

Analyse nach Heinrich Schenker

L. Poundie Burstein

I INTRODUCTION

The Three Schenkers

To a far greater extent than with almost any other music analytic system, Schenkerian analysis is associated with the ideas of a specific person—namely, Heinrich Schenker (1868–1935). Schenker was an Austrian pianist, composer, critic, teacher, music editor, and author who was most celebrated for his series of highly influential essays and books in which he described a revolutionary method for understanding masterpieces of the tonal repertoire.

Schenker's writings and teachings gave rise to the analytic method that bears his name. Specifically, the term "Schenkerian analysis" can refer to one of three things: (1) the analytic concepts that appear in Schenker's writings (the "actual Schenker"); (2) Schenker's ideas as they are characterized by his followers (the "idealized Schenker"); or (3) the body of analyses that are to varying degrees influenced by Schenker ("Schenkerian practice"). Though interrelated and overlapping, these three meanings remain distinct from one another. Unfortunately, when discussing Schenkerian analysis, people often mix up these three categories, which in turn creates confusion.

The Writings of Schenker

In his published and unpublished writings, Schenker proposes ways to model the tonal forces of compositions that he regarded as masterpieces. His models are multi-leveled and hierarchic. They rely on a series of largely recursive operations, which Schenker explains in detail and which are based on standard principles of tonal counterpoint and diatonic harmony. On each level, the models demonstrate how an underlying consonant sonority is embellished contrapuntally, and in many cases the contrapuntal embellishments coordinate with a harmonic framework that moves from the tonic to the dominant and back. Through such voice-leading models, Schenker attempts to show how the details of a composition relate to its larger tonal framework and vice versa. Although his method is largely pitch based, Schenker explains that the tonal features he describes relate to other elements of the music as well, such as rhythm, form, orchestration, articulation, and performance.

Schenker seems to make little distinction between the features of the composition itself, the composition as it is perceived by audiences, and the piece as conceived by the composer. On the contrary, he often suggests that—if it is correctly understood—a compositional masterwork as presented in a properly prepared Urtext score reveals the composer's intentions as well as the proper performance and analytic interpretations. Schenker shows little concern for what the average listener or the first-time listener perceives. Rather, he developed his approach primarily for the benefit of the expert listener, as he defined it. His intended audience apparently are those who

are intimately familiar with the canon of mostly Austro-Germanic masterpieces of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that Schenker favored, who know this repertoire not only in their ears, but also in their eyes and fingers.

Abstract Example

Using an imaginary piece in C major as its basis, Ex. 1 provides a demonstration of the approach developed by Schenker. Exx. 1a–d present a series of harmonic-contrapuntal models that each offer an increasingly detailed depiction of the voice-leading structure for this imaginary composition. Ex. 1a shows the underlying triad that serves as the basic source of the work’s content. The interval E–C, which appears as a harmonic interval in the top two voices of Ex. 1a, is presented as descending melodic interval in the subsequent level of Ex. 1b. In Ex. 1c the motion from E to C is filled in with a passing tone, so that this interval is “composed-out.” This creates a small tonal drama in which (1) a point of relative stability is followed by (2) a state of tension and then (3) a resolution that concludes the descent to the tonic. This tonal drama is enhanced in Ex. 1d, where the passing tone D is supported by a dominant harmony. This harmonic support creates a *Stufenkreise*—that is, a motion from I to V and back.

The model of Ex. 1e further elaborates this harmonic-contrapuntal structure by adding melodic motions to and from tones from inner voices. Thus, within the opening tonic chord, the note G from the tenor part is shifted up an octave so as to appear in the melody. Likewise, in the following V chord a passing motion in the melody leads to B, which initially appeared in the alto. In Ex. 1f these upper-voice motions are supported by a pair of *Stufenkreise*.

Each of the notes and harmonies seen in Ex. 1f could themselves be elaborated in similar fashions, adding an increasing amount of detail with each successive layer until every pitch of a lengthy movement is accounted for. Through such means, Schenker demonstrates how all the tonal motions on the various levels of a well-constructed composition could be regarded as relating to one another, governed by the same basic harmonic-contrapuntal forces. He further argues that other aspects of the composition—such as the chromaticism, modulations, motives, form, rhythm, orchestration, articulation, and expression—likewise can be understood to relate to this layered diatonic tonal layout. As such, every note and gesture within the piece can be recognized as bearing a vital connection to the tonal forces that embrace the entire movement, and vice versa, thereby displaying the synthesis and organic coherence that Schenker considers essential for masterworks of tonal music.

The hierarchical tonal layout of Exx. 1a–f is visually represented in Ex. 1g by a voice-leading sketch, using analytic notation invented by Schenker. Although to certain extent *ad hoc*, Schenker’s analytic notation system tends to follow certain basic guidelines (Ex. 2), many of which have been adopted by Schenker’s followers. It should be emphasized that the notes within a Schenkerian voice-leading sketch do not directly relate to the pitches of the piece being analyzed. Rather, they portray the notes of abstract voice-leading models, which in turn represent the tonal forces found in the composition itself.

Naturally, unless demonstrating his method abstractly, Schenker bases his voice-leading models on actual rather than imaginary compositions. Unlike his followers (as noted below), Schenker seldom explicates the rationales behind the analytic decisions with which he shapes

Example 1. (a)–(f) Increasingly detailed voice-leading models of an abstract piece in C major; (g) Schenkerian sketch that hierarchically represents voice-leading of this abstract piece.

(a) underlying Dreiklang

(b) E–C appears melodically

(c) passing tone D leads from E to C
stability - tension - resolution

(d) D is supported by V, forming I–V–I Stufenkreis
I V I
stability - tension - resolution

(e) melodic motion to and from an inner voice

(f) top voice motions supported by Stufenkreise
C: I V I I V⁶₅ I V G:I IV V⁷ I I

(g)

C: I V I I V⁶₅ I G:I IV V⁷ I I

Example 2. Summary of some standard practices for Schenkerian voice-leading sketches.

- Different types and lengths of the stems, along with different types of noteheads, suggest structural weight.
- Solid slurs link notes of the same harmony that are bridged by chord skip or by stepwise motion in one direction; solid slurs can also link an incomplete neighbor to the note that it embellishes.
- Dotted slurs mark returns to the same note a member of the same pitch class.
- Notes found in the middle of notes connected by either solid or dotted slurs are subordinate to the notes linked by the slurs.
- Beams are used either to highlight important stepwise connections or a *Stufenkreis*.
- Interlocking pairs of slurs (as in m. 2 of Ex. 1g) highlight bass motions from I through either II or IV to V.
- Inner voices often are implied and registers simplified.

his voice-leading models. In most cases, however, it seems clear that harmonies or notes that appear on the deeper levels of his analyses are emphasized by things such as the rhythmic or thematic layout. However, there is no automatic criteria whereby one can predict how Schenker necessary will interpret every situation. This is especially so in those cases where an event is emphasized by certain musical features but deemphasized by others, such as when a harmony that is briefly stated or deemphasized texturally appears at a critical formal juncture.

Compared to many others, Schenker pays far less attention to the concepts of harmonic progression or function. Rather, he bases his tonal frameworks on contrapuntal/harmonic structures that are replicated through various levels, such described above in reference to Ex. 1. He certainly does not ascribe an *a priori* role to a chord based solely on its function, divorced from its context. For instance, in a number of situations he might interpret a tonic triad as subordinate to IV or V. Also unlike many others, Schenker's tonal models are not based directly on cadence structure or key structure. Thus, in many cases Schenker might interpret the tonic of a strongly asserted key area as playing a relatively subordinate role within the larger contrapuntal/harmonic framework. Conversely, he might read a harmony that is not the tonic of a key area as nonetheless serving a crucial role on the deepest levels of the tonal structure.

Schenker's reading of the opening of Haydn's Symphony 104, ii

As an example of Schenker's approach in action, Exx. 3a-d presents a layered reading based on Schenker's analysis of the opening of Haydn's Symphonie Nr. 104,2. Like Ex. 1, each of the voice-leading models in Exs. 3a-d presents a more elaborate version of the previous one, culminating with a voice-leading sketch. Notice in particular how Schenker reads the I⁶ and I of m. 3 as embraced within a larger motion from IV to V (see Exs. 3c and d). Perhaps influenced by the rhythmic and gestural features in m. 3, he interprets these tonic chords not as moments of resolution, but as supporting a passing tone B in the top voice. In Ex. 3c, the passing tone B is depicted as appearing at the end of m. 3, above G in the bass. In the more detailed sketch of Ex. 3d, however, this passing tone B is shown as delayed until m. 4, so that in this sketch the bass and upper voice of the G chord are not aligned. Since Schenker interprets the actual B that arrives on the last eighth note of m. 3 as part of a passing motion leading up from F-sharp to C, the B that appears at the end of m. 3 in Ex. 3d is not the same as the B that appears at the end of m. 3 in Ex. 3c.

Another striking feature of Schenker's interpretation is his suggestion that the C-B-A motive in the second half of the phrase echoes the B-A-G heard in mm. 1-2 (Ex. 3b). As a result, the second *Terzzug* here is partly generated diachronically from the first *Terzzug*. Also of special interest are the notes B-C-D-E in mm. 1-2 (see asterisks in Ex. 3d): though these notes are not linked contrapuntally, Schenker nonetheless hints that this ascending gesture is significant.

Had Schenker's goal been to prove the logical derivation of this phrase's tonal structure, arguably he could have done so more efficiently with the analysis shown in Ex. 3e, an alternate reading that nonetheless fully accords with his methodology. The reading in Ex. 3e, after all, is more straightforward: it interprets the IV of m. 2 as embraced within a tonic prolongation, it aligns all the notes of the bass and upper voice, and it shows all the notes and gestures generated directly from voice-leading operations. I personally much prefer Schenker's interpretation of Ex. 3d, since I feel it presents a more evocative and stimulating interpretation. That the analysis of Exx. 3d follows the reading by Schenker does not necessarily make it more "Schenkerian" than the one of Ex. 3e, however. Indeed, those who prefer more systematically logical readings might prefer Ex. 3e.

Example 3. J. Haydn, Symphony Nr. 104, 2, T. 1–4: (a)–(d) increasingly detailed voice-leading models, after Schenker (1935 [Anhang], Ex. 73,3, p. 34; Ex. 124,2a, p. 82); (e) alternate reading (cf. Ex. 3d).

(a) (b) (C–B–A echoes B–A–G)

G: I V I IV V

(c)

I IV V
bass G provides support for passing tone B in top voice

(d) ascending gesture (B–C–D–E) not connected by voice leading B is delayed from m. 3 until m. 4 (cf. Ex. 3c)!

I IV V
I and I⁶ in m. 3 appear within motion from IV to V

(e)

I (vi) IV V₂ I₆
(Stufenkreis)
IV of m. 2 appears within larger prolongation of I

The “Idealized Schenker” and Schenkerian Practice

The contrasting Schenkerian readings in Exx. 3d and 3e highlight the distinction between an analysis by Schenker and a “Schenkerian analysis,” and they also underline the difficulties in pinpointing how Schenker’s ideas should be characterized. Schenker’s central ideas evolved over the course over several decades. Although his basic outlook remained in place throughout much of his career, numerous details of his methodology changed, sometimes quite substantially. Sometimes, ideas Schenker expressed in one publication might be contradicted in his later writings, or even

within the same publication. In such cases, it cannot automatically be assumed that his later revisions represent improvements of his earlier ideas.

One should be skeptical when confronted with claims that any specific analytic reading represents how a composition would be or should be interpreted according to Schenkerian analysis. The notion that Schenker's ideas form a consistent, unified theory is based on a fabrication. Accordingly, one might differentiate the ideas of the "actual Schenker," based on the motley collection of what literally appears in his writings, from the ideas of an "idealized Schenker"—that is, his analytic method as it is typically characterized by his followers. The idealized form of Schenker's approach is based on selective citation of his writings (with preference usually given to his later writings) in which many of the contradictions and ambiguities have been ironed out. As a result, the idealized form Schenker tends to be more consistent, if somewhat less nuanced, than the actual Schenker.

At times it can be difficult to decide which of Schenker's published statements or analyses are to be included within an idealized version of his methodology. In some instances a published statement or analysis of Schenker's seems so strange that it almost surely should be considered an error that should be ignored. However, it is not always easy to determine whether an analysis or comment by Schenker is wrongheaded or if it involves important subtleties that deserve closer scrutiny. Though there is general agreement on the broad outlines of Schenker's concepts, disagreements arise when dealing with specifics of his philosophy or methods. As a result, how Schenker's analytic system is characterized varies depending on whom is asked. In discussing Schenker's method, those who value his approach for what they see as its systematic rigor and logic tend to be more aggressive in removing the inconsistencies and ambiguities found in his writings. Conversely, those who value his ideas for their interpretive and expressive power often seem to revel in Schenker's apparent inconsistencies.

No matter how it is characterized, however, it is safe to say that none of his followers today employ Schenker's analytic system precisely in the manner as he described it. This brings us to the third and broadest meaning of the term "Schenkerian analysis": namely, the hierarchic analytic approaches to tonal music that to varying degrees are influenced by Schenker, and which thus may be referred to as "Schenkerian practice."

Although they adopt many of the analytic ideas, notations, and procedures developed by Schenker, the Schenkerian analyses of his followers all depart from his concepts to at least some extent. Furthermore, they almost invariably combine Schenker's approach with strategies culled from other analytic approaches. His followers often appeal to authority by selectively citing Schenker's writings when it is convenient for them to do so, and they ignore them when it is not. In particular, Schenker's political stances, which he considered central to his musical outlook, have routinely been disregarded by his followers, including his closest students. "Modified Schenkerian approaches" are those that adopt many aspects of his methodology but depart strongly from some of Schenker's central ideas, such as the notion that tonal music should have a diatonic triadic basis.

Conversely, “orthodox Schenkerian approaches” are those that stick more closely to his models and specific techniques—though even the most orthodox approaches depart from Schenker’s lead in certain respects.

For instance, Schenker often suggests that elements such as form, rhythm, and orchestration are ultimately to be understood as shaped by voice-leading processes. His followers, on the other hand, are far more likely than Schenker to argue that these various other elements shape how a work’s voice-leading is to be understood. Whereas some of Schenker’s own analyses are devoted almost entirely to discussion of voice-leading, present-day Schenkerian practitioners almost always intertwine their analyses of a work’s voice-leading with examination of its other features. As a result, Schenker’s followers are more likely to support their voice-leading interpretations by invoking other analytic systems, including those that Schenker explicitly derided.

Naturally, there are certain tendencies that are usually connected with Schenkerian practice, particularly those closely associated with the typical idealized form of Schenker’s own ideas (such as described above regarding Ex. 1). Nevertheless, there is no strict definition for what precisely constitutes Schenkerian practice. Rather, its boundaries are determined by the ever-evolving application of concepts that are commonly associated with those espoused by Heinrich Schenker.

Reception of Schenker’s Approach

Schenker’s extensive reputation derives in large part to attitudes toward the role of tonal analysis that developed around the start of the twentieth century. Most serious musicians from this time onward did not seek to study of tonal analysis as an aid to composition, as was often the case in previous eras. Nor did they regard tonal analysis as a means of understanding an ever-expanding repertoire, one that included compositions that were heard for the first time as well as pieces that had not yet been composed. Rather, many post-1900 musicians treated tonal analysis as a tool to help them interpret masterpieces of an era that was considered to lie in the past, consisting of a core set of works by composers from Johann Sebastian Bach through Johannes Brahms. These masterpieces were ones that these musicians had heard and played numerous times and with which they were intimately familiar.

By around 1900, classically trained musicians tended no longer to be interested in entertaining the average listener or appealing to the mass public. Rather, their primary goal was to *interpret* masterpieces of the repertoire by transmitting the intentions of the composers who created these masterpieces, as revealed through a properly prepared Urtext score. To this end, it was common for these musicians to spend hours in the practice room honing their performance of small nuances of a composition, with the belief that refining such details of a short passage would reflect upon the larger section within which it appears, and this in turn would reflect upon the entire composition. As a result, they felt that a true understanding of a great composition required being able to hear and transmit the interconnections between its details and its larger architecture.

Schenker's approach—with its combination of systemization and artistic daring—strongly resonated with numerous musicians who adopted this attitude. Few other music analysts examined this repertoire with the intensity and thoroughness of Schenker. Even many of those musicians who were interested in repertoires that Schenker himself derided responded well to the intensity of his approach and his ability to connect the details of compositions to their larger framework.

The uncompromising and combative nature Schenker's rhetoric, punctuated by frequent side comments on political matters, initially impeded the spread of his ideas, however. Certainly, Schenker's cultural chauvinism and unabashed praise of the superiority of Austro-Germanic culture did not endear him to musicians from other European countries. Even in Germany and Austria, his repeated attacks on other scholars and musicians earned him many enemies. Nevertheless, Schenker did manage to garner a small cult following in Austria and Germany during the first few decades of the 1900s, until his writings were banned by National Socialist government in the 1930s. After 1945, Schenker's political writings became an embarrassment and delayed the acceptance of his ideas in post-war continental Europe.

Schenker's ideas flourished most quickly in North America. This is partly because several Schenker's most prominent followers immigrated to the New World in the wake of World War II. Furthermore, the ability to “translate” the meaning of European works created in a different time and place perhaps seemed more naturally desirable to those living on another continent. Especially during its initial years, those who promulgated Schenker's ideas in North America presented them in a more user-friendly manner than did Schenker. In transmitting his ideas, they stripped them of their political content, avoiding his blustery attacks on other musicians and music styles. They explained Schenker's concepts more patiently than did Schenker, initially simplifying them so as to make them more palatable to a large audience. Unfortunately, refashioning them for mass consumption also at times resulted in stripping these concepts of many important nuances. Only after Schenkerian practice took firm hold in North America were there extended efforts to deal directly with his writings, along with the subtler and more controversial aspects of his philosophy.

By the 1970s Schenkerian analysis had become a dominating force in North American studies of tonal music, forming a central part of university and conservatory curricula. Furthermore, some of its associated ideas have been integrated into several standard harmony and counterpoint textbooks. Owing largely to North American influence, the study of Schenkerian analysis has since increased in other countries as well. As a result, Schenkerian analysis is now intensively studied and taught in many places in Europe and elsewhere.

Schenker's popularity has been met with backlash among various scholars. A number of them challenge some of the underlying assumptions of his analytic method, which they regard as too rigid and arbitrary. They also question the appropriateness of regarding tonality in terms of a strict hierarchy, and—especially when dealing with the deeper levels—they wonder whether his models are truly audible. Among other things, Schenker's critics are disturbed by his seemingly

ahistoric attitude; his privileging of pitch over other musical elements; his apparent preference for diatonic tonic-dominant polarity, monotonality, and triadic tonality as a basis for all tonal music; and his downplaying of things such as moment-to-moment impressions, key areas, and harmonic function. More seriously, some of his detractors complain that it is not easy to separate the analytic approach developed by Schenker from his overtly racist and anti-democratic opinions (which Schenker himself insisted are intimately related to his conception of music), and thus by employing Schenker's analytic methods one risks promoting offensive aspects of his world view. Schenker's advocates sometimes counter that these criticisms are based on incorrect interpretation of Schenker's concepts (that is, they try to adjust how the "idealized Schenker" should be characterized). In other instances, his followers acknowledge the problems and limitations of Schenker's approach, and then simply modify or adapt their own Schenkerian analyses as they deem appropriate.

II EMBLEMATIC ANALYSES

Haydn Symphony No. 104, ii, entire movement

As a sample Schenkerian analysis of an entire movement, Ex. 4 presents a voice-leading sketch of Haydn's *Symphonie Nr. 104, 2*, based on my own interpretation of this piece. It is by no means the only possible interpretation, and it does not pretend to present an empirically falsifiable proof of the composition's tonality or quality, how the composer conceived the piece, or how the average listener subconsciously hears the piece. Rather, it is a heuristic interpretation that suggests how I feel one could rewardingly perceive the movement's tonal layout, and in this regard this analysis is typical of current Schenkerian practice. Also typical of Schenkerian practice, in this analysis a number of details are omitted— not because they are unimportant, but because of space limitations. Given unlimited number of pages, a series of subsequent, more detailed analytic layers could be provided until every passage in this movement would be scrutinized with the same amount of detail witnessed in Ex. 3 above.

Ex. 4a proposes that this movement is framed by a large I- \flat III-V-I. Following standard Schenkerian practice, this analysis focuses on important *Stufen*, not key areas. Thus, for instance, although the V of mm. 68–73 is *not* the tonic of a key area, it is included within the deepest structural level, as a result of its emphasized appearance at the sustained half-cadence that concludes the B section. Conversely, the D minor in mm. 42–45, though the tonic of part of a key area that is strongly asserted, is depicted as having a relatively low-level role in the voice-leading structure.

Also in accordance with modern Schenkerian practice, this analysis supports its voice-leading interpretation with analysis of other musical elements, as is suggested by the annotations in Ex. 4a. For instance, notice how thematic returns help demarcate large-scale tonal returns, and how the cadences reinforce important *Stufen*. The audibility of the connection between the

relatively distant <flat>III and the main tonality is aided by the concatenation of closely related keys (see the letters in between the staves of Ex. 4a, starting in m. 40; note that the succession of these closely related keys is similar to what might be pointed out in a Neo-Riemannian analysis as a PLR cycle leading from the D chord of m. 40 to the home key of G major). Furthermore, the entrances of the trumpets and tympani—limited to the notes D and A—serve as types of tonal signposts that mark the relative distance from the underlying tonality (see asterisks above the top staff in Ex. 4a). Not every prominent event on the surface of the music corresponds to a large voice-leading event, however. For instance, the large-scale return of the tonic Stufe in m. 74 coincides with a subdued return of the main theme (*forte* outbursts are wittily deferred until mm. 88–89).

As often is the case, this voice-leading analysis has ramifications for understanding the movement's expressive and narrative layout. For example, the G triads of mm. 27 and 31 (see the † symbols in Ex. 4a) are interpreted as subordinate to IV (or ii⁶). This suggests that the tonal tensions in this passage are sustained while resolution to a deep-level tonic Stufe is delayed until m. 33. A particularly fascinating passage arises toward the climax of the A' section (Ex. 4b), where the motivic parallelisms between voice-leading events that appear on different structural levels (highlighted by brackets in Ex. 4b) form what Schenker calls "hidden repetitions." In m. 105, one expects the arrival of IV, with the notes D-sharp and F-sharp embellishing E in the top voice (cf. the analogous mm. 23–25 of the A' section). Instead, however, the expected IV is supplanted by a minor iv, after which the music seems to get lost in a reverie as it struggles to complete the upper-voice motive. Only after triumphantly restarting in m. 122 is the music able to bring to the D<sharp>-F<sharp>-E motive to fruition (see m. 128–130). An understanding of the embracing tonal and motivic structure in this passage helps set in relief its dreamlike tonal diversions.

Example 4. Haydn, Symphony Nr. 104, 2, voice-leading sketches: (a) entire movement; (b) T. 98–141. (* = entrances of tympani and trumpets; †= I chords embedded with larger prolongation)

(a)

T. 1 8 16 17 22 23 27 28 31 32 33 38 40 42 46 53 55 60 64 65 68-73 74 90 141

A a b a' B A' a b a'

PAC in V HC PAC PAC in bIII HC PAC

(D) d B^b g G

theme in G minor modulation from D minor to B^b sequences from B^b to G minor

I bIII 5 6 V I

key of D minor (but not deep-level Stufe) deep-level Stufe (but not key area)

(b)

T. 103 105 109 114 119-120 122 128-130 140 141

E^b F (?) D[#] F[#] (?) D[#] F[#] E!

I I⁶ iv (!) V I I⁶ IV V I

Ombra Flöte recitativo Tutti

“Ihr Bild”

Schenkerian analysis also can help illuminate expressive features in vocal works. An example of this may be witnessed in Carl Schachter’s examination of Franz Schubert’s setting of Heinrich Heine’s “Ihr Bild” (Schachter 1999, pp. 299–302). As with any Schenkerian analysis, this one by Schachter presents just one of the possible Schenkerian interpretations. Other published Schenkerian analyses of “Ihr Bild” include those found in Forte & Gilbert (1982b, pp. 105–106); Schwartz (1997, pp. 72–74); Wintle (2000); Lewin (2006, pp. 135–147); and Hust (2008, pp. 192–199). These various Schenkerian readings differ in several specifics not only from each other, but also from Heinrich Schenker’s own analysis of this song in Schenker (1921). The following

discussion of “Ihr Bild” focuses on Schachter’s interpretation not because his reading is definitive, but because it is a highly celebrated analysis that exemplifies the possibilities offered by the Schenkerian approach.

In the first and third strophes of Heine’s poem, the (presumably male) narrator relates his reactions as he stares at the portrait of his deceased “Geliebte” (who is described in the second strophe). Schachter interprets D-natural, the major-third scale degree, as this song’s “Kopftön”—that is, as the tone that initiates the stepwise melodic descent that frames the voice leading (Example 5a). For a major-third scale degree to serve as the *Kopftön* in a *minor*-key piece is highly unusual. Schachter argues that this conspicuous assertion of the major mode within a minor-key context reflects the narrator’s resistance to accepting his beloved’s death. As further evidence of this seemingly deliberate attempt to assert the major mode, Schachter points to the conspicuous avoidance of G-flat within the otherwise chromatic descending tetrachords leading from B-flat to F in the song’s A and A’ sections (Ex. 5b).

Example 5. F. Schubert, “Ihr Bild”: (a) voice-leading sketch, after Schachter (1999); (b)–(c) quotations.

(a)

T. 1 3 9 10 11 12 15–22 23 24 25–34 (=3–12) 35
 A (1. strophe) B (2. strophe) A (3. strophe)

D: Kopftön!

"starrt"

B major gradually emerges:
 "das Geliebte...zu leben begann"

G major → B minor!
 "Bild" → "starrt"

B major: → B minor!
 "ich kann es nicht glauben"

(b) T. 10–11, 32–33 descending tetrachord, but no G♭!

(c) T. 15 descending minor tetrachord, with F pulling up to G♭... 23

...is embraced within larger tetrachord, with G♭ moving down to F

G-flat appears in full force within the song’s middle section, however (mm. 15–22; see Ex. 5a). At this point the music modulates to the key of G-flat major, and the G-flat triad is then prolonged in the bass until m. 22. Significantly, it is within this middle section that the narrator most directly discusses the woman in the portrait. Schachter remarks that during the middle section there is an allusion to the descending minor tetrachord, but observes that the pitch F here initially leads *upward* in its role as the leading tone of G-flat—as if the beloved momentarily comes to life (see bracket above the staff in Ex. 5c). The reality of her death returns in mm. 23–24,

however, where the G-flat now moves *downward* to F, thereby concluding the descending minor tetrachord that embraces the entire middle section (see bracket below the staff in Ex. 5c).

In his own discussion of this song, Schenker (1921) claims that the opening, two-note gesture, which appears in mm. 1-2 and 23-24, represents the act of the narrator's staring at the portrait (see brackets below the staff in Ex. 5a). Thus, much as the woman in the portrait appears only through the eyes of narrator, so the G-flat that is prolonged during the song's second strophe (that is, when the woman is directly discussed) ultimately serves as an embellishment that resolves within a gesture associated with the "male gaze." In this regard, it is worth comparing Schubert's song with Clara Schumann's setting of this same text, published as her Op. 13, 1. In Schumann's setting, the strophe that discusses the woman in the portrait is *not* isolated from the other sections, but is motivically and harmonically connected to them (Ex. 6). Instead of existing solely within the "male gaze," in Schumann's song the character of the woman seems more fleshed out, as arguably is underscored by a voice-leading analysis. To what extent the differing approaches of Schubert and Schumann have larger hermeneutic or socio-cultural implications is a matter of speculation, though surely analysis of the voice-leading structure of these songs could play in an important role in exploring these implications.

Example 6. Voice-leading sketch of Clara Schumann, Op. 13, 1 (cf. Ex. 5a).

T. 6 7 13 15 19 23 24 27 28 30 31

A (1. strophe) B (2. strophe) A' (3. strophe)

G A \flat C B \flat G A \sharp C B \sharp → B \flat

2nd strophe (Bild: "[ihre] Thränen") and 3rd strophe (ich: "meine Thränen") are motivically and harmonically strongly connected

III DISCUSSION

In recent years, there has been an upsurge of studies on Schenker and his cultural milieu. This has helped encourage scholars to reexamine some of the subtleties of his approach that previously have been overlooked, as well as to reevaluate analytic possibilities that Schenker might have pushed aside too quickly. Considering that Schenker's world view differs so greatly from that of most musicians today, it is not surprising that his concepts are often modified in their current applications.

These modifications are particularly apparent when applying Schenkerian analysis to the repertoires that Schenker himself avoided, such as pre-1700 music, post-1900 music, popular music, jazz, and non-Western music. In dealing with these styles, as well as some music of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, many of Schenker's followers amend his methods to allow for models that have a chromatic, modal, or non-triadic basis, at times combined with insights from other analytic strategies such as those that involve set theory or Neo-Riemannian theory. Compared to Schenker, his followers tend to be far more accepting of more than one possible valid perspective for understanding a musical composition. For instance, they are more likely to consider how understanding of a work's voice-leading may be colored by different historical or cultural perspectives, different viable performances, or different moments of temporal perspective that arise while listening to a composition. A topic of particular interest in Schenkerian practice is the analysis of rhythm and hypermeter, and there are many studies in this area that mix standard Schenkerian concepts and analytic notation with durational voice-leading reductions.

Furthermore, as noted earlier, almost all modern Schenkerian analyses combine their voice-leading readings with other analytic methodologies, such as those discussed in other chapters of this handbook. In some instances, the elements that are the focus of the different analytic approaches might seem to clash with Schenkerian reading, as when an important thematic return (such as might be highlighted by a *Formenlehre* approach) appears in the middle of a large-scale harmonic motion (such as might be highlighted by a voice-leading analysis). The resulting conflict between thematic layout and voice-leading structure does not necessarily suggest a contradiction between the different analytic approaches, however. On the contrary, such a conflict can serve as an important source of musical expression that can be illuminated by applying Schenkerian methodology in combination with other analytic systems.

There also are several other analytic methods devoted to exploring tonal hierarchy that developed before and after Schenker. A number of scholars who use these other methods cite Schenker as an important influence but acknowledge that their approaches differ too widely from Schenker's model to be appropriately classified as Schenkerian analysis. Not only do these other approaches discard many of Schenker's specific analytic techniques, but many of them also are rooted in cognitive or linguistic methodologies in a manner that is far removed from Schenker's lead.

These other methodologies in turn have influenced some of those that are more directly aligned with standard Schenkerian practice, which creates further confusion for those who seek a clear dividing line that separates what should be classified as Schenkerian analysis from what should not. The resulting confusion is amplified when people group all these divergent methods together when discussing what is permitted or not according to “Schenkerian Theory,” as though Schenkerian practice and the various methodologies that are loosely allied with it form a unified analytic system. As noted above, although what is generally regarded as Schenkerian practice is associated with certain broad tendencies, it nonetheless embraces a wide range of practices and philosophical and methodological approaches that constantly evolve, much as is the case with other analytic approaches discussed within this handbook.

Selected Bibliography

Berry, D 2004, *A Topical Guide to Schenkerian Literature*, Hillsdale NY, Pendragon Press.

Eybl, M 1995, *Ideologie und Methode. Zum ideengeschichtlichen Kontext von Schenkers Musiktheorie*, Wien, Tutzing.

Schachter, C 1999. »Structure as foreground: ‘das Drama des Ursatzes’«, in *Schenker Studies 2*, hrsg. Carl Schachter und Hedi Siegel, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, S. 298-314.

Schenker, H 1906-1935, *Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien*, 3 Bde.:

- Bd. I: *Harmonielehre*, Stuttgart, J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1906, nachd. Universal-Edition, 1978.
- Bd. II: *Kontrapunkt*, Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1910 and 1922, nachd. Hildesheim, Olms, 1991.
- Bd. III: *Der freie Satz*, Wien, Universal-Edition, 1935; aufl., hrsg., und bearb. Jonas, O 1956.

Schenker, H 1921-24, *Der Tonwille*, nachd. Hildesheim, Olms, 1990.

Schenker, H 1925-30, *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik: ein Jahrbuch*, nachd. Hildesheim, Olms, 1974.

SDO [*Schenker Documents Online*] 2016. <http://www.schenkerdocumentsonline.org/index.html>