"without ligatures"

Fux, Table XIX, Figure 4.
"without ligatures"
Perfect Chords with Cantus Firmus.

Imperfect Chords

N.B. "bad"
The works cited by Bellermann are:
1. "Ach bleib mit deiner Gnade" (Chorale, page 418; (five-part).
2. "O crux benedicta" by Goudimel, pages 419-422.
3. "Kyrie" by Bellermann, pages 423-426; (six-part).
4. "0 Domine Jesu Christe" by Palestrina, pages 428-432; (six-part).
5. "Fratres ego enim" by Palestrina, pages 434-443; (eight-part).

The German text reads "Terz" [sic].

See Example 342, Lessons No. 2 and 3.

This example, from Fux, was not included by Mizler in his translation. However, in the original Latin edition (p. 138) it is:
(*59) See above, note No. 58.

(*60) He refers to his second example:

(*61)
APPENDIX

Kontrapunkt I*: List of Free Composition Examples  
(Arranged by Composer)

BACH, C.P.E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonata in F major, 1st mvt.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata No. 2, Largo</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACH, J.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aria</td>
<td>212b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorale</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Suite in A minor</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Suite in A major, Courante I</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Suite in D minor</td>
<td>17, 62, 76, 293a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Suite in D minor, Allemande</td>
<td>105/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Suite in D minor, Gigue</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Suite in D minor, Gavotte</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Suite in D minor, Prelude</td>
<td>120, 248a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Suite in E minor</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Suite in F major, Sarabande</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Suite in G minor</td>
<td>396b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Suite in G minor, Sarabande</td>
<td>105/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Suite in C minor, Sarabande</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Suite in D minor</td>
<td>396a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invention No. 1 (two-part)</td>
<td>291a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invention No. 5 (three-part)</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invention No. 11 (three-part)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass in B Minor, Agnus Dei</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass in B Minor, Kyrie</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass in B Minor, no. 3</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass in B Minor, no. 13</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelude in A minor</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelude and Fugue in A minor</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelude and Fugue in C minor</td>
<td>248b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John Passion, no. 14</td>
<td>510b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Matthew Passion, Soprano Aria</td>
<td>53, 299b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Matthew Passion, Recitative</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC I, Prelude in C# minor</td>
<td>359, 506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kontrapunkt II does not contain examples of free composition.
**BEETHOVEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leonore Overture</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata, op. 2, no. 1</td>
<td>146, 212a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata, op. 13</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata, op. 27, no. 2, 1st mvt.</td>
<td>287b, 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata, op. 27, no. 2</td>
<td>290b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata, op. 27, no. 2, 2nd mvt.</td>
<td>426, 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata, op. 53</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata, op. 57, 1st mvt.</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata, op. 110</td>
<td>387, 430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata, op. 111, Arietta</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet, op. 59, no. 1, 1st mvt.</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet, op. 130</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony III</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony VII, Allegretto</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony IX, 1st mvt.</td>
<td>74, 78, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony IX, Adagio</td>
<td>101, 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio, op. 1, no. 3</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio, op. 93, 1st mvt.</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BRAHMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A German Requiem, IV</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handel Variations, XXIII</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermezzo, op. 117, no. 1</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermezzo, op. 117, no. 2</td>
<td>156b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Quartet in G minor, 1st mvt.</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhapsodie, op. 53</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonata for Piano in F minor</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songs: &quot;Auf dem Kirchhöfe,&quot; op. 105, no. 4</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Begräbnisgesang,&quot; op. 13</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Nachtwache,&quot; op. 104, no. 2</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony I, Introduction</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony IV, 1st mvt.</td>
<td>202, 290a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony IV, 4th mvt.</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio, op. 8</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio, op. 8, 1st mvt.</td>
<td>110/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trio, op. 87, Finale</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BRUCKNER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psalm 150</td>
<td>125, 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Deum</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphony I</td>
<td>52, 121, 122, 123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHOPIN

Etude, op. 10, no. 2 .............................................................. 8
Mazurka, op. 17, no. 4 .......................................................... 32
Mazurka, op. 24, no. 2 .......................................................... 44
Mazurka, op. 30, no. 4 .......................................................... 184
Nocturne in F# major ........................................................... 119
Nocturne, op. 37, no. 1 ......................................................... 22
Nocturne, op. 55, no. 1 .......................................................... 113
Prelude, op. 28, no. 3 .......................................................... 287a
Prelude, op. 28, no. 6 .......................................................... 356
Prelude, op. 28, no. 21 .......................................................... 508
Prelude, op. 28, no. 24 .......................................................... 274

COUPERIN, F.

Chaconne, "La favorite" ...................................................... 242

GRAUN

Tod Jesu .................................................................................... 83

LUTHER, M.

"Mit Fried' und Freud' fahr' ich dahin" .................................... 89

HANDEL

Air in B♭ major, Var. 3 ......................................................... 293b
Air in B♭ major, Var. 4 .......................................................... 265
Capriccio ................................................................................... 61
Chaconne in G major, Var. 2 .................................................. 357
Concerto for Organ in B♭ major .............................................. 59
Israel in Egypt ........................................................................... 81
Lecon ......................................................................................... 291b, 292
Messiah, "Through His Stripes, We Are Healed" ..................... 82
Messiah ..................................................................................... 360
Suite in E major, Air, "Double" .............................................. 111, 256
Suite No. 7, Passacaglia .......................................................... 267
Variation in B♭ major ............................................................. 56
Variations in B♭ major, Var. 1 ............................................... 48
HAYDN, F. J.

Andante con Variazioni ............................................................ 428
Divertimento in F minor .................................................. 18, 155
Divertimento in F minor, Var. 1 .............................................. 147
Sonata in A major ............................................................. 420
String Quartet in Eb major, op. 20, no. 1 501, 509
String Quartet, op. 23, no. 2 .............................................. 510a
String Quartet, op. 52, Andante ........................................... 51
String Quartet in D major, Minuet all Zingarese ............ 432
String Quartet in D major ............................................................. 431
String Quartet in D minor, op. 76, no. 2 99
Symphony in D major .............................................................. 95, 468

LISZT

Hungarian Rhapsody No. 12 ............................................................ 263

MENDELSSOHN, F.

Piano Concerto in G minor ........................................ 288, 299a
Scottish Symphony ............................................................. 64, 252

MOZART

Piano Concerto in Eb major ............................................................. 289
Piano Trio in G major ............................................................. 286, 299c
Piano Quartet in G minor, 1st mvt. ............................................ 107
Quintet in G minor, Minuett ............................................................. 71
Rondo in A minor ................................................................. 29
Sonata, K. 333 ................................................................. 397
String Quartet in D minor ............................................................. 86
String Quartet in Eb major ............................................................. 86
Symphony in C major, K. 425 ....................................................... 200
Symphony in Eb major, Andante .............................................. 47, 266
Symphony in Eb major, Introduction ........................................... 30
Symphony in Eb major, Finale ................................................... 19
Symphony in G minor, Andante ................................................... 72, 275

SCHUMANN, R.

Piano Quartet, Andante ............................................................. 505
Piano Quartet in Eb major ............................................................. 157
Symphony in C major ............................................................. 194
**SCHUBERT, F.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German Dances, No. 41</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Sonata in A minor, op. 42</td>
<td>285, 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano Sonata in A minor, Scherzo</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songs: &quot;Der Kreuzzug&quot;</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Frühlingstraume&quot;</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ihr Bild&quot;</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Meeresstille&quot;</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SMETANA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>String Quartet in E minor</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STRAUSS, R.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ein Heldenleben, op 40</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salome</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Till Eulenspiegel</td>
<td>259, 264, 268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WAGNER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faust Overture</td>
<td>6, 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Götterdämmerung, Act II</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rheingold, Scene III</td>
<td>203, 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegfried Idyll</td>
<td>97, 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tristan &amp; Isolde</td>
<td>94, 156a, 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walküre, Act II</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOLF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Tambour&quot;</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since a comprehensive annotated bibliography on Schenker by David Beach has been published in the Journal of Music Theory (23/2, Fall, 1979), it seemed unnecessary to repeat one here. Therefore, the bibliography below is a listing of the sources used in [the preparation of] this translation.


Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice, 2d ed.

Furtwängler, Wilhelm. Ton und Wort, Aufsätze und Vorträge.

Fux, Johann Joseph. Gradus ad Parnassum, sive manuductio
ad compositionem musicae regularem, methodo nova,
ac certa, nondum ante tam exacto ordine in lucem
edita: elaborata a Joanne Josepho Fux, sacrae
caesareae, ac regiae catholicae majestatis Caroli VI
Romanorum imperatoris supremo chori praefecto.
Vienna: Johann Peter van Ghelen, 1725.

Gradus ad Parnassum oder Anführung zur regel-
mässigen musikalischen Composition auf eine neue,
gewisse, und bisher noch niemals in so deutlicher
Ordnung an das Licht gebrachte Art . . .
ausgearbeitet von Johann Joseph Fux . . . Aus dem
Lateinischen ins Teutsche Übersetzt, mit nöthigen
und nützlichen Anmerckungen versehen und heraus-
gegeben . . . Mit sieben und fünfzig Kupfertafeln
in Quart, trans. into German by Lorenz Mizler.
Leipzig: Mizlerischen Buchverlag, 1742.

The Study of Counterpoint from Johann Joseph
Fux's Gradus ad Parnassum, trans. and ed. Alfred

Grädener, Karl G. System der Harmonielehre. Hamburg:
K. Grädener, 1877.

Hauptmann, Moritz. Die Natur der Harmonik und Metrik. Zur
Theorie der Musik, 2d ed. Leipzig: Breitkopf &
Härtel, 1873.

"Heinrich Schenker," Baker's Biographical Dictionary of

Helmholtz, Herman. Die Lehre von den Tonempfindungen als
physiologische Grundlage für die Theorie der Musik.
Braunschweig: F. Vieweg & Sohn, 1863.

Prentice-Hall, 1934.

Jonas, Oswald. Eine Einführung in die Lehre Heinrich
1972.


