

## Review

*Studies in Music With Text*, by David Lewin. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Reviewed by Jeannie Ma. Guerrero

*I write about myself with the same pencil and in the same exercise book as about him.  
It is no longer I, but another whose life is just beginning.*

- Samuel Beckett, *Malone Dies*.

A casual observer might remark that David Lewin seems to embody two personae: one as the author of the oft-cited *Generalized Music Intervals and Transformations*, the other of numerous, less-cited writings on text-music relations.<sup>1</sup> *Studies in Music With Text* deals with this latter persona. The observer might also note that the field at large did not reflect Lewin's equal devotion to his two sides: transformation-theory and Neo-Riemannian topics regularly populate sessions at music-theory conferences and have even filled entire issues of music-theory journals, yet no music-text counterpart enjoys comparable visibility or solidarity. The observer might wonder whether this imbalance stemmed from the facility and precision (and anonymity, ironically) to which K-nets and other mathematically derived constructs can be transmitted and implemented, especially in limited musical repertoires. In contrast, the more nebulous text-music analyses span wider repertoires and display more of Lewin's idiomatic, inimitable flair. The two-Lewin phenomenon deserves more examination than can be provided here, but it nonetheless casts an image that the present review ultimately seeks to dispel.

Imbalances aside, Oxford University Press has collected, in *Studies in Music With Text*, nineteen essays by Lewin on seven widely ranging topics: Mozart's *Le nozze di Figaro*,

---

<sup>1</sup> A reprint of the first edition of *Generalized Musical Intervals and Transformations* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987) has been issued by Oxford and is edited by Lewin's student Edward Gollin (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Schubert's songs, Clara and Robert Schumann's songs, Wagner's operas, Brahms's duet *Die Schwestern*, Schoenberg's vocal music, and Babbitt's *Philomel*.<sup>2</sup> Twelve of the essays have appeared in print elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> All seven new chapters—and unpublished notes on Schoenberg's Op. 15, No. II—furnished material for Lewin's text-and-music seminar, whose participants speak in footnotes throughout the book.<sup>4</sup> The collection's broad scope defies comprehensive coverage, so I shall limit the present review to four of the newly published pieces (Chapters 6 through 9) concerning Schubert and the Schumanns, which probably constituted works in progress.<sup>5</sup>

The breadth of his interests notwithstanding, Lewin unites new and old ideas: "I seem to be looking for ways in which music and text ... *enact* each other. I like the term 'enact' better than 'read' or 'allegorize,' because the term emphasizes *gestural*—often even *bodily*—aspects of the interrelation" (xii, emphasis original). It would be worthwhile to trace the precise relationship between the origins of Lewin's dramaturgy to that of writers such as Edward T.

---

<sup>2</sup> The following briefly summarizes the layout of chapters in the book: Part I, Mozart—3 chapters; Part II, Schubert—3 chapters; Part III, The Schumanns—3 chapters; Part IV, Wagner—3 chapters; Part V, Brahms—1 chapter; Part VI, Schoenberg—5 chapters; Part VII, Babbitt—1 chapter.

<sup>3</sup> "Figaro's Mistakes," *Current Musicology* 57 (1995): 45-60; "Musical Analysis as Stage Direction," in *Music and Text: Critical Inquiries*, ed. Steven Paul Scher (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1992); "Music Theory, Phenomenology, and Modes of Perception," *Music Perception* 3.4 (1986): 327-92; "Auf dem Flusse: Image and Background in a Schubert Song," in *Schubert: Critical and Analytical Studies*, ed. Walter Frisch (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1986); "Amfortas's Prayer to Titirel and the Role of D in *Parsifal*," *19th Century Music* 7.3 (1984): 336-49; "Some Notes on Analyzing Wagner: *The Ring* and *Parsifal*," *19th Century Music* 16.1 (1992): 49-58; "Women's Voices and the Fundamental Bass," *The Journal of Musicology* 10.4 (1992): 464-82; "Toward the Analysis of a Schoenberg Song (Op. 15, No. XI)," *Perspectives of New Music* 12.1 (1973-74): 43-86; "A Way into Schoenberg's Opus 15, Number VII," *In Theory Only* 6.1 (1981): 3-24; "Vocal Meter in Schoenberg's Atonal Music, with a Note on Serial *Hauptstimme*," *In Theory Only* 6.4 (1982): 12-36; "Moses und Aron: Some General Remarks and Analytical Notes for Act I, Scene 1," *Perspectives of New Music* 6.1 (1967): 1-17; "Some Problems and Resources of Music Theory," *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy* 5.2 (1991): 111-32.

<sup>4</sup> Cited participants include Natalie Boisvert, Ed Gollin, Cynthia Gonzales, and Lara Pellegrinelli, who all participated in the Harvard course before I did. Of course, other students and individuals appear (such as Lori Burns and Brian Hyer), but through their published work rather than as voices from the classrooms in Paine Hall at Harvard University.

<sup>5</sup> The other new chapters are, in order of appearance: "Crudel! *Perchè finora...*, [from *Le nozze di Figaro*]" and its "Postscript: A Methodological Note"; "Tristan: Well-Made Play and Theater of Passion; The Teleology of Functional Tonality and the Self-Propagation of Transformational Atonality"; and "Die Schwestern."

Cone (whom Lewin often cited), who writes in *The Composer's Voice* that “all music, like all literature, is dramatic... [E]very composition is an utterance depending on an act of impersonation which it is the duty of the performer or performers to make clear.”<sup>6</sup> All the same, and in partial fulfillment of this agenda, the script of Chapters 6 through 9 stars Schenker, Schenkerism, and Schenkerians in the service of pursuing a *tertium quid* [some third thing], a character who enters stage left during Chapter 8:

The [*Ursatz*] would be neither strictly functional tonally, nor strictly Phrygian as an expanded cadence. It would be some sort of *tertium quid*, so far as canonical models for modal and tonal cadence-structures are concerned.<sup>7</sup> (166)

The ensuing review pursues the meaning of these printed words, which only incompletely document Lewin's thoughts on a number of issues.

Lewin generally challenges existing analytical methods, Schenkerism in the case of the chapters on Schubert and the Schumanns, but he also calls for open-mindedness, as evidenced by his prefatory remarks. Part III's Preface serves up a muted but nonetheless savory morsel: “Theoretical matters involving Schenkerian analysis come to the fore; I touch on some, if only in a cursory way, to suggest paths for more thorough investigation” (151). The book's main introduction better avoids predisposing the reader to any preconceived notions: “Two of the Schumann essays investigate a music-theoretical topic as they explore, within their respective songs, relations between minor tonality and Phrygian modality” (xi). Part II, especially Chapter

---

<sup>6</sup> Edward T. Cone, *The Composer's Voice* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 5. Incidentally, David Clampitt's review for *Notes* ([December 2006]: 340-42), also highlights the dramatic focus; in contrast to my review but in its spirit, Clampitt devotes most of his brief time to Chapter 4, which reprints “Music Theory, Phenomenology, and Modes of Perception.”

<sup>7</sup> The phrase surfaces earlier, in print at least, at the beginning of Chapter 8 in *Generalized Musical Intervals and Transformations*, p. 175: “On the one hand, we could conceive of [the fundamental-bass network's] arrows as signifying intervals between individual elements, in this case roots. On the other hand, we could also conceive of the arrows as signifying transformational relations between Gestalts, in this case chords or harmonies, or even potential keys. Resolving the ambiguity, we could also conceive of the arrows as denoting some *tertium quid*, a phenomenon whose manifestations include both harmonic intervals between pitch classes and transformational relations between chords” [emphasis mine].

4, presents the strongest challenge to Schenkerian analysis, which might explain Lewin's neutral preface: "'Music Theory, Phenomenology, and Modes of Perception,' although quite extensive and broad in theoretical scope, draws heavily from examples on the middle section of *Morgengruß*. It was published in *Music Perception*, vol. 3, no. 4 (1986)" (51).<sup>8</sup> The book's introduction similarly avoids suggestive language: "One of the Schubert essays is primarily about the phenomenology of listening; to illustrate its critical stance and technical apparatus it discusses a Schubert song in some depth" (xi). Nonetheless, the morsel in Part III's Preface flavors other sections of the book, including Part II as well as Part I's Postscript.

Without prejudicial fanfare, the analysis of Schubert's *Ihr Bild* (Chapter 6) lays some foundations for a *tertium quid*. Lewin had conceived the analysis by the early 1970s while writing "Toward the Analysis of a Schoenberg Song" (reprinted as Chapter 15), whose footnotes carry the main points raised in Chapter 6.<sup>9</sup> The song foils Schenkerian analysis through its patchwork phrase structure, in which antecedent and consequent phrases articulate distinct tonalities without transition (B-flat minor, B-flat major). A man, presumably, stares at a portrait of his beloved to minor-mode music. The portrait comes to life in the opposite mode. A contrasting middle section in G-flat major finds the woman in the portrait smiling and weeping, whereupon the antecedent-consequent pair returns. The man weeps in the minor mode, but inexplicably, he exclaims "I cannot believe that I have lost you!" in the major mode, which the piano shatters by commandeering the tonality back to B-flat minor. Few have commented on the

---

<sup>8</sup> Time and space do not permit a fuller explication of the article's stance, but to state the matter briefly, "our [phenomenological] model enables us to bypass certain false dichotomies in analytic discourse, dichotomies that rise when we implicitly but erroneously suppose that we are discussing *one* phenomenon at one location in phenomenological space-time, when in fact we are discussing *many* phenomena at many distinct such locations" (79, emphasis original). In particular, Schenkerian discourse encourages analysts to adopt such fixity in identification and thus perception: "In my article on phenomenology and music theory, I went so far as to challenge the Platonic THE in expressions like 'THE B flat in measure 12.' I also challenged the word 'IS' in statements like 'THE harmony of measure 15 IS such-and-such.' The issue in greatest generality might be termed 'Hidden prior restraints in common linguistic conventions'" (391, emphasis original).

<sup>9</sup> Notes 1, 5, and 12 (pp. 284, 299, and 312 in the Oxford volume).

song, perhaps precisely because of its fragmented tonal areas.<sup>10</sup>

Lewin confronts Schenker's essay from *Der Tonwille* in full view, but deep resonances between both writers hide behind the curtain.<sup>11</sup> Lewin relegates Schenker to a single utterance in the main text, in which he describes the piano's enigmatic prelude: "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 wonderfully transported to the side of the unhappy lover, who stands there . . . staring at the portrait.' [Pastille, 31]" (139-40).<sup>12</sup> Schenker soliloquizes offstage in three footnotes, where Lewin interjects with asides that all but express annoyance that Schenker disregards the verb-tense shifts central to his own interpretation. The following is intended to read as an imaginary interaction between Lewin and Schenker:<sup>13</sup>

Schenker's verbal discussion of the epilogue is perfunctory and unsatisfactory.

---

<sup>10</sup> Interestingly enough, the few who have actually published on the song also seem to have made contact with Lewin during his work on it: Joseph Kerman and Carl Schachter visited Harvard, each teaching for a semester there (Kerman in 1998 and Schachter in 1991-92 and 1996); Lewin knew Allen Forte for most of his life; and Lewin met Pastille during a colloquium at Cornell (some time between 1980 and 1985, according to Pastille). A recent, uncited study (read against Freud and Lacan) of *Ihr Bild* may be found in David Schwarz's *Listening Subjects: Music, Psychoanalysis, Culture* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1997), 72-86. Beyond its shared connection to the psychoanalytic tradition, Lewin's search for a *tertium quid* may bear formal resemblances to Schwarz's "listening as a space": "I suggested that listening as a thing is produced when a piece of music is described and analyzed as if from a stable perspective. Listening as a space is produced when a piece of music enunciates a crossing of thresholds between or among music theory, history, psychoanalysis, and personal experience(s). Combining Schenkerian voice leading and psychoanalysis to listen to 'Der Doppelgänger' and 'Ihr Bild' can produce fantasies of the music as *thing* or *space*, depending on whether the two registers are *subordinated* or *coordinated* to one another. Subordination tends to produce a representation of thingness; it denotes a stable relation between a basic, primary structure and a dependent, secondary structure or feature. If I assert, for example, that the psychoanalytic material of this chapter is subordinated to the Schenkerian voice-leading analyses, then I produce a representation of the music as if a thing. Coordination, on the other hand, tends to produce fantasies of space, more a signifying structure that is open than a signified structure that is closed. This is how Schenker and psychoanalysis relate in these songs—as coordinated structures of listening space" (85-6). In general, the new chapters make few references, which prompts Arnold Whittall to yearn for more "editorial intervention"—something that the editors expressly sought to avoid—at the end of his review for *The Musical Times* (147.1896 [Autumn 2006]: 109-13). All the same, Whittall's review provides valuable insight on the chapters about Wagner.

<sup>11</sup> Heinrich Schenker, "Franz Schubert, *Ihr Bild*," trans. William Pastille, *Sonus* 6.2 (1986): 31-37.

<sup>12</sup> Lewin devotes considerable time to the piano's barren opening gesture, drawing upon Joseph Kerman's survey of Schubert's Preludes (Joseph Kerman, "A Romantic Detail in Schubert's *Schwanengesang*," *Musical Quarterly* 48 [1962]: 36-49).

<sup>13</sup> The focus on verb tenses also stems from the article on Opus 15, whose reading of the poem hinges similarly on Stefan George's verb-tense shifts.

*Review: Lewin's Studies in Music With Text*

[Schenker:] “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.[”] [Schenker, 37]

[Lewin:] 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.

[Schenker:] “Gloomy minor engulfs the whole inner landscape....” [Schenker, 37] (142-43)

...

[Schenker:] “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].

[Lewin:] Schenker is beautifully sensitive to the emotional nuances of the final situation, though his analysis takes no explicit notice of the tense systems in the text—he describes the poem’s events in the present tense throughout the essay. (143)

In fact, Schenker’s commentary generates a map isomorphic to Lewin’s time plan; Example 1 transcribes Lewin's organization of the song into a four-fold division of narrative time (139).

Example 1: Lewin's “The Music's Map”

<u>Past 2</u>	<u>Past 1</u>	<u>Present A</u>	<u>Present B</u>
	First stanza		
	1. B-flat minor: i -> V		
	2. B-flat major: I cadence		
Middle stanza			
G-flat major tonicization			
	1. B-flat minor: i -> V		
		2. B-flat major: I cadence	
			Piano epilogue

Where Lewin’s map conveys psychic time, Schenker’s conveys space (shown by Example 2, my

representation of Schenker's ideas in a format that can be easily compared to Example 1):

Thus, with the very first stroke, Schubert reveals himself as a true sorcerer, who instantly ties a mysterious band around the outward action (in this case, staring at a portrait), around the heart of the unfortunate lover, and around us—a ribbon that ensures for this event, beyond its single occurrence, a neverending future always full of renewed presence.<sup>14</sup>

Example 2: Hypothetical map of Schenker's narrative zones

<u>Internal (protagonist)</u>	<u>External (protagonist)</u>	<u>External (composer)</u>
	First stanza 1. B-flat minor 2. B-flat major	
Middle stanza G-flat major		
	Last stanza 1. B-flat minor 2. B-flat major	
		Piano epilogue

However, the reader sees so little of Schenker's commentary that such essential commonalities might be easily missed. It would thus be dangerous to inflate Lewin's negative assessment of Schenker by relying solely on the printed words.

Lewin spends the remainder of the essay explaining his dissatisfaction with all other known readings of the song, as rendered by Carl Schachter, Allen Forte and Steven Gilbert, and William Pastille.<sup>15</sup> All the graphs, including Schenker's, share the propensity to render the song mono-tonal, thereby vanquishing one of the two competing key areas. Schachter privileges the

---

<sup>14</sup> Pastille, 31-32. Lewin does not quote the passage here.

<sup>15</sup> Carl Schachter, "Structure as Foreground: 'das Drama des Ursatzes,'" in *Schenker Studies 2*, ed. Carl Schachter and Hedi Siegel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 298-314; as Edward Gollin, editor of the present volume, notes, Schachter's ideas first came forth during a lecture at Harvard. Allen Forte and Steven E. Gilbert, *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1982), 218. Lewin reconstructs an analysis based on one that Pastille made for him during a colloquium at Cornell, quite accurately, according to Pastille (private correspondence with the author).

B-flat major sections to the exclusion of the B-flat minor sections. Pastille achieves the inverse by delaying the *Uralinie* to the piano's B-flat minor postlude. Forte and Gilbert bridge both tonalities in favor of B-flat minor, to Lewin's dissatisfaction and to the exhaustion of all graphable possibilities. However, rather than dismiss Schenkerian methods entirely, Lewin abruptly drops the matter:

The reader may perhaps be asking, what is the point of all my obsessive speculation about Schenkerian background readings...? 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."... [M]y 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. (147)

However, Lewin's words again do not relate the whole story.

Twenty-odd years earlier—in print, but perhaps not in actual time—Lewin pursued the matter in "Toward the Analysis of a Schoenberg Song," which complements *Ihr Bild* in several ways. A sudden verb-tense shift concludes both poems, and both also address an otherwise unnamed '*dich*' at their conclusions. Most importantly, both songs present a "both/and" situation that runs counter to (Schenkerian) "either/or" strategizing, which strives toward a single outcome.<sup>16</sup> The 1970s piece introduces a *tertium-quid* prototype when weighing two meanings of the piano's introduction:

[A]re we to take the piano introduction as symbolizing a reality external to the singer...[o]r are we to take it as a projection of the singer's internal present musings, thoughts and feelings quite likely unconscious or pre-conscious?... The interpretation that satisfies me best is some amalgam of the above two extremes... A both/and approach to the problem is consistent with the idea that what actually

---

<sup>16</sup> The reader will hopefully recall that Schachter numbers among the symbolic few cited in the Schubert essay, though the following reference does not appear: Carl Schachter, "Either/Or," in *Schenker Studies*, ed. Hedi Siegel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). It must be continually borne in mind that Lewin (and the author of the present review) has no intention of condemning Schenkerian methods. Schachter, for instance, shares much in common with Lewin and evoked his admiration, as evidenced in "Structure as Foreground": "In doing analysis, in teaching it, in trying to learn it, even in reading Schenker's graphs, it can become all too easy to fall into the heresy of valuing the work's deep structure more highly than the work itself ... [U]ltimately the analysis must lead back to the work and must illuminate its sensuous surface" (313-14).



happened in the past seems hard to separate, in this song, from the present memories and recall abilities of the singer. (298-99)

Lewin elaborates his answer to this question directly in the chapters on the Schumanns, which I shall discuss later.

As an indirect explanation of what a “both/and” strategy might involve for *Ihr Bild*, Lewin offers the temporal map in Example 1. The reader must follow its implication in lieu of direct commentary, an implication that I will now explore. *Ihr Bild*'s focal point, the starting act, serves as a gateway to a continuous cycle of possession and loss. Indeed, the piano's introduction could conclude as easily as open the piece, inviting the performer to render it ambiguously. One might even go so far as to suggest that a different “song” has concluded by the time *Ihr Bild* begins. Rather than observe it in progress, the listener intrudes upon an event to which full access is withheld. The device might be likened to one used in Romantic painting, in which the subject faces into the background, leaving the viewer to derive the image's action from the surrounding, often richly rendered, landscape. This explains *Ihr Bild*'s fragmented dispersal of musical action. B-flat major only reconstructs the portrait coming to life (in the man's imagination) and the sudden exclamation, betraying the narrator's selective memory. Likewise, B-flat minor dually denies action, suspending the present to enable the illusion to unfold and ignoring the past by omitting cadences (until the piano's brutal postlude). The song alludes to the act of loss rather than portray it; again, that event just might be a “song” to which *Ihr Bild* serves as a nostalgic coda. Thus, Schubert concatenates various snapshots into a quasi-collage, doing nothing to counteract each fragment's shedding of harmonic context.

This reading that illustrates Lewin's *tertium quid* cannot arise without a co-existing *primum* and *secundum*, as represented by variant Schenkerian readings. Herein lies Lewin's background challenge to “either/or” thinking, which assumes center stage in the phenomenology

article:

When we are using words like “merely” to put down certain of our perceptions, we are likely to call other perceptions “important” or “more important”... They are suspect because they inferentially put down the precepts that are “unimportant” or “less important.” They are also suspect because “importance” is too imprecise a word to be useful in critical discourse. The word casually suggests unspecified criteria of aesthetic value, as if the values had been stated explicitly and the word was descriptive. And—often at the same time—the word can be used carelessly as a synonym for “priority in a syntactic system” or “rank in a formal hierarchy.” The two careless usages, compounding each other, can lead the unwary critic to confuse syntactic priority with aesthetic value, a confusion that is particularly dangerous when one is using Schenkerian or post-Schenkerian music theories. (82-3)

Rather than eliminate alternative scenarios to find a single solution, Lewin allows multiple, parallel universes to accumulate, any of which could attain primacy from a certain perspective. Further, the listener can engage in quasi-free transposition between universes, thereby usurping the habit or desire to be anchored to one “truest” or “best” reading. Philosophically, the critique of Schenkerian analysis seems to end here, but the still-evolving hunt for a *tertium quid*—which addresses all hearings and analytical methods that aim for fixity—ranges into the other newly published chapters.

Beyond presenting an un-model of phenomenological perception, Lewin generalizes his *tertium quid* to other musical languages, just as he had extended his phenomenology model to other musical dimensions (such as duration). In “*Anfangs wollt'ich*” (Chapter 8), two musical languages assume the roles of *primum* and *secundum quae* respectively, functional tonality and Palestrina-era modality. A chorale melody underlies the song, whose antecedent phrase articulates D minor to the text, “At first I almost wanted to give up; And I thought I could never bear it” (161, Lewin's translation). The consequent loses its D-minor bearings, culminating on a tonal half cadence that lives a double life as a full cadence in Phrygian modality: “And yet I *have* borne it—; Just do not ask me, ‘How?’” The double reading arises from Lewin's desire to hear a

conclusive ending to the song precisely where most tonal hearings leave it open, a detail that radically affects the song's interpretation.

A tonal reading implies that the narrator has *not* successfully borne the burden; a modal reading enables the song to close. A *tertium quid* presents both possibilities simultaneously. One might imagine Heine occasionally wondering whether discomfort will further cripple him while simultaneously marveling that he has trudged thus far. A *tertium-quid* synthesis thus does not merely present a third alternative: "Characteristic for the song, I believe, is a certain rhythm or progression, from one unambiguous hearing to the other—or at least the possibility of the other" (166). Thereupon ensues the most extensive elaboration of the *tertium quid* that Lewin ever provides:

It would be nice to have a theoretical-analytic system for representing structural voice-leading that responded better to this issue [the relation between the two hearings]. I can imagine a sort of morphing hypertext that moved from one window like Example 8.1b [the tonal graph], to another window like Example 8.1a [the modal graph], in some pertinent way. But at present I cannot work out this notion as anything more than a fantasy.<sup>17</sup> (167)

The argumentation then reaffirms the need for a stable, *primum* reading:

In this connection it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish to abandon the notion of "an" Ursatz altogether, as somehow "irrelevant" to some soi-disant "more sophisticated" hearing. Any background analysis does crucial work in specifying just what some metastable hearing of the piece is. Without a background analysis, we should be reduced to more or less impressionistic discussion of large-scale voice-leading possibilities, and such a return to pre-Schenkerian hermeneutics (as if Schenker had never happened) would surely lower, rather than raise, the level of sophistication in our discourse. (167)

Despite their indispensable insight, conventional analyses cannot capture what Lewin finds essential, namely, the ambiguity presented to and by a player in the throes of dramatic enactment. The ambiguity translates into a regular commute between tonal and modal hearings.

---

<sup>17</sup> In this light, a *tertium quid* seems to differ from a dialectical synthesis in that its *primum* and *secundum* components as well as the contradictions therein remain intact.

Tonal-modal interplay arises once more in *Auf einer Burg* (Chapter 9), for which the preceding analysis offers a preparatory study.<sup>18</sup> The song spans two strophes, one dedicated to an old knight in a tower and the other to a young bride in the valley below. Both strophes commence by tonally articulating E minor, which Lewin hears, after the first strophe's conclusion on an A-minor cadence (with significant displacement among the voices, as shown by Example 3), as evolving into the second strophe's final E-major triad (see Example 4), a sonority that invites two interpretations.<sup>19</sup> The same conclusion arises as in the previous chapter: "If we demand that [an *Ursatz*] project either a complete Phrygian piece, or an incomplete tonal piece, but not some *tertium quid*, then I feel we are not doing justice to the sensations with which we are left at the end of *Auf einer Burg*" (176). Thus, Lewin desires to hear that final E-major triad both as a half cadence in A-minor and as a full cadence in Phrygian mode.

Example 3: A-minor cadence (mm. 14-19) in Schumann's *Auf einer Burg*

The image shows a musical score for Example 3, which is the A-minor cadence (measures 14-19) from Schumann's song 'Auf einer Burg'. The score is presented in two systems. The top system is the vocal line, starting at measure 14 with the lyrics 'hun-dert Jah-re o-ben in der stil-len Klau-se.' The bottom system is the piano accompaniment, which features a prominent bass line with a Phrygian mode cadence. The piano accompaniment consists of a series of chords and single notes, with a strong emphasis on the Phrygian mode. The vocal line is written in a simple, clear style, with a focus on the lyrics. The piano accompaniment is more complex, with a variety of chordal textures and melodic lines. The overall mood is somber and reflective, consistent with the lyrics and the Phrygian mode.

<sup>18</sup> Other, uncited studies on *Auf einer Burg* may be found: Jon W. Finson, "The Intentional Tourist: Romantic Irony in the Eichendorff Liederkreis of Robert Schumann," in *Schumann and His World*, ed. R. Larry Todd (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 166-67; Patrick McCreless, "Song Order in the Song Cycle: Schumann's 'Liederkreis', Op. 39," *Music Analysis* 5.1 (1986): 5-28; David L. Mosley, *Gesture, Sign, and Song: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Schumann's 'Liederkreis' Opus 39* (New York: Peter Lang, 1990); and David Ferris, *Schumann's Eichendorff Liederkreis and the Genre of the Romantic Cycle* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

<sup>19</sup> "Auf einer Burg" prolongs one *Stufe* through each of its two strophes (and hence through its entirety), projecting a

Example 4: Final cadence (mm. 34-39)

34

Mu - si - kan - ten spie - len mun - ter, und die schö - ne Braut, die wei - net.

ritard.

ritard.

However, the argument for a modal reading does not seem to have attained its full realization. Lewin offers a fully modal *Ursatz*, which accounts for the E-minor beginning (with its non-lowered second scale degree) and E-major cadence; a sonority with a D as its root serves as structural neighbor. The reading hinges on the neighboring D chord (which Schumann decorates as a ninth-chord) asserting priority over an A-minor sonority directly preceding it. However, the arrival of C (scale-degree 3) within A minor at mm. 14 and 35 (a cornerstone of a tonal reading) cannot be so easily denied. A sequence beginning at mm. 9/30 displaces voices rhythmically in a gesture that mimics the glacial passage of time aloft in the knight's tower; it also drives toward an A-minor triad, voiced with the third in the soprano.<sup>20</sup> Soprano and alto notes in mm. 14/35 belong to the bass's A and are suspended over D, with the upper notes of the following measure (mm. 15/36) constituting harmonic tones within the chord. It would thus be difficult not to acknowledge A minor as structural within either reading, tonal or modal.

---

harmonically stable  $v\text{—}\#$  in minor, or  $i\text{—}\#$  in Phrygian" (171).

<sup>20</sup> Two Arabic numerals separated by a slash indicate two measure numbers: the initial statement of an idea and the statement in the repetition of the idea.

Ironically, such acknowledgement would also strengthen the proposed modal *Ursatz* by exploring a Phrygian co-final.

Lewin argues that the bass's D and F create cadential thrust in his Phrygian hearing, yet the tones expand vii<sup>o7</sup> of A minor, a sonority not found in Palestrina's palette.<sup>21</sup> Displacing the right-hand tones of mm. 16/37 a half-note (so that they fall over the bass E) would not resolve the situation either, yielding a dominant-seventh chord, also not a Palestrinian sonority. Further still, the tones at the end of mm. 15/36, whether regarded as harmonic or contrapuntal in function, spell an augmented-sixth chord, whose extremely directed behavior also suggests a tonal reading rather than a modal one.

Although it would seem that Lewin's modal *secundum quid* in *Auf einer Burg* competes only weakly with its *primum* rival, the desire that motivated the search for a *tertium quid* in the first place prevails nonetheless. In extension of Lewin's reading, accepting both alternatives completes an undeniably satisfying, formal exchange between a tonal cadence in the tower and a modal cadence in the valley, and vice versa. Regardless of how one reads the content traded in it, the cadential exchange vivifies and dramatically bridges the poetry's marked contrasts between aged knight and youthful bride.

Generalized further, a *tertium quid* might synthesize two distinct compositions. As Lewin shows in Chapter 7, Clara Schumann's *Ich stand* sets the same poem as Schubert's *Ihr Bild* but reads the poem to reflect her reunion with Robert. Lewin does not seem to have been aware of the broader work undertaken by Poundie Burstein, who examines a number of Clara's songs

---

<sup>21</sup> The invocation of Palestrina suggests a historical, style-based reading as opposed to the more general employment of modal sonorities and structural spaces. Further, the references to Barbarossa as a foil to Romantic proto-nationalism as well as the ancient Church continue the historically tinged play of ideas; here Lewin cites Karen A. Hindenlang, "Eichendorff's *Auf einer Burg* and Schumann's *Liederkreis*, Opus 39," *The Journal of Musicology* 8 (1990): 570-587.

against her male peers.<sup>22</sup> The book's organization artificially separates the Schubert and Schumann settings, which offer a *primum-secundum* basis for a *tertium* reading of Clara's circumstances. Assuming Clara knew Schubert's setting, one might envision her at an advanced age reflecting on her separation from Robert (as Schubert's singer does) and then her marriage (as her singer does). Employing a metric analysis highly reminiscent of "Vocal Meter in Schoenberg's Atonal Music" (Chapter 17), Lewin locates a "suture" excising Clara's tears from her then-current memory. The advance-age reading enables Clara to reflect on her past memories as they successively transform over time. Although Lewin never says as much, one might suture fragments from Schubert's and Clara's songs—an undesirable exercise, undoubtedly—in the spirit of hunting a *tertium quid* not "with gun and camera," but by relishing the chase and enlivening one's musical experience.

The quest for a *tertium quid* pervades the other new chapters as well under the more general guise of dramatic enactment, as mentioned above. The new chapter on *Tristan* critiques Francis Fergusson's *The Idea of a Theater*.<sup>23</sup> Bertolt Brecht's *Verfremdung* shapes the discussion in the chapter on Brahms of staging and acting out the duet. Similarly, the new chapter on Mozart continues the trajectory established by "Musical Analysis as Stage Direction" (Chapter 2). Outside of the new chapters, resonances of "enactment" and "drama" never fade away, even in the chapters not concerning opera:<sup>24</sup> "The musical examples just above involve text and/or drama" (106, "Music Theory, Phenomenology"); "I do care how well [Schubert] 'acted' that script *per musica*" (125, "*Auf dem Flusse*"); "It is as if the vocal meter were a character alone on

---

<sup>22</sup> Burstein also draws a comparison between Clara Schumann's and Schubert's (among others) setting of the Heine poem in "Their Paths, Her Ways: Comparison of Text Settings by Clara Schumann and Other Composers," *Women & Music: A Journal of Gender and Culture* 6 (2002): 11-26. Schubert, like the other men who set Heine's poem to music, frames the woman's portrait within a clearly defined ternary form; Schumann, like Amy Beach, emancipates the woman by through-composing her song.

<sup>23</sup> Francis Fergusson, *The Idea of a Theater* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1953).

<sup>24</sup> I read these signs as pointing to the continuous background presence of David's wife June, a stage actress.

stage...then its behavior begins to change... [by which] the influence and proximity of another, perhaps more central, character who has not yet appeared on stage can be inferred" (357, "Vocal Meter"); "After reading my essay, Babbitt sent me a letter approving my notion that weaving symbolism is enacted in the serial technique of *Philomel*" (401, "Some Problems and Resources of Music Theory").

The enactment principle, however, does not reflect a simple desire to stage texted—or even instrumental—music. The desire explains occasional literalness in Lewin's readings, which borders on philological attachment to textual sources. For instance, analyses of Schoenberg's Opus 15 cycle never abstract away from Stefan George's words. Similarly, the chapter on *Ihr Bild* enmeshes itself in Heine's verb tenses. Lewin exhibits analogous attachment to musical sources, desiring to hear the fruits of his analytical labors and to depict analysis/listening as performative. By positioning the analyst/listener in her proper, performative role, Lewin demonstrates how music sounds when experienced from within the creative process-of-the-moment. Hence, the listener-as-protagonist experiences indecision between outcomes, thereby engaging the artwork not simply as an observer, but as an inhabitant.

A poignant encapsulation of these sentiments takes the form of words published in Lewin's previous book, *Musical Form and Transformation*:<sup>25</sup>

[T]he most crucial critical demand I make upon my experience of an artwork is that it make me undergo again Rilke's experience before the torso of Apollo: "Du mußt dich ändern."<sup>26</sup> The quality of the conviction, not its intensity or extent, is the crux of the matter; if the world is not in some way sensibly different as a result of the artistic deed, then I do not see in what sense one can say a work of art has transpired... Stockhausen's [*Klavierstück III*] does challenge me, and provoke

---

<sup>25</sup> David Lewin, *Musical Form and Transformation: 4 Analytic Essays* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993); a reprint by Oxford University Press is forthcoming. Like the text-music articles collected in the volume under review, Lewin's second book has been upstaged by *Generalized Musical Intervals and Transformations*.

<sup>26</sup> Rilke gazes upon a damaged statue of Apollo, whose torso alone remains. Although the statue lacks its head, Rilke infers and envisions a brilliant light shining forth from the god's eyes. The beams of light bear a message that Lewin slightly misquotes: "Du mußt dein Leben ändern!"



*Review: Lewin's Studies in Music With Text*

me, and in some ways infuriate me, and make me want to extend my hearing—and that is precisely one of the most vital things it does to me. (62)

These words arise from the same dramaturgy that *Studies in Music With Text* consistently exhibits. The analyses contained herein show how Lewin extends his hearing and intellectual curiosity via a causal chain of events triggered by various musical stimuli. The attachment to sources textual and musical leaves behind a paper trail documenting the process of vitalization, indeed the very life that he elicited from music—or did music elicit it from him?

Works Cited

- Burstein, L. Poundie. "Their Paths, Her Ways: Comparison of Text Settings by Clara Schumann and Other Composers." *Women & Music: A Journal of Gender and Culture* 6 (2002): 11-26.
- Clampitt, David. Review of David Lewin, *Studies in Music with Text*. *Notes* (December 2006): 340-42.
- Cone, Edward T. *The Composer's Voice*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
- Fergusson, Francis. *The Idea of a Theater*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1953.
- Ferris, David. *Schumann's Eichendorff Liederkreis and the Genre of the Romantic Cycle*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Finson, Jon W. "The Intentional Tourist: Romantic Irony in the Eichendorff Liederkreis of Robert Schumann." In *Schumann and His World*, ed. R. Larry Todd. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Forte, Allen and Steven E. Gilbert. *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1982.
- Hindenlang, Karen A. "Eichendorff's *Auf einer Burg* and Schumann's *Liederkreis*, Opus 39." *The Journal of Musicology* 8 (1990): 570-587.
- Kerman, Joseph. "A Romantic Detail in Schubert's *Schwanengesang*." *Musical Quarterly* 48 (1962): 36-49.
- Lewin, David. "Amfortas's Prayer to Titirel and the Role of D in *Parsifal*." *19th Century Music* 7.3 (1984): 336-49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Auf dem Flusse: Image and Background in a Schubert Song." In *Schubert: Critical and Analytical Studies*, ed. Walter Frisch. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Figaro's Mistakes" *Current Musicology* 57 (1995): 45-60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Generalized Musical Intervals and Transformations*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1987. Reprint ed., Edward Gollin. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Moses und Aron: Some General Remarks and Analytical Notes for Act I, Scene 1." *Perspectives of New Music* 6.1 (1967): 1-17.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Music Theory, Phenomenology, and Modes of Perception." *Music Perception* 3.4 (1986): 327-92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Musical Analysis as Stage Direction." In *Music and Text: Critical Inquiries*, ed. Steven Paul Scher. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Musical Form and Transformation: 4 Analytic Essays*. New Haven,

Review: Lewin's Studies in Music With Text

- Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1993. Reprint ed., Edward Gollin. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Notes on Analyzing Wagner: *The Ring* and *Parsifal*." *19th Century Music* 16.1 (1992): 49-58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Problems and Resources of Music Theory." *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy* 5.2 (1991): 111-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in Music with Text*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Toward the Analysis of a Schoenberg Song (Op. 15, No. XI)." *Perspectives of New Music* 12.1 (1973-74): 43-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Vocal Meter in Schoenberg's Atonal Music, with a Note on Serial Hauptstimme." *In Theory Only* 6.4 (1982): 12-36.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Way into Schoenberg's Opus 15, Number VII." *In Theory Only* 6.1 (1981): 3-24.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Women's Voices and the Fundamental Bass." *The Journal of Musicology* 10.4 (1992): 464-82.
- McCreless, Patrick. "Song Order in the Song Cycle: Schumann's 'Liederkreis', Op. 39." *Music Analysis* 5.1 (1986): 5-28.
- Mosley, David L. *Gesture, Sign, and Song: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Schumann's 'Liederkreis' Opus 39*. New York: Peter Lang, 1990.
- Rilke, Rainer Maria. *Selected Poems*, trans. C. F. MacIntyre. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1957.
- Schachter, Carl. "Either/Or." In *Schenker Studies*, ed. Hedi Siegel. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Structure as Foreground: 'das Drama des Ursatzes.'" In *Schenker Studies 2*, ed. Carl Schachter and Hedi Siegel. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Schenker, Heinrich. "Franz Schubert, *Ihr Bild*." Trans. William Pastille. *Sonus* 6.2 (1986): 31-7.
- Schwarz, David. *Listening Subjects: Music, Psychoanalysis, Culture*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Whittall, Arnold. Review of David Lewin, *Studies in Music with Text*. *The Musical Times* 147.1896 (Autumn 2006): 109-13.