Studies in Music with Text

DAVID LEWIN

ML
1400
.L48
2006

UNT
MUSIC
LIBRARY

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS
2006

CHAPTER Six

Ihr Bild

Ich stand in dunkeln Träumen und starrt' ihr Bildnis an, und das geliebte Antlitz heimlich zu leben begann.	I stood in gloomy reverie and stared at her picture, and the beloved face secretly began to come to life.
Um ihre Lippen zog sich ein Lächeln wunderbar, und wie von Wehmuthsthränen erglänztze ihr Augenpaar.	About her lips there began to play a magical smile, and, as if with melancholy tears, her two eyes gleamed.
Auch meine Tränen flossen mir von den Wangen herab,— und ach! ich kann es nicht glauben dass ich dich verloren hab'!	My tears, too, flowed down my cheeks,— and ah! I cannot believe that I have lost you!

When I start to analyze a piece with text, I have found the following exercise to be fruitful. (1) I read the text, then (2) (if I don't know the music well,) I listen to the music until it sounds familiar, then (3) away from text and musical score, I write out a précis for "what is going on," for "what happens" in the piece. (It is important for me actually to write out the précis, not just to say it to myself.) Then (4) I check my written précis carefully against the text, and take note of any discrepancies I observe. Such discrepancies are often a good point of entry for further study of the piece. If any readers wish to carry out the exercise for themselves in connection with *Ihr Bild*, this will be a good point to do so, returning to the present essay after writing out a précis and checking it against the text.

Having frequently brought *Ihr Bild* into classes for musical analysis—including classes comprising quite sophisticated and advanced student musicians, I can report that a very large preponderance of the précis run along the following lines.

"The speaker is terribly depressed over the loss of his beloved. As he stares at her picture, he tries to deny his loss by imagining signs of life in the portrait. When he imagines her eyes gleaming with melancholy tears—'I miss you so'—he notices that the tears are in his eyes, and he is thrust back into his depressed state. No longer able to maintain his illusion, he bursts out in a cry of grief."

Such a summary captures a good deal of the piece's affective content. But, when carefully compared with the text, the précis is still crucially deficient. We can explore the matter by asking, where "is" the speaker? According to the sample précis above, he "is" standing and staring at the picture. But that is not what the poem gives us. The speaker, rather, "is" presently telling (himself and us) how he was standing and staring.

This may at first seem like an overpunctilious cavil. The sense of gloom and despair in the piece is so immanent that we take the past tense of the text, on first encounter, as a literary substitute for a present-tense narration. "I was standing and staring (just as I am doing now), and the picture began to live (just as it is doing now)," and so forth. The implicit inference is that the speaker has often gone through the ritual described, is going through it now as he speaks, and will continue to go through it forever, as if he were inhabiting Dante's Inferno. The inference is perfectly plausible, but it still does not adequately engage the actual tense systems manifest in the text.

For the poem does have a present tense, which it distinguishes sharply from its narrative simple-past. The present tense bursts forth in the last couplet, when the persona exclaims, "I *can* not believe, that I *have* lost you!" I italicize *have* as well as *can*. The auxiliary for the perfect tense is present tense, and the perfect tense, like the present, has never appeared before in the poem. The cry of grief does not only burst through the illusion that the woman is (was) "alive," it also bursts through the speaker's efforts to distance his grief and loss, putting it somewhere else. "I *was* standing and staring," (then and there), "and the picture *began* to come to life," (then and there), "and a smile *appeared*, and her eyes *gleamed*," (then and there). "And my tears, too, *flowed*" (even in this verse, very crucially, then and there—it's not as if I were crying *now*). But of course the speaker is crying now, and his present-tense grief finally bursts through when he cannot hold his distance, his "then and there," away from the raw emotion. Thus, throughout the entire piece, up until the final couplet of text, the "then and there" is conspicuously not "here and now."[1]

True, *we* may feel that the grief is "here and now" despite the speaker's efforts to distance it. That is why a typical précis puts the action of the piece into a present tense. (I discussed the phenomenon two paragraphs above.) But the persona does not acknowledge any "here and now" at all, until the final couplet.

We can synopsize such observations in what I have called "the Speaker's Map" of the poem's tenses.

1. Distancing is also manifest in the speaker's references, during the first two stanzas of text, to "her" portrait, "the" beloved visage, "her" lips, and "her" eyes. There is no "you" in the poem until the final verse.

The Speaker's Map

("1." = first couplet; "2." = second couplet)

Past 2	Past 1	Present
	first stanza	
	1. his gloom	
	2. she came to life	
middle stanza,		
1. her lips		
2. her eyes		
	final stanza	
	1. back in gloom	
		2. outcry

Past 1 is the time in which the speaker "was standing" and so on.; Past 2 is an earlier time in which the couple were together, in which she was "alive" for him. The animated face of the portrait invokes such a time, prior to the time of Past 1, and the persona, while immersed in Past 1, experienced an illusion that he was back in Past 2. The map helps us to see how cleverly Heine set up a "false" ABA form, a form that would be manifest if only his final couplet took place in Past 1. But, having constructed his false ABA, Heine then shatters it ironically with his final couplet.

Now let us examine "the Singer's Map," a map that logs the tonal profiles of the sung phrases, phrases that set the textual couplets.

The Singer's Map

Past 2	Past 1	Present
	first stanza	
	1. b♭: i→V	
	2. B♭: I and cadence	
middle stanza		
1. G♭ tonicized		
2. G♭ bis		
	final stanza	
	1. b♭: i→V	
		2. B♭: I and cadence

At first glance it seems as if Schubert made a dreadful mistake. He appears to have been fooled by Heine's "false ABA," into composing an actual musical ABA: the music for the final couplet of sung text, for the shattering present-tense outcry of grief, exactly recapitulates the optimistic major-key music for the second couplet of the first stanza, where the picture began to come to life in Past 1.

But Schubert's setting—no matter how he arrived at it—is in fact highly sophisticated. It is also absolutely straightforward. Rather than presenting some stylized manifestation of grief, Schubert shows us the persona, in the present tense, literally not believing that he has lost his beloved. "I *can not believe* that I have lost you," he sings, and the music enacts his disbelief—not just his inability to accept the loss, but

even more, his refusal to accept it. "Even now, I can make the picture come to life again—using just the same music with which it came to life in couplet 2 of stanza 1. I can do that whenever I want to—and as long as I can do that, I have not lost you."

Schubert's setting thus elevates Heine's pathetic puppet into a figure of some tragic stature. For Heine's speaker, the sudden incursion of the present tense, at his outcry of grief, completely demolishes the whole impotent ritual of stanzas 1 and 2. Schubert's singer, in marked contrast, refuses to accept or even acknowledge his present "reality"; he immerses himself instead, by an act of will, in a Dante-esque cycle of obsession. He is fated, by this heroic act of will, to enact again and again throughout eternity the ritual described in stanzas 1 and 2—for, without that ritual, there will be no occasion for the picture to "come to life" again and again.[2] And he accepts—nay embraces—his fate. Where we characterized the final couplet of Heine's speaker as an "outcry," the final phrase of Schubert's singer is better characterized as a "denial" (of reality).

Once we grasp what Schubert's setting is up to, we can appreciate the extraordinary effect of the final couplet in Schubert's setting, where the major-key tonic recapitulation enters into a frightful and continually growing cognitive dissonance against the devastating incursion of Heine's present tense. "No!" we want to exclaim, as the major music enters once more, blissfully proceeding exactly through its allotted phrase, "No! No!"

And that dissonance is precisely what is discharged for us by the final piano epilogue, now loud (rather than soft as was the parallel epilogue after the first stanza), now minor (rather than major), now with a full orchestral treatment, trombones and all (rather than a churchy sort of harmonium texture). The final chord, with its seven tones, is the densest chord in the piece, and it is the only complete tonic minor triad in the piece. After "I can not believe that I have lost you," the piano clearly states "But you *have* lost her." The final epilogue is Schubert's formal equivalent for the present tense of Heine's final couplet: it crashes in on the singer's "mistaken" musical ABA and demolishes it.

And nevertheless—does the singer "hear" the piano? To put the matter another way: does the piano epilogue happen "inside" the singer, betokening a final internal collapse despite the singer's effort to maintain his optimistic illusion? In that case, the vocalist might let us sense such an emotional collapse in his physical demeanor after he has finished singing. Or is the piano an ironist in its final epilogue, addressing the singer and/or the audience from "outside" the singer? In that case, the vocalist might take good care to maintain the "optimistic" stance of his physical presence after the singing is over, "not hearing" the piano epilogue at all as he stares blissfully up and out into cloud-cuckoo land.

Considering the role of the final epilogue, we will need to augment the tense systems of the art work yet again, extending the Singer's Map to what we shall call "the Music's Map."

2. To be able to make the picture "come to life" again whenever he wants, the persona must also be able to make it "die" whenever he needs to, killing off his beloved again and again (to put it brutally). Adequately to explore the psychology and sociology of that observation would require a complete and extended essay in its own right. I hope that the present study may provide a good point of departure for anyone interested in writing such an essay.

The Music's Map

Past 2	Past 1	present A	present B
	first stanza		
	1. b♭: i→V		
	2. B♭: I cad.		
middle stanza G♭ toniciz.			
	1. b♭: i→V		
		2. B♭: I cad.	
			piano epilogue

The Music's Map distinguishes two present tenses. Present A is the singer's present tense, the tense in which he sings "I can not believe" using the earlier B♭ major music. One could call this "the present of denial" or "the delusional present." Present B is the piano's present tense, the present of "reality," the present in which the piano's crashing minor epilogue comments, "but you *have* really lost her." Present B definitively leads us, the audience, out of the piece. Perhaps it leads the singer out as well (depending upon the interpretations recently discussed). Alternatively (depending upon those interpretations), the singer, "not hearing" the piano epilogue, may be hopelessly trapped inside the piece by the link between the final B♭ major phrase and the second phrase of stanza 1, in Past 1.

The piano, playing solo over a more or less extended amount of time, frames every sung phrase of the piece. Except for the final piano epilogue I have not put any of this solo material onto the Music's Map, because—except for that epilogue—each piano solo seems plausibly consistent with the singer's journey through the tenses of the piece: the piano (up to the final epilogue) can be analyzed as if "with" the singer, in whatever part of the map the singer is traversing. So, for instance, the little echoing "winking" figure in the middle of measure 18 is easily taken to be "with" the singer in Past 2. The same goes for the "winking" figure in the middle of measure 22. Then the heavy transformation of the figure in measures 23–24—combined there with the motif of "the two B flats"—modulates from the G♭ major ambience of Past 2, back to the b♭ minor ambience of Past 1 (couplet 1), and this musical move goes "with" the singer on his return from Past 2 to Past 1.

Even the mysterious opening of the piece, presenting the motif of the two B flats as a temporarily disembodied phenomenon, can be heard as "plausibly consistent" with the Past 1 of the singer's opening phrase that follows. In that connection, the two B flats of the piano introduction can be heard to foreshadow the initial and final B flats of the singer's initial slow turn figure ("*Ich stand* . . . (Träu-)*men*). But the motif of the two B flats, presented so mysteriously as the music begins, while "consistent" with a location in Past 1, does seem to mean something more.[3] Schenker takes the two B flats, with a rest between, as a means for making listeners perform the auditory equivalent of *staring* at the pitch; thus "we feel ourselves

3. The two B flats are the subject of a fine study by Joseph Kerman, "A Romantic Detail in Schubert's *Schwanengesang*," *Musical Quarterly* 48 (1962), 36–49. The article is revised and reprinted in *Schubert: Critical and Analytical Studies*, ed. Walter Frisch, paperback printing (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996), 48–64.

wonderfully transported to the side of the unhappy lover, who stands there . . . staring at the portrait . . . ."[4] Following Schenker's lead a bit farther, one might identify the two B flats with all the acts of staring that permeate the piece: we are staring at the persona, who is "here and now" staring at himself as he stood "then and there" in Past 1, staring at the portrait until it began to stare back at him, tears in its eyes. During the piano epilogue, however one interprets it, we will be struck by the way in which the vocalist (if performing well) stares out into the audience.

My own inclination is to hear the two B flats of the opening two measures (and everywhere else) as a symbolic tolling of funeral bells.[5] True, we do not know that the beloved is dead. From Heine's poem alone, we could easily understand the loss as a broken marriage engagement, rather than the physical death of the beloved.[6] And yet the music seems a good deal more funereal than the poem, and the idea of tolling bells seems apt. Even if the beloved has not physically died, the singer seems to be treating her absence as if she had. (Even in the poem by itself, the person does that to a certain extent—dying is, after all, the obverse of "coming to life.")

The bells, in my hearing, toll at every solo comment by the piano except for the two epilogues.[7] The piano's interjection at measures 7–8 (with pickup) tolls on C rather than on B♭. At the beginning of the G♭ music for the middle stanza, though the piano is not playing solo we still hear the two B flats tolling in measures 15 and 16, above the melodic line that doubles the singer. The "winking" motif in the piano halfway through measure 18 combines with the same motif in measure 22, to produce "the two B flats" at a higher rhythmic level. And then at measures 23–24 the two B flats are heavily recapitulated from measures 1–2, as we return to Past 1 for the beginning of the final stanza.

The motif of "the two B flats" appears not only in such foreground passages but also at very high rhythmic levels of the composition. The motif engages, for instance, the two big B♭ major cadences—at measure 12, and again at measure 34. It also engages the way in which measures 23–24 correspond, as a "second B♭" on a

4. Heinrich Schenker, "Franz Schubert, Ihr Bild," trans. William Pastille with the same title in the journal *Sonus*, 6.2 (1986), 31–37. Kerman, in "A Romantic Detail," discusses Schenker's idea skeptically but enthusiastically.

5. Kerman, in "A Romantic Detail," counts as an antecedent for the introduction to "Ihr Bild" (written in 1828) the introduction to a little-known song Schubert wrote in 1824, "Gondelfahrer" (The Gondolier). There, some "chiming" octaves in the introduction are later revealed to be explicit extra-musical symbols when they recur and are developed in the music that sets the text: "Vom Markustürme tönte/Der Spruch der Mitternacht." ("From the tower of Saint Mark's [Cathedral in Venice] resounded the pealing of midnight.") "Spruch" seems impossible to translate here—Kerman translates "tönte der Spruch" as "chimed the knell," which makes the Mayrhofer text too funereal for my taste—perhaps Kerman was transferring a funereal feeling from "Ihr Bild," or from Mayrhofer's other works in general, or perhaps he was under the influence of Gray's *Elegy* (in which case one might translate "tolled the knell").

Later on in Kerman's essay, though, he discourages all efforts to pin the Motif of the two B flats in "Ihr Bild" down to any extramusical symbolism whatsoever.

6. In early-nineteenth-century Germany, engaged couples exchanged portraits. Heine suffered a broken engagement, and the motif of the broken engagement is widespread in his poetry.

7. Although not explicitly "tolling," both epilogues are consistent in character with the beloved's death: the first epilogue is in the nature of "religious uplift," and the second, trombones and all, is amply funereal in its own right.

Example 6.1

(a) ♩ = meas.

(the 3 meas. contract 4)

2

3 < 4

2

12

3 < 4

23

34

(b) 𝅗𝅥 = 2 of (a)

12

23

34

(c) 𝅗𝅥 = 2 of (b)

♮? ♭?

(d) 𝅗𝅥 = 3 of (c)

high rhythmic level, to measures 1–2. The motivic effect of measure 23, as a "second B♭ beat" for measure 1, is strongly brought out by a rhythmic (but non-Schenkerian) reduction of the music, as in Example 6.1.

Already on rhythmic level (c) of the piece, one hears quite powerfully not only the tolling of the B flats at the beginning of each hypermeasure but also, at a higher level, the tolling of two B♭ "hyperbeats" at measure 1 and at measure 23. At rhythmic level (d)—talk about funerals!—the effect of the two B♭ "hyperbeats" is even stronger.

Yet we must not lean too hard on the structure of Example 6.1. Level (d) indicates why. On that level, the B♭ major cadences have disappeared completely from the scene. Level (d) hears the background musical action of the piece as G♭-displacing-F, then G♭-returning-to-F, while B flats continually toll along as pedal tones. That musical gesture represents the progression from Past 1 into Past 2, fol-

lowed by the return from Past 2, back into Past 1. So level (d) is "taken in" by Heine's false ABA: it represents faithfully the hearing that is responsible for the inadequate sample précis discussed at the beginning of this chapter, the précis that contained no awareness of any present tense(s) in the work. In that connection, Example 6.1 is in fact very useful to our critique. It specifically demonstrates how a Newtonian chronometry, when brought up to the piece, is inadequate to engage the richness of the work's temporality (or temporalities). It will be interesting, then, to review a variety of Schenkerian background readings that have been proposed for the music. F–G♭–F is not admissible as a Schenkerian *Urlinie*, so each of these readings necessarily confronts the question, what is the overall "action" of the piece through some temporal medium other than Newtonian chronometry?

Schenker himself, in the essay already referenced, proposed an "*Urlinie*" for the work.[8] The line starts out with a gesture spanning a melodic fourth, from the B♭ of "stand" (m. 3), through the A of "Träu-" (m. 4) and the G♭ of "starrt"" (m. 5), to the F of "an" (m. 6). The *Urlinie* then soars up to an imaginary F an octave above, at the top of the treble clef—one might fantasy a soft tremolo of orchestral violins on the pitch during measures 9 and 10—and from there it descends through a melodic fifth during measure 11, through the E♭ of "heim-", the D of "le-", and the C of "-ben", to arrive at measure 12 on the cadential B♭ of "-gann."

There are musical problems with this *Urlinie*. The A natural of "Träu-" surely returns as a lower neighbor to the B♭ that follows it ("-men"), rather than moving down an augmented second to the G♭ of "starrt." That is not simply a matter of abstract theory, which abstractly "prohibits" melodic motion across an augmented second: Schubert writes a slur under the piano doubling from "stand" to "-men," he writes another slur on the accompaniment from "und" to "an," and the syntactic construction of the text—I was doing X (slurred), "und" I was doing Y (slurred)—is not propitious for any melodic connection here (abstractly "legal" or no) between A natural and G♭ across the "und." Then, too, the "imaginary" high F of the proposed *Urlinie*, while highly poetic, seems a suspicious addition to Schubert's music.

Schenker's *Urlinie* continues onward from measure 12. (His essay was written in 1921, and he had not yet developed the mature theories of *Der Freie Satz* [1935] that are promulgated today—with some justice—as "Schenker.") He brackets the melodic descent of a third, from the B♭ of measure 15 ("ihre"), through A♭ to the G♭ of measure 16 ("sich"). The bracket, in the notation he was using at the time of his essay, indicates a segment of his "*Urlinie*." That is a good idea, for it enables us to get down from B♭ to G♭ via A♭, instead of having to traverse the A♮ of "Träu-." One might accordingly consider emending Schenker's *Urlinie*, so that it begins with this B♭–A♭–G♭ in Past 2, hits its F in Past 1 (at "-ab" in m. 28), and then continues on into Present A, via the imaginary high F and the E♭–D–C–B♭ of measures 33–34 ("dich verloren hab'!"). The suggested emendation also shores up a problem with Schenker's analysis, which unduly downplays the third stanza of the piece.[9] As

8. Schenker's article on "Ihr Bild" gives this as his "Figure 9," which appears on page 37 of Pastille's translation, at the end of the essay, prefaced only by the curt paragraph [*sic*], "Here is the Urlinie:"

9. His sketch describes the structure from the beginning of the third stanza to measure 34 as "like measures 3–12." Of course, the sketch, projecting the poet-as-hero, also omits any reference to the final piano epilogue after the vocal cadence of measure 34. Schenker's verbal discussion of the epilogue is

emended, Schenker's *Urlinie* would only begin acting for real in Past 2, not at the beginning of the piece.

Despite its problems, Schenker's analysis has strong virtues. It integrates into one background action a large-scale melodic gesture that extends from Past 2 through Past 1 into Present A, traversing G♭ major music, b♭ minor music, and B♭ major music in one grand overall sweep, thus engaging the singer's temporal and tonal journey much more extensively than did Level (d) of Example 6.1—or will other *Urlinie* readings we shall consider soon. In Schenker's reading (as emended), the singer is much more a protagonist of the drama than he is at Level (d) of Example 6.1—or in several other background readings. Schenker's *Urlinie* ends in major, with the singer's last sung note; Schenker clearly believes that Present A is the *emotionally* "real" present, despite the piano epilogue, and that makes the singer more heroic, than do several other readings—a feature which will endear itself to vocalists.[10]

Carl Schachter also hears *Urlinie* closure on the sung B flats at the B♭ major cadences of measures 12 and 34.[11] Accordingly, he also believes (like Schenker) that Present A (at m. 34 and following) is the "real" present of the piece, as opposed to Present B. His *Urlinie* does not have the majestic sweep of Schenker's octave. (On the other hand, it is more consistent with Schenker's mature theories.) Rather than descending through an octave, Schachter's *Urlinie* goes $\hat{3}$–$\hat{2}$–$\hat{1}$ in B♭ major: the bass D natural of measure 9 gets transferred into the upper register, where it is sung during measures 10 and 11; then it descends through C (on the last quarter of measure 11) to the B♭ at the beginning of measure 12.

According to this *Urlinie*, the principal action of the piece is "to make the picture come to life" (again and again, as happens in Present A during mm. 31–34). The background structure of the piece is now completely major, taking place during measures 9–12 and (again) during measures 31–34. Past 2 is ignored as a

perfunctory and unsatisfactory. ("But the composer's prophetic vision sees farther. He withdraws the wave of major. At one time it could support an interlude; now it can do so no longer. [D. L.: Why not? Running out of text did not stop Schubert from continuing his music, recycling used text as pertinent, in many of his other songs. Schenker does not explicitly notice the change to present tense in the poem.] Gloomy minor engulfs the whole inner landscape . . .") I wonder if Schenker, on further thought, would have been so ready to imagine the piano postlude as part of a sentimental "*inner* landscape," rather than an ironic "*outer* reality." Perhaps so—Schenker was after all in many ways a nineteenth-century soul, at home with the Romantic dramatic aesthetics of Goethe, Coleridge, and Carlyle, alienated in many ways from early-twentieth-century modes of irony and *Sachlichkeit*.

10. "The unfortunate lover still clings to the last bridges that lead to his beloved with the desperate cry: 'Und ach! ich kann es nicht glauben, dass ich dich verloren hab'!' and the major recounts this. Has he really lost her as long as he still feels this way?" Schenker, "Ihr Bild," trans. Pastille, 36–37. Schenker is beautifully sensitive to the emotional nuances of the final situation, though his analysis takes no explicit notice of tense systems in the text—he describes the poem's events in the present tense throughout his essay.

11. [Carl Schachter presented this reading of "Ihr Bild" during a lecture, "Structure as Foreground: 'das Drama des Ursatzes,'" delivered at Harvard University during the 1991–1992 academic year. A partial representation of Schachter's reading (one that includes the m. 12 cadence but not the cadence at m. 34) can be found in the published version of the talk, "Structure as Foreground: 'das Drama des Ursatzes,'" in *Schenker Studies 2,* edited by Carl Schachter and Hedi Siegel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 298–314. The work is discussed on pages 299–302. E.G.]

complete "red herring"—in this respect, the reading is quite the opposite of Level (d) in Example 6.1, which wholeheartedly enacts Heine's false ABA progression from Past 1 to Past 2 and back to Past 1, incorrectly asserting that dramatic progression to be the main action of the piece.

As a "heroic" reading of the piece that is also syntactically well formed according to Schenker's mature theories, Schachter's reading can not be faulted. I am somewhat uncomfortable, though, to feel an implicitly asserted "through" (Ur) action for the piece which is confined so strictly to the B♭ major sections. After all, I think that most of us feel the piece to be "in b flat minor," not "in B flat major," and Schachter's structural background does not engage that intuition, which must then be regarded as part of what is "denied" by the heroic protagonist of his reading.

Allen Forte and Steven Gilbert seize just this bull by the horns, in asserting a B flat minor *Urlinie* for the music.[12] They write explicitly, "Analysis of mm. 1–8 should yield the progression $(\hat{3}/i)$–$(\hat{2}/V)$ which is continued in the ensuing measures thus: $(\natural\hat{3}/V)$–$(\hat{2}/V)$–$(\hat{1}/I)$. Notice that at no point in the song does the raised form of scale degree 3 have full harmonic support—and for that reason (in addition to the obvious fact that the song is in B♭ minor) the flatted form takes precedence structurally."[13] Their *Urlinie* goes $\hat{3}$–$\hat{2}$–$\hat{1}$ in b flat minor. It starts on the vocal D♭ of measure 3 [*sic*!], and descends through the vocal C of measure 4, as reverberated by the piano during measures 6–7, reaching its ultimate goal with the vocal B♭ of measure 12. The major harmony at measure 12 is a *tierce de Picardie* in their large-scale b-flat minor structure, not a defining mode for the piece as a whole. Forte's and Gilbert's *Urlinie* thus covers the entire extent of Past 1, both the minor and the major couplets. On repetition, it also covers the move from Past 1 into Present A during stanza 3. And, finally, even though the *Urlinie* ends with the singer's major cadence(s), Forte and Gilbert nevertheless implicitly locate themselves within Present B, when they refer to "the obvious fact that the song is in B♭ minor." From this vantage point the singer's B♭ major is a delusion and denial of b♭ minor "reality."

We may well wonder how to interpret the structural priority that Forte and Gilbert lay on the note D♭ of measure 3. What could be being enacted here, as regards the text? Still, as they point out, that is the one minor third degree of B flat that Schenkerian melodic theory has available to seize on during measures 1–8.[14] And if we assign high priority to an intuition that the piece "really" is in B flat minor, rather than B flat major, locating ourselves at least implicitly in Present B, like Forte and Gilbert, we shall have to analyze some sort of B flat minor structur-

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

13. Forte and Gilbert, *Introduction*, 218.

14. To my ear, the sense of the minor mode in the song is established much more by the minor *sixth* degree of the key (G♭), than the minor third (D♭). However, that is not easy to reflect in the background of a Schenkerian sketch.

Some German theorists of the nineteenth century proposed a "major/minor" mode consisting of major tonic and major dominant triads, along with a minor subdominant triad. This mode would fit the harmonic world of *Ihr Bild* quite well. But I do not feel that it could be invoked to "solve" any problematic issues of the sort we have been discussing. The issue of major versus minor tonality is at the forefront of the song, and nothing can be "solved" by pretending that there is no such conflict in the piece, hauling in a "major/minor" mode to achieve some sort of abstract "synthesis."

ing about the music. Furthermore, as already noted, the reading of Example 6.1 is not fully satisfactory in that regard.

An extreme B flat minor reading of the music was suggested to me by William Pastille (the translator of Schenker's essay) in the context of a colloquium I gave at Cornell some dozen years ago. I can not locate the sketch he made at the time, and in any case I do not want to hold him to it now, after so many years have passed during which his views may have changed. I shall, rather, use my memory of his general idea as the basis for an exemplary sketch of my own that I shall present here as Example 6.2.

Example 6.2

The *Urlinie* of Example 6.2, which comprises the beamed open note heads in the lower register of the treble staff, almost buys into Heine's red herring, the "false" ABA of Example 6.1, level (d). The *Urlinie*'s F of measure 6 ("an") is inflected by a neighboring G♭ during stanza 2 (say at "sich" in m. 16); the G♭ then returns to F (at m. 24 and following). The B♭ major cadences of the singer happen "above" the melodic Ur-gesture F-G♭–F, as indicated by the various solid noteheads of Example 6.2 in the upper register. So far the musical analysis is not much more than a recasting, with Schenkerian symbols, of the "chronometric" story told in Example 6.1. But then a remarkable idea emerges on Example 6.2: the final piano epilogue picks up the open-notehead F of the *Urlinie* and moves it stepwise down in B flat minor, during measures 35–36. The cadential rhythm of the melody in the two piano epilogues, in measures 13–14 and in measures 35–36, is a clear variation of the singer's cadential rhythm in measures 11–12 and measures 33–34. Accordingly, the *Urlinie* closure at the end of Example 6.2 is saying, "This is the true cadence of the piece; this is where the cadential rhythm bites home, in B flat minor."

Pastille's *Urlinie* is suspended on F, with a neighboring G♭, through the entire sung part of the piece. There is no essential structural motion of the *Urlinie* here, through fourteen-plus-eight-plus-twelve measures of music. The whole essential motion of the *Urlinie* takes place with a giant rush over the last two measures of the piece, after the singer has signed off, where the *Urlinie* plunges wildly down, finally free of the false ABA as "reality" rushes in. We are not talking, of course, about the "delusional reality" of Present A, but rather the "real reality" of Present B. The "reality" in which the *Urlinie* of Example 6.2 plunges down at the end is the "reality" that says, "But you *have* lost her," the "reality" that makes us somehow hear the piece as "really" in B♭ minor, not B♭ major.

The rhythmic rush with which the *Urlinie* plunges down, at the end of Example 6.2, is consistent with the rhythmic profiles of some of Schenker's mature background sketches (for instance his sketch for *Auf dem Flusse*, discussed in an earlier

chapter in this book, where his entire *Urlinie* rushes down very close to the end of the song, indeed actually only starting close to the song's end as well).[15] Here, the rushing down of the *Urlinie* over the last two measures of the piece enacts particularly well an appropriate reading of the drama.

Less consistent with Schenker's mature productions is the register of the *Urlinie* in Example 6.2, an "inner voice" of the sketch. For myself, I do not find that an insuperable problem as a matter of abstract principle: it seems to me there are pieces in which it makes sense to think of the *Urlinie* as something more like a "tenor" (in the Renaissance sense) than a "solo melody" in the common-practice style. My ideas about *Auf dem Flusse*, as regards the piano right hand, engaged this notion. My ideas about Robert Schumann's *Auf einer Burg*, in a later chapter, will engage the notion again. In general, I am particularly willing to accept the plausibility of an inner-voice *Urlinie* when I am analyzing a piece with text, if there is something *innig* about the text that can plausibly be enacted by an "inner-voice" *Urlinie*. That is, of course, the case with *Ihr Bild*.

The *Urlinie* of Example 6.2 might at first glance seem somewhat problematic in Schenkerian terms as regards his concept of an "obligatory register" in which all notes of an *Urlinie* must coexist. But I think a plausible case can be made for the bass-clef register an octave below the written *Urlinie* of the example, particularly if the F of that line is effectively heard in that register when the male vocalist sings it.

All this said, I am not quite convinced by the *Urlinie* of Example 6.2, although I find it remarkably ingenious and plausible. As the reader has gathered, I am not completely comfortable with any of the proposed *Urlinien* so far discussed (which

15. The rhythm of a mature Schenkerian *Urlinie* is something like the historical rhythm in which we are accustomed to name the kings and queens of England, or the emperors of Rome. When speaking such a list as if it had some sort of historical *Vernunft*, we do not pause and dwell for a much longer time on say the name of Queen Victoria, simply because she reigned for a longer chronometric span than did most of her fellow sovereigns. The list has a serial logic and rhythm of its own, one not controlled (beyond very loose bounds) by Newtonian chronometry. We are accustomed to such discourse as, "and then nothing much happened for the next fifty years, at which time Marcus Aurelius came to power," even though we have no intention of discussing fifty (more) years in connection with Aurelius's reign.

Many scholars who criticize Schenker for not respecting a Newtonian chronometry of acoustical sound in his analytical sketches are not sufficiently aware, I think—if aware at all—of the Hegelian historicist tradition in which his views of temporality were formed. One can criticize Hegelian theories of temporality in light of more modern and less German views of temporality (and more modern and less German music than that of Schubert, Beethoven, et al.), but one will not so easily be able to assert that Hegelian temporality is irrelevant to the music of Beethoven, Schubert, and their German contemporaries among composers. The issues are somewhat like those of "early music" performance practice. The acoustical differences between Beethoven's pianos and a modern Steinway can be revealing. Robert Cogan, in *New Images of Musical Sound* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), demonstrates this through his "PHOTO[S] 6" and the surrounding commentary on pages 49–56. A modern pianist in the United States, even if not intending to perform Opus 109 on a Beethoven fortepiano, is nonetheless well advised to heed the acoustical analysis. (That is so even if one believes that Beethoven was in fact as dissatisfied with his instruments as he sometimes asserted.) Similarly, a modern pianist in the United States, even if not intending to project Schenker's analysis of Opus 101 in performance, is nonetheless well advised to be sensitive to the publication of Hegel's *Logic* in 1817, the same year in which the sonata was published. Hegelian temporality was in the German air at the time.

are all those I have heard entertained). My problem with Example 6.2 is that it seems to me to underplay the B♭ major cadences too drastically, to undercut the role of the speaker/singer as protagonist too much. My reaction here is the obverse of my reaction to Schachter's analysis, which seemed to me to highlight too vividly the major cadences of the speaker/singer, at the expense of my intuition that the song "really is" in B flat minor, not major. (Perhaps it "was" in B flat major, in some pertinent past-tense location, perhaps it "delusionally is" in B flat major, in Present A, but as I finish listening to the piece I am inclined to sense a more determinative influence from Present B.)

The reader may perhaps be asking, what is the point of all my obsessive speculation about Schenkerian background readings—along with the non-Schenkerian "chronometric" analysis of Example 6.1? Am I being obscurantist, throwing forth all these suggestions but not promulgating any one of them as my own preference? "After all," one sometimes hears, "the performers must make choices, one way or another."

Elsewhere, I have argued that such a remark seriously underestimates and misapprehends the resources available to good and thoughtful performers, even in apparently highly constrained contexts.[16] In any case, my intention is not to waffle on performance choices, but, rather, to show a menu of reasonable and sensitive options available to performers, enacting and enacted by a variety of poetic readings, within which a singer and a pianist may (and must) find a location that both find satisfying for the occasion of any particular performance. Failing physical ineptitude on my part, a reader would feel no qualms about my personal location(s) while hearing me perform as a pianist, accompanying a singer whose own location(s) were compatible with mine.

16. David Lewin, *Generalized Musical Intervals and Transformations* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1987), 96.