Stephen Slottow

Heinrich Schenker held that both the concept and the term "sequence" were not only incorrect, but indefensible. For instance, in *The Masterwork in Music*, Vol. 2, he writes (in reference to J.S. Bach's C minor Prelude, *Well-Tempered Clavier* I, mm. 5–18):

The word 'sequence', which is used so frequently and loosely when one is unable to explain certain passing notes, has no validity. The mere fact of its existence as a theoretical term does not lend it any credibility as a concept. (Schenker 1996: 48)

And, in *Free Composition*:

Great composers trust their long-range vision. For this reason they do not base their compositions upon some 'melody,' 'motive,' or 'idea.' Rather, the content is rooted in the voiceleading transformations and linear progressions whose unity allows no segmentation or names of segments [...] One cannot speak of 'melody' and 'idea' in the work of the masters; it makes even less sense to speak of 'passage,' 'sequence,' 'padding,' or 'cement' as if they were terms that one could possibly apply to art. (Schenker 1979: 26–27)

Certainly it would appear that, as Schenker says, sequences are linear progressions composed of passing notes moving between beginning and ending points. The common sequence types – falling fifths, rising fifths, rising 5-6, chain suspensions – are composed of descending or ascending stepwise motion between repeating transposed units. Even the falling thirds sequence (also called falling 5-6) can be reduced to descending stepwise tenths that alternate $\frac{5}{3}$ and 6 positions.

But sequences are not only linear progressions; they are a particular type of linear progression – i.e., sequences – since they are constituted of regularly transposed imitative units. That is, to use Schenker's language, they are linear progressions whose unity *does* allow "segmentation and names of segments." There is no need to deny sequences their own identity because they function as linear progressions. Rather, they function as linear progressions *because* they are sequences. Moreover, because sequences are always elaborated, they not only operate as linear progressions within the large voice-leading/harmonic structure; they have their own internal subsidiary harmonic/voice-leading structures. They are patterned repetitive whorls within the larger energy flow. They are flexible patterns or templates that can be realized and elaborated in many different ways, and that tend to appear as middleground elaboratory structures that either prolong a single sonority or the motion between two sonorities.

Schenker's refusal to reify sequences, and his concomitant contempt for them, have not been continued by Schenkerians, who have been, in this as well as in some other matters, less severe than the founder. The term *Linear Intervallic Patterns* (LIPs) was first introduced in Allen Forte's and Steven Gilbert's *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis* (1982), where it is defined as "a voice-leading design made up of successive recurrent pairs of intervals formed between the descant and bass (outer voices)" (Forte, Gilbert 1982: 83). But – perhaps mindful of Schenker's attitude – they are cautious about associating LIPs too closely with sequences.

The term sequence is sometimes used, incorrectly, to designate what we call the linear intervallic pattern. Properly speaking, the sequence is a *melodic* pattern in a single voice, which is repeated at different transpositions and in immediate succession, over the span of a passage. Such sequences may occur in connection with a linear intervallic pattern [...] However, the melodic sequence is not a necessary condition for the linear intervallic pattern. There are many instances in which a melodic sequence within a linear intervallic pattern may be terminated, while the linear intervallic pattern itself continues. (Forte, Gilbert 1982: 85)

Allen Cadwallader's and David Gagné's *Analysis of Tonal Music: A Schenkerian Approach*, first published in 1998, downplays Forte and Gilbert's qualifications on the difference between LIPs and sequences. The very first sentence of the section

Example 1. Sequence 1, mm. 17-22.



on LIPs in Chapter 4 is "Harmonic sequences often involve a repeated interval pattern between a pair of voices; these are known as *linear intervallic patterns.*" (Cadwallader, Gagné 2011: 86) The paragraph continues:

Sequences and associated linear intervallic patterns produce harmonic prolongations and larger structural connections. And, like linear progressions, linear intervallic patterns prolong a single harmonic class or expand the space *between* classes in T-Int-D-T frameworks. (*ibid.*)

Here, sequences have been explicitly recognized in their own right and under their own names as full participants in the "voice-leading transformations and linear progressions" that comprise the process of composing out. No conflict between sequences as things and sequences as voice-leading processes remains.

The remainder of this paper focuses on how sequences operate within a single sonata movement, Mozart's F major Piano Sonata, K. 280/l. I have taught this movement several times, and each time have been struck by how it seems to be stitched together by a tissue of sequences, each rather different from the others in type and design. The movement was a teaching piece of Ernst Oster, and has been similarly used by at least three of Oster's students: Charles Burkhart, Edward Laufer, and David Beach.¹ I studied this piece with Charles Burkhart. My reading is certainly influenced by his; but I have also, over the years, changed my mind about some things and focused more on certain aspects, particularly on the sequences.

For convenience I will identify the sequences by number.

Sequence 1, Exposition

Sequence 1 (see Example 1) occurs in mm. 17–22, and forms part of the transition from the first to the second group. By m. 17 the *Urlinie* has descended from $\hat{5}$ (C) to $\hat{3}$ (A) within a prolongation of initial tonic harmony. The sequence further extends the tonic, retaining *Urlinie* $\hat{3}$. In the measure after the

¹ Charles Burkhart has not published on the piece; my comments on his reading are based on my notes and his private sketches. Edward Laufer, so far as I know, has likewise not published on the movement, but I have copies of three pages of notes on the first subject and transition from his Fall 1989 Schenkerian analysis course at the University of Toronto; these were given to me by Mark Anson-Cartwright. David Beach has published extensively on the piece in Beach 1983, 1990, 1994, and 2012; his analyses have much in common with Charles Burkhart's.





sequence ends, m. 23, the *Urlinie* descends to $\hat{2}$ (G) over a ii⁶-V half cadence which completes the transition from tonic to dominant key areas. This sequence expands the tonic sonority with *Urlinie* $\hat{3}$ in the treble. The arpeggiated texture in the right hand is related to the arpeggiation in the very first measures of the piece – actually, all of the sequences (and much of the rest of the movement) utilize the initial arpeggiation motive to one degree or another (see Example 2).

Example 3 builds up the sequence from background to foreground. Example 3a simply shows the F major triad with the outer-voice tenth A/F.² Example 3b pulls apart the A/F tenth into an A/F voice exchange. Example 3c inverts the lowervoice F-A from a third up to a sixth down, opening up registral space which is then filled in with a column of descending tenths that march into the depths *underneath* the F upper right pole of the voice exchange. In Example 3d, the diatonic descending tenths become chromatic descending tenths. In Example 3e, starting with the second tenth, every other tenth becomes an applied VII^{o4} of the following tenth (a 6/3 triad).

Except for the first and last full measures of the sequence (see Example 1, mm. 17 and 22), the events shown in Example 3e occur on only the first two beats of the intervening measures (mm. 18–21). So what happens on the third beats? For one, descending passing tones: B_{\flat} in m. 18, G in m. 20, and F in m. 21. But there is also something else, something that creates a little dissonant tang. In m. 18, the right-hand E_{\flat} on beat 3 (coming from E_{\natural} on beat 2) anticipates the left-hand E_{\flat} 's in the next measure. It also creates a noticeable and rather harsh cross relation with the bass E_{\natural} on the previous beat. The same thing happens with C_{\natural} in m. 20, and with B_{\flat} in m. 21. Mozart could have composed the passage without these chromatic anticipations and cross relations – it would sound pleasant enough, if a little bland. But composing it as he did introduces a little sense of distortion, a little *frisson*, a mild harshness that renders the flavor of the passage a bit sharper. My sketch of the final version is shown in Example 3f.

Example 3g extends the passage to the half cadence in m. 26, showing that the function of the sequence is to expand the motion from I (A/F) via the voice exchange to I⁶ (F/A) to II⁶ (G/B_b), which then proceeds to V (G/C).

Note that Example 3c, which shows diatonic descending tenths, is embellished with chromatic passing tenths to form Example 3d. But the treble and bass chromatic passing tones don't always match up. For instance, chromatic bass C_t underlies diatonic treble E, and chromatic treble E_b, overlies diatonic bass C_b. This non-coincidence isn't taken account of in my slurring, but it is in Example 3h, Edward Laufer's sketch of the sequence (Laufer 1989). In the top system, Laufer stems top and bottom diatonic notes - whether coinciding or not – and leaves chromatic passing notes unstemmed, clearly and elegantly distinguishing the levels of structure in the foreground sketch. He also divides the treble and bass descending sixths (doubled at the tenth) midway, at F in the treble and D in the bass, thus delineating an A-F-C arpeggiation in the treble against F-D-A in the bass. Since treble A-F-C matches the F major stufe of the passage, it is the leading line; the bass foregoes a matching arpeggiation of F major in order to preserve the parallel tenths, so it is the followina line.³

Sequence 1, Recapitulation

As shown in Example 4, Sequence 1 returns in mm. 99–104 of the recapitulation, but strangely altered. Example 5a reproduces my sketch of the exposition version of the sequence (Example 3f). Example 5b (which resembles a ball of tangled

² X/Y stands for "X above Y."

³ Laufer's sketch also explores rhythmic and motivic features that I will not go into here.

Example 3, a-f. Sequence 1, buildup.



yarn) is a sketch of the recapitulation version. It still prolongs the tonic sonority via (mostly) descending tenths within an F/A voice exchange, but in Example 5b some of the tenths in Example 5a have been inverted to sixths, because in parts of the sequence the voices have been registrally displaced and scewed.⁴ The voice-leading lines, which in the exposition had kept to their proper registers and descended by step, are now tangled, boomeranging up and down as the voices crisscross, bouncing up to higher registers and back down again. Example 5c is my de-scewed version of Example 5b, that is, how it would appear without the registral displacements – much

⁴ Skew refers to the voice-crossing that results from multiple simultaneous registral displacements.





like Example 5a, as one would expect, but not exactly the same.

In the recapitulation version, the third-beat dissonant anticipations have disappeared, some of the chords have changed, and the bass - or what would be the bass were the passage registrally disentangled (see Example 5c) - has changed from a chromatic to a basically diatonic descending line – F-E-D-C-B_b-A. One reason for this last is that during the registral displacements the (disentangled) main bass notes - soprano notes in the actual music – are not preceded by applied VII^o⁴ diminished seventh chords built on a step above (as in the exposition version), but from a step below. The two approaches alternate: from above (F-E), from below (C⁺_-D), from above (D-C), from below (A-B_b), and from above (B_b-A). A diminished 7th chord built on a bass note a semitone below the chord of resolution is different from one a semitone above, so the relevant applied diminished 7th chords in the recapitulation version - the ones that swoop up to the higher registers differ from their cognate chords in the exposition version. See the chords after the double bars in Examples 5a, b, and c. In 5a, the exposition version, the relevant applied diminished ⁴/₃ chords resolve to B_b⁶ and G⁶ chords. In 5b, the recapitulation version, they resolve to D⁶ and B_b⁶ chords.

Sequence 2

See Example 6. Sequence 2, from the second group of the exposition, starts in m. 35 and ends in m. 43, where it dovetails with the beginning of the coda. Strictly speaking, only mm. 35 to 40:1 is sequential.⁵ By the end of the transition the *Urlinie* has descended from the Kopfon \hat{s} (C) in the tonic to $\hat{2}$ (G) in the dominant. In the second group, and especially in Sequence 2 (see Example 7g), *Urlinie* $\hat{2}$ (G) creates its own offshoot subsidiary fifth-descent (G-F-E-D-C) in an expanded auxiliary cadence C: I⁶-ii⁶-V-I with E-F-G-C in the bass. I⁶ begins in m. 35 and, after the sequential expansion, proceeds to ii⁶ in m. 42.

There are points of resemblance between Sequence 2 and Sequence 1 (especially the exposition version). Sequence 1 descends in stepwise parallel tenths; Sequence 2 ascends in stepwise parallel tenths. Both fill out the diatonic tenth line with chromatic passing tones and secondary dominants; and both utilize the ubiquitous arpeggiation motive from the first measure of the piece, although Sequence 2 does so more directly. There is also some registral transference in the right hand that resonates a bit with the recapitulation version of the first sequence. However, there are differences in the functions of the two sequences: the first expands a single harmony, F major; this

⁵ The notation "m. 40:1" means measure 40, beat 1.



Example 3h. Sequence 1, Edward Laufer sketch.





one expands the motion between two harmonies: for the sequence proper, in the key of the dominant, I^6 to VI; for the whole sequential passage, I^6 -II⁶.

Example 7 builds up the sequence in progressive stages: (a) shows an ascending fourth progression in parallel tenths. In (b), the second and fourth soprano notes are displaced to the lower octave, creating back-and-forth registral transfers that "break up" the ascending fourth progression. In (c), the registral soprano "holes" created by the displaced notes are filled in by substitute notes a step down from the preceding ones, creating 10-8's in a reaching-over pattern that takes place over the broken-up ascending fourth progression, but introducing an awkward F-B_k tritone leap in the soprano. In (d) the succession of reaching-over motions is more developed. Now the ascending registral transfers form a partial coupling (A4-A5, B4-B5) that creates a stepwise sequential ascent in the treble, eliminating the F-B tritone leap and bringing out a kind of counterpoint between the 10-10's and the 10-8's. In (e) the diatonic bass is filled in with chromatic passing tones that create applied dominant [§] chords, approached by chromaticized 5-6 exchanges. And in (f), inner-voice descending passing tones strengthen the applied dominants by transforming them from $\frac{9}{3}$'s to $\frac{9}{5}$'s.

Example 7g shows the sequence in more detail and includes the rest of the passage. Notice that the soprano A5 in m. 40 – which would have appeared at the end of the measure had the sequence continued – is only implied. The sequence carries the passage (in dominant Roman numerals) from I⁶ to VI (transformed to IV via another 5-6), followed by a triple voice exchange in which the previously implied soprano A appears in actuality, functioning as an upper-level incomplete neighbor from *Urlinie* $\hat{2}$ (G), followed by the subsidiary fifth-descent from $\hat{2}$ – G-F-E-D-C. The sequence helps to expand the motion from I⁶ to II⁶ (G/E to F/F).

Sequence 3

Sequence 3 is located in the development (see Example 8, which shows the entire development) and runs from mm. 67 to 78. Unlike the first sequence, which descended in tenths, or the second sequence, which ascended in tenths, this one is a straightforward falling-fifth sequence. Its surface presentation is divided into staggered segments in low, middle, and high voices – as if the body of the sequence was sliced up into registral layers and strewn about. However, there is a pattern (see my markings on Example 8): low/high, low/ middle, low/high, low/middle. The left-hand artic-

Example 5a. Sequence 1, exposition.



Example 5b. Sequence 1, recapitulation.







Example 6. Sequence 2, mm. 35–43.



ulations are aligned with the chord changes, but the right-hand groupings overlap chord changes. The rising arpeggiation motive in the left hand is answered by descending third-progression (doubled in thirds) in the right hand. As in many classical sonatas, this sequence takes up almost the entire second half of the development.

As to how the sequence fits into the larger context, see Example 9, a sketch of the entire development. The development begins in the dominant with Urlinie $\hat{2}$ (G) retained from the end of the exposition. As the bass moves from C through C[±] to D in a 5-6-5 progression, the treble G moves to an implied F as the harmony moves to VI (Dm) and the sequence begins in m. 67. The registral partitioning in the sequence (just discussed) can be clearly seen in the graph. Of course, since the sequential unit consists of two chords, the interval of transposition between units is a falling step, and the bass moves D-(through G to)-C-(through F to)-B_b. Although the treble for the literal strict sequence would be $A/(D)-B_{\downarrow}/(G)-G/(C)-A/(F)-F/(B_{\downarrow})$ - a 5-10 LIP, in the freer realm of the imaginary continuo, A/D moves to B_{\flat}/G (m. 69), but B_{\flat}/G doesn't

move to G/C. Instead, B_b holds on (becoming a seventh above bass C) and descends to A (over bass F). A doesn't continue the new pattern and become the seventh above bass B_b, but moves instead to G_t, which abruptly throws a wrench into the clockwork of the sequence and brings it to an abrupt close. The expected chord in m. 75 would be B_{i} major, and indeed all of the notes of the B_{i} triad are present, but the addition of G[#] converts it to a German augmented 6th, which is charged to, and soon does, resolve to an A major chord in m. 76 – locally V/Dm but, in a larger context, III_#.6 Ill_# then slithers its way down the muddy slope in mm. 82–84, through V_3^4 (and upper neighbor B_b in the treble), past the interruption, to I, the start of the recapitulation, where *Kopfton* $\stackrel{\wedge}{5}$ (C) is reestablished.

There are two important expanded motives in Sequence 3.⁷ The first is that the repeated treble A-B $_{\flat}$ -G $_{\sharp}$ -A in mm. 78 and 79 echo, in miniature, the much larger treble $A-B_{\flat}-(A)-G_{\sharp}-A$ in the sequence as a whole. The second is that the main bass notes of the entire development form a large-scale version of the melody from the first two measures of

⁶ The use of III# in some Mozart sonatas as a divider between V at the end of the exposition and I at the beginning of the recapitulation is discussed in Beach 1983 – as regards K. 280/I in particular, pp. 2-7. 7

I first heard about these from Charles Burkhart.

Example 7. Sequence 2, mm. 35–43.



Example 8. Sequence 3, mm. 67–78 (development).





Example 9. Development (Sequence 3, mm. 67–78).

the movement: C-D-C-B_b-A-G-F, which in turn are an embellished version of the bass (F)-C-A-F descending arpeggio that begins the piece.⁸

Sequence 4

The last sequence I will discuss, Sequence 4, is located in the recapitulation, second group, mm. 117–123. It has no counterpart in the exposition at all, but is inserted in the second group, right before the recapitulation version of Sequence 2.⁹ Example 10 juxtaposes the cognate passages. Example 10a (top system), from the exposition, shows the beginning of the second group, in the dominant, starting at m. 27 and ending at the start of Sequence 2. Example 10b (bottom system), from the recapitulation, shows the parallel measures, this time in the tonic, starting at m. 109 and also ending at the start of Sequence 2. But this time there is a new sequence (mm. 117-123) tucked in right before Sequence 2. It is a fallingfifths sequence, like the one in the development. Here the arpeggiation motive is in both hands, in contrary motion, with the material swapping between hands at every measure. When one voice has the "straight" ascending arpeggio, the other hand has the descending arpeggio embellished with passing and escape tones. Why is this "extra" sequence inserted here at all? One reason is probably simply to provide variety and an increased richness of material in the recapitulation; but perhaps a more practical reason is to lead out of the high register into the lower and more normative

⁸ Beach makes a similar point in Beach 2012: 218.

⁹ Another example of Mozart inserting a sequence in the recapitulation that has no counterpart in the exposition is his A minor Piano Sonata, K. 310/I.





Example 10b. Beginning of 2nd group, recapitulation, Sequence 4 (mm. 117–123).







Example 11. Sequence 4.



(obligatory, if you will) register for the recapitulation version of Sequence 2, which begins in m. 123.

See Example 11. Like Sequence 1, Sequence 4 prolongs tonic harmony, moving from I_3^5 to I^6 . From mm. 117 to the beginning of m. 121 it is quite regular, with the two chords of the sequential unit in $\frac{5}{3}$ and $\frac{6}{3}$ positions respectively, and an LIP of 5-8, registrally displaced in both voices, changing chords evenly on the downbeat of each measure: F-B_b, E^o-Am Dm. In a larger sense (see the bottom graph), both voices move in parallel third-descents – C-B_b-A (treble) and F-E-D (bass). With the arrival of the D minor chord in m. 121, the sequence falls apart, dissolving into stepwise-filled descending thirds (vertically doubled in tenths) that run until the next sequence (Sequence 2) starts in m. 123. However, even though the melodic sequence has disintegrated, it is still possible to trace the continuation of the harmonic sequence Dm-Gm C-F.

Through the swiftly falling detritus at the end of Sequence I (m. 121) I read an ascending line of A-B_b-C which rejoins the retained *Kopfton* (C) of the second branch of the divided structure; so the treble line of the sequence is C-B_b-A-B_b-C.

One objection to my reading might be that my treble B_{\downarrow} (the 7th of a V⁷ chord) moves up instead of resolving down. But, since the bass B_{\downarrow} resolves down to A, I think that the treble B_{\downarrow} is free to move up to C.

In conclusion: Schenker (although not Schenkerians) viewed the phenomena or devices commonly called sequences as expanded linear progressions or passing notes, and rejected the validity of reifying them under their own name, thus denying them any existence in their own right. His main reason is that their "content is rooted in the voice-leading transformations and linear progressions whose unity allows no segmentation or names of segments." I agree that sequences are linear progressions, but they are a particular type of linear progressions that are indeed characterized by "segments and names of segments." Earlier I wrote that sequences prolong either a single sonority or the motion between sonorities. Thus they represent an elaboration, the "long way around," as it were. Of course, in Schenkerian methodology everything is, in a sense, the long way around because everything is considered a multi-leveled improvisation upon simpler structures. But there is something quite distinctive about the sequential route. Sequences are so venerable, so established, and so instantly recognizable through their internal segmental transposed repetition that we feel guite comfortable with them and can simply appreciate both the familiar sequential process and, simultaneously, its role in composing out the larger-scale harmony and voice leading. The sequences in the first movement of Mozart's Piano Sonata, K. 280, are actual things in their own right, each guite distinctive and individual, yet each furthering larger aims. Unlike Schenker, I see no conflict between these two perspectives.

References

Beach, David 1983. A Recurring Pattern in Mozart's Music. – *Journal of Music Theory* 27/1 (Spring), pp. 1–29.

Beach, David 1990. The Cadential Six-Four as Support for Scale-Degree Three of the Fundamental Line. – *Journal of Music Theory* 34/1 (Spring), pp. 81–99.

Beach, David 1994. The Initial Movements of Mozart's Piano Sonatas K. 280 and K. 332: Some Striking Similarities. – *Intégral* 8, pp. 126–146.

Beach, David 2012. Advanced Schenkerian Analysis: Perspectives on Phrase Rhythm, Motive, and Form. New York / London: Routledge.

Cadwallader, Allen, David Gagné 2011. *Analysis of Tonal Music: A Schenkerian Approach*. 3rd ed., New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Laufer, Edward 1989. Sketch of Mozart Piano Sonata, K. 280, I, mm. 17–25. Class handout from Schenkerian analysis class at the University of Toronto. Copy obtained from Mark Anson-Cartwright.

Schenker, Heinrich 1979. Free Composition. Trans. and ed. by Ernst Oster, New York: Longman.

Schenker, Heinrich 1996. The Organic Nature of Fugue as Demonstrated in the C Minor Fugue from Bach's *Well-Tempered Clavier*, Book I. Trans. Hedi Siegel. – *The Masterwork in Music*. Volume 2, ed. William Drabkin, Cambridge Studies in Music Theory and Analysis 8, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 31–54.

Harmoonilised sekventsid Mozarti klaverisonaadi F-duur KV 280 I osas

Stephen Slottow (tõlkinud Kerri Kotta)

Oma teostes "Vaba stiil" ja "Muusikalised meistriteosed" väidab Heinrich Schenker üsna jõuliselt, et sekventse pole muusikas olemas ja et seda sõna ei saa "ilmselt kunstile rakendada" ning lõpuks, et "pelgalt selle olemasolu teoreetilise terminina ei garanteeri veel tema usaldusväärsust mõistena". Tema väitel peitub muusika sisu hoopis "häältejuhtimisteisendustes ja lineaarsetes järgnevustes, mille ühtsus ei võimalda neist rääkida liigendamise või liigendamisele viitavate mõistete keeles" (Schenker 1979: 26–27, 1996: 48). Seetõttu välistas ta sekventsimõiste oma teoreetilises süsteemis põhimõtteliselt.

Artikli autor ei eita, et sekventsid on sisuliselt lineaarsed järgnevused, kuid sellisena on need ühtlasi järgnevused, mis põhinevad regulaarselt transponeeritavatel ja üksteist imiteerivatel üksustel. Seetõttu on "liigendamise või liigendamisele viitavate mõistete" kasutamine nende eksistentsi olemuslik osa. Pole ka mingit vajadust eitada sekventsi kui iseseisva nähtuse olemasolu põhjusel, et samal ajal funktsioneerib see ka lineaarse järgnevusena. Pigem funktsioneerivadki sekventsid lineaarse nähtusena just oma spetsiifilise struktuuri tõttu. Kuna sekventsid ilmnevad sageli arendatud ja kaunistatud kujul, ei opereeri need ainult vormi sügavama tasandi häältejuhtimis- või harmooniliste üksustena, vaid omavad ka iseloomulikku alusstruktuuri. Need on kindlakujulised korduvad keerised laiemas energiavoolus ning näivad tekkivat kesktasandi arendatud struktuuridena, mis võivad prolongeerida nii üksiksündmust kui ka liikumist kahe sündmuse vahel. Samuti pole schenkeriaanid Schenkeri enda arusaamale sekventsidest kui põlastusväärsetest mitte-entiteetidest üldreeglina truuks jäänud.

Selles artiklis uuritakse, kuidas sekventsid leiavad kasutamist Mozarti klaverisonaadi F-duur, KV 280, I osas, lähtudes nii artikli autori (Slottow 2013) kui ka David Beachi (1983, 1990, 1994, 2012), Charles Burkharti ja Edward Lauferi (1989) analüüsidest. Toon välja neli sekventsi, millest enamik ilmneb nii ekspositsioonis kui ka repriisis. Kõik sekventsid sisaldavad teataval määral ka registrivahetust.

Sekvents nr. 1 (taktid 17–22), mis tekib sidepartii liikumisel kõrvalpartiisse, põhineb laskuvatel paralleelsetel deetsimitel ja n.-ö. täidab häältevahetuse, mis sügavamal tasandil prolongeerib toonikat. Sekvents on omakorda kaunistatud kromaatiliste läbiminevate helidega, mille tulemusena tekib rida juhtseptakordikujulisi kõrvaldominante. Repriisis kõlab mainitud sekvents (taktid 99–104) muudetud kujul, viimane on põhjustatud arvukatest ja samaaegsetest registrimuutustest kolmes hääles.

Sekvents nr. 2 (taktid 35–43) kõrvalpartii lõpus liigub eelnevaga võrreldes vastupidi, tõusvasuunaliste paralleelsete deetsimitena, olles samas kaunistatud esimese käsitletud sekventsiga üsna sarnaselt (ka siin tekitab kromaatiliselt liikuv bass rea kõrvaldominante). Samuti sisaldab see korduvat registrivahetust parema käe partiis ning lõpeb kadentsidominandile liikudes kolmekordse häältevahetusega.

Sekvents nr. 3 (taktid 67–78), mis hõlmab suure osa töötluse teisest poolest, on üsna sirgjooneline laskuv kvintsuhteline sekvents, mida moodustavad lülid ilmnevad registriliselt kolme rühma, madalate, keskmiste ja kõrgete häältena. Sekvents lõpeb suurendatud sekstiga akordiga, mis laheneb omakorda A-duur kolmkõlasse. Mainitud kolmkõla funktsioneerib lokaalselt kõrvaldominandina VI astmele, laiemas plaanis aga mažoorse III astme harmooniana sügavama tasandi järgnevuses V-III-I tagasi repriisi toonikasse (peegeldades ühtlasi motiivi *c-a-f*, mis kõlab teose alguses).

Sekvents nr. 4 (taktid 117–123) ilmub repriisi kõrvalteemas ning ekspositsioonis puudub sellele vaste. Analoogiliselt sekventsiga nr. 3 on see laskuv kvinstsuhteline sekvents ning analoogiliselt sekventsiga nr. 1 avaldub see toonikaharmoonia prolongatsioonilise laiendusena. Kordus ei avaldu siin ainult sekventsilülidevahelise nähtusena, vaid ka sekventsilülide sees. Samuti võib äärmiste häälte vahel rääkida mõlemat kätt temaatiliselt ühendavast korduvast registrivahetusest. Sekvents nr. 4 niivõrd ei lõpe, vaid pigem lihtsalt laguneb.

Lõpetuseks tuleb tõdeda, et vana ja väärikat sekventsitehnikat ei saa vaadelda Schenkerile omaselt arusaamatuse ega pettekujutlusena, vaid pigem lineaarse järgnevuse spetsiifilise alaliigina, mida iseloomustab tõesti "liigendamine või liigendamisele viitavate mõistete" kasutamine. Sekventsid Mozarti klaverisonaadi F-duur, KV 280, I osas on autonoomsed struktuurikomponendid, mis eristuva ja individuaalsena aitavad siiski laiemas plaanis kaasa tervikstruktuuri loogilisele moodustumisele. Erinevalt Schenkerist ei näe artikli autor konflikti kahe eelkirjeldatud perspektiivi vahel.