When this kind of analytical technique penetrates further into the main stream of theoretical thought, becoming clearer, broader, less esoteric and sacerdotal, Contemporary Tone-Structures will take its rightful place as an impressive pioneering effort.¹

Ocurring as it does in a review of music theorist Allen Forte’s book The Compositional Matrix (Forte 1961)—a quasi-Schenkerian analytical monograph on Beethoven’s Piano Sonata in E Major, op. 109, with a particular focus on sketch studies—Robert Trotter’s prescient evaluation of “this kind of analytical technique” could apply equally to Schenkerian analysis, analysis informed by sketch studies, or the linear analysis of post-tonal music (which was the true subject of Forte’s first book, Contemporary Tone-Structures [Forte 1955]).² Whether or not subsequent contributions to the field of post-Schenkerian linear analysis have become clearer and less esoteric (a question best left for the reader to decide), there is no doubt that the technique has penetrated further into the music-theoretical mainstream in the past four decades, due in large part to the contributions of Forte and his students. In this essay, I will outline the development of the analytical technique that he eventually dubbed “linear-motivic analysis” (Forte 1988a), with

² Due to the frequent citations of Forte’s work, parenthetical references are made to the chronological list of his publications appearing in the Appendix. All other citations appear in footnotes, as usual.
an emphasis on its connection to Schenkerian analysis via the concepts of closure and structural levels. I will then expand on these concepts to suggest a future direction for the Schenkerian and post-Schenkerian linear analysis of dramatic vocal works. I will offer analyses of Franz Schubert’s song cycle *Winterreise* (1827–28) and Erich Korngold’s opera *Die tote Stadt* (1920) as illustrations of that new direction.

*Linear-Motivic Analysis as an a fortiori Vision of Closure.*

In his review, Trotter alludes to a chill toward linear analysis in the prevailing scholarly climate of the 1950s: “the combination of intensive (and unfamiliar) description, together with the choice of pieces, caused a kind of ‘short circuit’ in most readers.”3 This unreceptive attitude was exemplified by Howard Boatwright (Forte’s soon-to-be colleague at Yale) in his review of *Contemporary Tone-Structures* in the inaugural issue of the *Journal of Music Theory.*4 That Forte’s first major publication nonetheless tackled the subject of post-tonal linear analysis head-on indicates its importance as an underlying stimulus for much of his subsequent scholarly work, synthesizing as it does the two main influences on his research: Arnold Schoenberg (through Milton Babbitt) and Heinrich Schenker (through Oswald Jonas, Ernst Oster, and Felix Salzer). To aid in considering this body of work, Table 1 lists publications over five decades, from 1955 to 2004, and divides them chronologically into six contiguous or overlapping periods of varying length, as demarcated by boxed rows.

---

3 Trotter, review of *The Compositional Matrix*, 170.
**Table 1.** Forte’s publications (1955–2002) by area of interest

NB: The abbreviations after the year are of titles, either of books (italicized) or of journals in which articles appeared (plain). For full citations see the Appendix to this article, as well as the complete Forte bibliography published elsewhere in this issue (Berry, “The Twin Legacies . . .”). The designation YUPx refers to the xth book in Forte’s “Composers of the Twentieth Century” series at Yale University Press; the composer to which the book is devoted appears in a prior column, followed by an arrow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sets</th>
<th>Genera</th>
<th>Schenker</th>
<th>Linear</th>
<th>Impact on Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957 MuA liner notes</td>
<td>1957 MR</td>
<td>1957 CTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963 PNM</td>
<td>1962 THCP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964 JMT</td>
<td>1965 JMT</td>
<td>1966 JMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 “SAM”</td>
<td>1972 PNM/Schoen.1</td>
<td>1973 JMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978 MQ/Schoen.2</td>
<td>1978 HORS/Strav.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 MTS/Webern2</td>
<td>1980 MQ</td>
<td>1980 NGrove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 JASI/Schoen.3</td>
<td>1982 ISA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Berg]</td>
<td>1982 YUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983 MA</td>
<td>1983 JMT/Brahms1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984 19CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985 MA</td>
<td>1985 MQ/Berg1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986 “Syntax”/Strav.2</td>
<td>1986 YUP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Scriabin]</td>
<td>1986 YUP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Hindemith]</td>
<td>in UK: 1986 MA letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986 MA (Taruskin)</td>
<td>1987 [‘89] MTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 JMT</td>
<td>1988 JAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989 AM(2)</td>
<td>1989 AM(1)/Debussy1</td>
<td>in France: 1989 AM articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Debussy]</td>
<td>1990 MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 MQ</td>
<td>1992 JMT/Schoen.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Bartók]</td>
<td>1992 YUP6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 MQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 MTS/Webern4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 “Golden”/Webern5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued*
The first period (1955–63) represents the early stages of Forte’s academic career, during which he established his two primary areas of research interest: Schenkerian theory and the analysis of tonal music (Forte 1957, 1959, 1961, 1962), and mathematical set theory and the analysis of atonal music (Forte 1960, 1963). The most frequently cited articles from this time are his lucid précis of Schenkerian theory in the *Journal of Music Theory* (Forte 1959), and his outline of the basic elements of pitch-class set theory in *Perspectives of New Music*, in which he analyzed Schoenberg’s *Sechs kleine Klavierstücke* [Six Little Piano Pieces], op. 19 (Forte 1963). Both articles demonstrate an interest in relationships between elements at different structural levels and a concomitant focus on onset and closure, hallmarks of Forte’s analytical approach to both the tonal and atonal repertoires.

During the second period (1964–79), Forte focused his energy on the development and formalization of pitch-class set theory and analysis, a process culminating in the publication of *The Structure of Atonal Music* (Forte 1973) and *The Harmonic Organization of The Rite of

---

**Table 1. (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sets</th>
<th>Genera</th>
<th>Schenker</th>
<th>Linear</th>
<th>Impact on Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1995 APB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1995 YUP7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997 YUP9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997 Festschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(MTCP)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Gershwin]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997 PNM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997 [‘97–98] ARJZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1998 AMAW/Webern6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1998 MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1999 MQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>in UK: 1998 MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 CMR</td>
<td></td>
<td>article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2001 LCAPS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 MTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2001–01 Intégral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2002 MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>in UK: 1998 MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>articles (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spring (Forte 1978). He was also responsible for helping to found and lead the Society of Music Theory during this period, serving as its first president. Although *The Structure of Atonal Music* has since been joined by a number of other excellent books on pitch-class set theory and analysis, it remains an important reference work with regard to large-scale relations between groups of sets. Forte’s analytical work during this period concentrates on the music of Schoenberg, Webern, and Stravinsky.

The third period (1980–84) comprises a brief hiatus from set theory and a return to the enhancement and pedagogical dissemination of Schenkerian theory (Forte 1980, 1982), particularly with regard to the Schenkerian conception of motive (Forte 1983a, 1983b, 1984). During this period, Forte’s analyses focused on the music of Mozart, Brahms, and Mahler, making use of Greek letters to identify and differentiate various rhythmical, melodic, and harmonic motives. Forte’s return to Schenkerian theory was perhaps inspired by the passing of his friend Ernst Oster (regarding which see Forte 1977b), the subsequent publication of Oster’s English translation of *Der freie Satz* (which Forte had initially undertaken before turning his materials over to Oster), and Forte’s newly formalized (bittersweet?) role as *pater familias* in the world of American music theory.

---


In 1984, Forte reached an important professional milestone: the twentieth anniversary of his first publication on pitch-class set theory in a developed form (Forte 1964). That year in London, at the King’s College Music Analysis Conference, he used the occasion to reflect on the gradual establishment and acceptance of the theory in the American music-theoretical community, to respond to some of his critics (particularly musicologist Richard Taruskin and composer-theorist George Perle),

8 to comment on recent applications and expansions of the theory (especially Schmalfeldt 1983, an astonishingly comprehensive pitch-class set analysis of Berg’s Wozzeck), and to suggest possible future avenues for research. In an expanded version of this talk, published the following year, he included three criteria he considered essential for music-analytical models: completeness, consistency, and testability (Forte 1985a, 42). Although he demonstrated the fulfillment of these criteria with analyses of his own, Forte’s primary agenda in the article was to bookend the first phase of set-theoretical development—concerned primarily with segmentation, set identification, complementation, the set-complex relations, and the question of intentionality9—and to set the stage for a new phase featuring major studies of the music of individual composers by James Baker, Richard Parks, Paul Wilson, and others.10

---


9 In the article, Forte again addresses the issues of segmentation (1985a: 44, 48–54) and intentionality (1985a: 45–47).

The fourth period of Forte’s career (1985–92) began with the publication of an article on Wozzeck (Forte 1985b) in which he demonstrated a new method of analysis that combined Schenkerian analytical notation (the use of stems, beams, and slurs) with pitch-class set analysis in order to focus on the motivic aspects of harmonic and melodic structure. On the thirtieth anniversary of his first foray into the linear analysis of post-tonal music (Forte 1955), it seemed appropriate that Forte would return to the task of synthesizing aspects of these two analytical techniques typically reserved for tonal and atonal repertoires respectively. He accomplished this task by drawing once again on the general concepts of structural levels and closure, specifically with regard to motive. He demonstrated this hybrid analytical method—“linear-motivic analysis” (Forte 1988a)—through analyses of music by Berg, Liszt, Mussorgsky, and others.

Although the linear-motivic phase of Forte’s career extended through 1992—as marked by the publication of his analysis of Schoenberg’s Das buch den hängenden Gärtten (Forte 1992a) as well as Paul Wilson’s linear-motivic analysis of Bartók’s music—his summary of the analytical method in Forte 1988a served as another bookend, allowing him to turn his attention back to pitch-class set theory that same year. If linear-motivic analysis stressed Forte’s abiding interest in onset and closure, his next theoretical project—the development of pitch-class set genera (Forte 1988b)—affirmed his commitment to exploring the idea of structural levels in both tonal and atonal repertoires. Like the set-complex relations (K and Kh) addressed in The Structure of Atonal Music, the genera allow the analyst to group sets into larger collections that typically govern longer spans of music (and deeper structural levels). This overlapping fifth phase of Forte’s career (1988–98) features analyses of the work of Debussy, Ives, and especially Webern.

sible for definitive analytical studies of the works of the titular composers that ended, appropriately enough, with Forte’s own study of the music of Webern (Forte 1998a).
Richard Parks’ book on the music of Debussy, and the 1998 special issue of *Music Analysis* devoted to the genera, indicate the impact of the new theoretical model, just as Schmalfeldt’s book did for pitch-class set theory, and Baker’s and Wilson’s books did for linear-motivic analysis.

The sixth and most recent period of Forte’s career (from 1995) presents a turn toward the analysis of popular music, along with a return to the development and dissemination of Schenkerian theory. In his book on the American popular ballad (Forte 1995), Forte applies Schenkerian theory to the music of the great songwriters of the first half of the twentieth century (Cole Porter, George Gershwin, et al.). His publication of a second book on the subject for a more general audience (Forte 2001a), accompanied by a CD recorded with Yale professor and baritone Richard Lalli, highlighted his desire to make this major research effort as wide-reaching as possible.

Forte’s interest in both pitch-class set theory and Schenkerian theory throughout his career—from pitch-class sets in the late 1960s and 1970s to Schenker in the early 1980s, then to a combination of the two in the late 1980s and early 1990s—reflects his keen desire to apply Schenker’s concept of structural levels, which he claims “opened the way for a deeper understanding of musical structure” (Forte 1959, 4), to both tonal and atonal repertoires. The concept of structural levels, in turn, suggests an emphasis on “onset and closure” (Forte 1988a, 346), which determine the potential coincidence of elements at different levels. Forte’s intentionally broadened “vision of closure” includes both harmonic and linear closure, and in the following sections I will address each type in turn, with particular reference to major works by Erich Wolfgang von Korngold (1897–1957) and Franz Schubert (1797–1828). Harmonic closure will be discussed in terms of cadential resolution in Korngold’s opera *Die tote Stadt* (1920), while
linear closure—particularly as it relates to the Schenkerian concept of interruption—will be the focus of the sections on Schubert’s song cycle *Winterreise* (1827–28).

In the five decades since Forte first began expanding the concept of structural levels to include both tonal and atonal repertoires, it has become increasingly common to combine the study of musical structure with the application of concepts and theories borrowed from fields such as mathematics, linguistics, literary criticism, psychology, and cognition (to name just a few of the more popular choices). Because the two pieces analyzed below are examples of what I have called “dramatic vocal music”\textsuperscript{11}—i.e., music that is built around one or more characters who attempt to overcome obstacles to achieve a specific objective—the analyses presented here will instead discuss closure in dramatic terms, borrowing from Schenker and the Russian actor, director, and dramatic theorist Constantin Stanislavsky (1863–1938). Incorporating artistic theories like those developed by Stanislavsky for drama and Laban for dance, especially when studying staged or choreographed musical works, represents a possible future direction for Schenkerian and post-Schenkerian linear analysis—a move toward interdisciplinarity and a broadening of the traditionally narrow focus of the discipline that could facilitate the examination of new genres and works, and expand the potential audience for Schenker’s ideas.

*Visions of Harmonic Closure in the Music of Korngold and Other Twentieth-Century Composers.*

In her 1992 article “Cadential Processes: The Evaded Cadence and the ‘One More Time’ Technique,” Janet Schmalfeldt defines three categories of cadential strategy: distinct closure,
elision, and evasion. Within each of the first two categories, she posits five possible cadential progressions, including the half cadence (HC), the imperfect and perfect authentic cadences (IAC and PAC), the deceptive cadence (DC), and the evaded cadence (EC). Noting that “a well-defined hierarchical theory of cadence-types has simply not become established” within the realm of conventional harmonic theory, Schmalfeldt proceeds to outline such a theory. She assigns greater weight to self-standing cadential resolutions than to those that are elided or overlapped with the beginning of a subsequent phrase; and she privileges the DC as a successful (albeit devious) progression over the genuine EC.

If one were whimsically to imagine a panel of judges holding up ten-point scorecards for stability after each cadence, such scores might be calculated according to the rating scale in Table 2. It shows both elided versions (marked with a small “e”) and self-standing versions of the “six degrees of confirmation” (to paraphrase a well-known title), including Schmalfeldt’s five cadences and William Caplin’s “abandoned cadence” (AC, to be discussed below), each weighted according to the criteria listed at the bottom of the table. The plagal cadence (PC) is assigned the same rank as the HC, as both contain only one of the two chords listed as cadential criteria (which presume the presence of a dominant-preparatory chord).

In his 1998 book *Classical Form*, Caplin cites Schmalfeldt’s discussion of cadential disruption and refines the distinction between DCs and ECs. Whereas Schmalfeldt restricts her description of the DC to a cadential progression resolving to the submediant, Caplin expands the definition to include any cadence in which “the final tonic is replaced by a related harmony, one

---


usually built over [6] in the bass,” providing the cadential goal is grouped in a phrase-structural sense with the preceding harmonic and melodic material. Emphasizing melodic closure as the primary determinant of cadential resolution, he even includes I₆ as a potential deceptive goal, rejecting Schmalfeldt’s notion of an “EC: deceptive type.” With regard to the EC, Caplin again expands its definition, including chords built on 6 (VI, IV₆, vii°/V) and even root-position I, providing that there is “sufficient disruption of melody, texture, register, and so on to counter our perceiving a structural end when the I chord appears.”

One of the most startling possibilities resulting from Caplin’s expanded concept of the DC is the deceptive resolution to root-position IV, shown in the passage from Marietta’s aria,

---


15 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 106.

---

**TABLE 2. The six degrees of (cadential) confirmation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AC</th>
<th>eHC/ ePC</th>
<th>eHC/ PC</th>
<th>eEC₁inv</th>
<th>eEC²inv</th>
<th>eEC₃chr</th>
<th>eDC</th>
<th>E₄chr</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>eIAC</th>
<th>ePAC</th>
<th>IAC</th>
<th>PAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0-</td>
<td>3.5-</td>
<td>3.5-</td>
<td>4.5-</td>
<td>4.5-</td>
<td>6.0-</td>
<td>6.5-</td>
<td>7.0-</td>
<td>7.5-</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:**
1) AC using unresolved cad. ⁶
2) 5.5 EC¹ using V⁴₋₁ with ₂–₁ in sop.
3) 8.5 EC² using V⁷/IV with ₁ in sop.
4) 8.5 DC using vi with ₁ in sop.

**Criteria for cadence:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 5 in bass</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• stable (₃) triad (or V³)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• harmonic and melodic goal</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 7 and ₂ in chord</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ₂ in soprano</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Ihr, die ihr abgeschieden,” from *Die tote Stadt*; see Figure 1. Here, Korngold prepares the cadence by modulating from B♭ major to C major seven measures after R243 (on the word “laßt”), using a D-minor chord in second inversion as a pivot chord (iii$_4^6$ in the old key becomes ii$_4^6$ in the new key). This unusual inversion of the pre-dominant ii chord then leads to V$^7$ in the subsequent measure (on the word “trunkne”). The dominant resolves deceptively to IV on the word “Geniesse,” set by Korngold with a dramatic ascending-seventh leap in the melody that highlights the disjunctive nature of the cadence.

Despite the sudden changes in register, dynamics, and accompanimental texture at this moment—all elements that signal an EC for Caplin—the essentially stable nature of root-position IV and the long cadential F in Marietta’s melody create the effect of a *deceptive* arrival rather than a *missed* arrival, much like getting off the train at the wrong stop rather than forgetting to get off all together and flying past your stop with your nose pressed against the window in disbelief. Far from being an isolated example, the cadential strategy shown in Figure 1 is idiomatic for Korngold and occurs throughout *Die tote Stadt*; additional examples from the opera are given in Figure 2. The large-scale example occurring at R219a–222 is particularly noteworthy:
the cadence unfolds over the course of nineteen measures, and features the same seventh leap shown in Figure 1. Nor is Korngold the only composer to have employed the DC to IV: Figure 3 gives instances from Debussy’s prelude “La fille aux cheveux de lin,” and Puccini’s “Nessun dorma,” the Prince’s aria from Turandot. In the Debussy example, the next chord is vi, the more conventional goal of a DC, making the link between the two more explicit.
Defining the EC proves to be a somewhat more problematic endeavor, due to the existence of two separate paradigmatic progressions: pre-dominant–$V_2^4$–I$^6$ (the type discussed by Schmalfeldt and Caplin), which might be termed the “inverted” type (EC$^{inv}$); and pre-dominant–
V\(^7\)-V\(^7\)/IV, or the “chromatic” type. Schmalfeldt is correct that the inverted type (pre-dominant–
V\(^2\)-I\(^6\)) is always indicative of a cadential evasion because it returns the harmonic progression to
the tonic, from which it will need to depart once again for the cadence (hence the “one more
time” technique she describes in her article). Yet the goal of the cadential progression (I\(^6\)) is a
comparatively stable harmony, hence Caplin’s insistence that it can justifiably be called a DC.
The distinction between deception and evasion becomes clearer, however, in the case of the
chromatic type (pre-dominant–V\(^7\)-V\(^7\)/IV), due to the dissonant quality of the cadential resolu-
tion. Instead of projecting a comparatively stable point of arrival, V\(^7\)/IV (which acts as a tonic
substitute) propels the harmony forward toward the subdominant, avoiding cadential resolution
altogether. Acknowledging Caplin’s inclusion, on phrase-structural grounds, of chords built on
scale-degrees other than \(\hat{6}\), his expansion of the DC must nonetheless be limited to consonant
triads, reserving diminished and dominant-seventh chords for the EC because of the forward
momentum generated by their dissonant character. Hence the inclusion of the “EC: chromatic
type” or EC\(^{chr}\) in Table 2.

Variations on the chromatic EC abound in *Die tote Stadt*. Figure 4 contains the conclu-
sion of a passage from Paul’s Act I aria, “Du weißt, daß ich in Brügge blieb,” in which Korngold
modulates from A\(^\flat\) major to B\(^\flat\) major, using an applied German augmented-sixth chord in m.
100 to effect the change of key and to prepare the new dominant. Embellished by the cadential \(\hat{6}\)
in mm. 101–05, the F dominant-ninth chord then evades closure to the B\(^\flat\) tonic by shifting all
three of its upper voices down by semitone in m. 106 (at the word “lebend”), creating a vii\(^9\)/ii
that itself resolves “deceptively” to an A\(^\flat\) cadential-\(\hat{6}\) chord in m. 107. The key of A\(^\flat\) major is
reinstated and Korngold concludes the phrase on a DC to \(\flat\)VI, enharmonically respelled as the
dominant of the aria’s home key, A major. Additional examples of chromatic ECs, from operas by Leoš Janáček, Giacomo Puccini, and Richard Strauss, are shown in Figure 5.

One of the hallmarks of Caplin’s approach to phrase structure is his expansion of the lexicon of phrase types (following Schoenberg) to include both the period and the sentence, as well as various hybrids of the two (antecedent–continuation, for example). It is therefore curious to note that he does not attempt to define any hybrid cadences. Perhaps, despite his open-minded and inclusive approach to phrase structure, Caplin would contend that adopting a similar stance toward cadences would be to cross the line between inclusion and inconclusiveness—that analysts would, in effect, be trying to have their cadential cake and eat it too. Nonetheless, the notion of hybrid cadences is suggestive and musically intuitive, and it has therefore been outlined in Table 3 in three potential groups, involving respectively the PC, the EC, and the HC.
**Figure 5.** Chromatic evaded cadences (EC$^{chr}$) by other composers

(a) Janacek, *Jenufa*

(b) Puccini, *Turandot*

(c) R. Strauss, *Ariadne auf Naxos*
One such cadence—an “evaded-then-plagal” cadence—is shown in Figure 6 as it appears in *Die tote Stadt*. Here, Korngold begins with a horn call in G major at R246, establishing the tonic. He then moves to a mode-mixed dominant-preparatory ii6 5 that bypasses the root-position cadential dominant and leads directly to the evasive V4 2, preserving the common-tone 4 in the bass. V4 2 resolves to IV, continuing to prolong 4 in the bass, and then finally moves to I, creating a PC. Two other examples of hybrid cadences, including a “deceptive-then-evaded” cadence in *Die tote Stadt* and a “half-then-evaded” cadence in Kurt Weill’s *Street Scene*, are presented in Figures 7a–b. The Puccini cadence from Figure 3 and the Puccini and Strauss cadences from Figure 5 can also be reinterpreted as hybrid cadences: when it is repeated at the end of “Nessun
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**FIGURE 6.** The “evaded-then-plagal” cadence (EC\textsuperscript{inv}→PC) in *Die tote Stadt* (R246+6)

**FIGURE 7.**
(a) The “deceptive-then-evaded” cadence (DC→EC\textsuperscript{inv}) in *Die tote Stadt* (R222)

(continued)
dorma,” the cadence from Figure 3 becomes a “deceptive-then-plagal” cadence, and the excerpts in Figure 5 are combinations of the inverted and chromatic types of EC.¹⁷

In addition to his expansion and refinement of the DC and EC, Caplin posits a third type of cadential disruption, which he calls the “abandoned cadence” (AC), in which “the composer

¹⁷ In the classroom, I typically refer to this combined form of evaded cadence as “doubly evasive,” just as a cadential motion to bVI or iv in major could be considered “doubly deceptive.”
 initiatives what seems to be a cadential progression but then ‘abandons’ the progression by either inverting the cadential dominant or allowing the progression to bypass that dominant entirely.”18

One possibility for such an abandonment is an arrival on the cadential $\frac{6}{4}$ without subsequent resolution to the dominant seventh chord; an example from Weill’s *Street Scene* is shown in Figure 8, from Rose’s aria “What Good Would the Moon Be.” Caplin suggests that the AC is inherently “less dramatic” than a true cadential evasion, because “a partial cadential goal is neither achieved (as with the DC) nor even immediately promised (as with the EC).”19 That assertion is called into question, however, by the many examples found in *Die tote Stadt*, where ACs provide some of the most wrenching detours in the opera, often at crucial dramatic moments. With apologies to Freud, the central question for the analyst confronted with a potential AC is this: when is a $I_6^6$ just a $I_6^6$ (i.e., a consonant $\frac{6}{4}$ rather than a cadential embellishment)? The answer to that question invariably lies in the context within which the chord is situated, so we must turn now to a detailed examination of Paul’s aria “Du weißt, daß ich in Brügge blieb” (one excerpt of which we already studied in Figure 4).

---

18 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 107.

---
Harmonic and Linear Closure in Die tote Stadt.

A through-composed number comprising 134 measures, Paul’s aria includes examples of all six degrees of cadential confirmation, as shown in Table 4. Beginning in A major, Paul’s opening phrase enters over the cadential $6_4$, concluding with a HC on $2$ over V in m. 6. After effecting a transition to the intermediary key of C major, Korngold then concludes Paul’s second phrase by resolving the leading tone to $1$ in the vocal line, harmonized by the deceptive cadential progression: $\text{cad.}^6_4 - V^7 - \frac{\text{VI}}{5}$. A variation of this cadential progression, in which the resolution of the cadential $6_4$ to the dominant is omitted to create an AC, prepares the transition to E major in m. 15, and the A section of the aria concludes with an IAC in m. 23 (repeated in m. 33).

In the B section (mm. 37–65), Korngold continues to expand the aria’s cadential lexicon, adding a PC in m. 50 and a Phrygian HC in m. 54. He concludes the section with an elided hybrid of the EC and PC, harmonizing $b\text{III} - 2 - 1$ in the orchestral melody with the progression $iv^9_{14} - V^4_7 - I$. The C section (mm. 66-108) continues this expansion by adding a startling string of ACs (mm. 75–79, 85–90, and 92–100) that propel the aria through a tortured series of modulations from E major, through E major, to A major, and ultimately to B flat major. But Korngold is not content to let Paul rest, perhaps by transforming B flat major into V of E major (the key that concluded the aria’s opening section); instead he uses an EC (mm. 101–06) that thrusts the key back down to A flat major, followed by a string of DCs, first to $b\text{VI}^5$ (m. 108), then to IV (mm. 115 and 124). Final closure via a PAC in the home key of A major arrives only at the last possible moment (m. 133).

19 Caplin, Classical Form, 109.
20 The aria’s measures are numbered beginning at R18 (“Ruhig beginnend”).
The lengths to which Korngold goes to prevent perfect-authentic closure in Paul’s aria become more comprehensible when the aria is placed in its dramatic context. Paul’s wife, Marie, has died, and he is obsessed with keeping her memory alive. When the aria opens in A major, Paul is still firmly grounded in reality: he is catching up with Frank, an old friend, and recounting his activities since the last time they met one another. As the aria progresses, however, Paul begins to describe to Frank a vision he has had of Marie, and the key shifts from A major to its polar opposite, E♭ major, the key of fantasy in the opera. Nowhere is the juxtaposition of fantasy and reality more apparent than in m. 85, where, without warning, Korngold shifts the entire orchestra up by semitone, forcing a modulation from E♭ major to E major, the dominant of the home key. Paul, describing a woman that he saw on the street as he dreamt of his wife, suddenly...
reveals that he believes the woman to be Marie herself; he has transferred his fantasy to the real world. The transformation is not complete, however, and Paul teeters precariously between two competing versions of reality, tilting temporarily toward fantasy (A♭ major, mm. 92–110) as he recounts hearing his dead wife’s laugh and seeing her, living and breathing, before him. Only when he hears the mysterious woman speak (mm. 128ff.) do fantasy and reality merge completely for him, and the aria closes in A major.

A comparison of the cadential plan and modulatory scheme of Paul’s aria with its linear structure reveals another aspect of Korngold’s manipulation of closure: as shown at the background level in Figure 9, almost the entire aria is taken up by an auxiliary cadence, prolonging B (♭2) over the home-key dominant, E major. This is due to the fact that Korngold withholds the tonic triad until m. 117, choosing instead to prolong ♭2 over V through the use of two large-scale neighbor tones (B♭ and C), as shown at the first middleground level. Moreover, because of the large number of HCs in the first half of the aria, none of the local descents shown at the second middleground level are permitted to close on the tonic, but are left half finished or interrupted.

Each of the modulatory and cadential “joints” in the aria provides insight into Paul’s progressively devolving psychological state. In mm. 9–11, when the key shifts from A major to C major, Paul mentions his wife’s “likeness,” and describes walking “arm in arm with her shadow.” When the IAC in E♭ Major (the tritone-related key of fantasy) arrives in m. 23, it sets Paul’s depiction of Marie’s “golden hair”—his most cherished relic of his dead wife, the crown jewel of a shrine to her he has built in his home and the most tangible part of her that remains accessible to him. As he longingly tries to recapture Marie’s memory in mm. 25–43, and mourns “the days of happiness” now lost to him in mm. 50–54, he twice descends to ♭2 over a local dominant, but is unable to finish either line. Most telling of all, from a voice-leading perspective,
is the string of middleground parallel fifths with which he desperately forces the modulation from E♭ major to E major in mm. 62–87, as he tries to transform Marietta, a woman he has met on the street, into his beloved Marie through sheer force of will. This moment provides an early

**Figure 9.** Structural levels in *Die tote Stadt*: “Du weiß daß ich in Brügge blieb”
indication of Paul’s violent nature, which comes back to haunt him at the opera’s tragic apex. Paul abandons all distinction between fantasy and reality in m. 108, where his climactic Ab-major melody sets the feverish words “my living, breathing wife” as the orchestra moves to a DC on Ⅰ, spelled enharmonically as an E-major triad, the dominant of the opening key of reality. His final exhortation in m. 117, “God . . . give her back to me,” occurs at the precise moment where Korngold finally introduces the home-key tonic and Ⅰ, the primary tone of the aria, thereby allowing Paul to achieve the goal he so desperately desires: to convince himself that Marietta, the gypsy dancer he has met on the street, has become his departed wife, Marie.

*The Schenkerian Concept of Interruption.*

Despite Korngold’s eventual completion of a Ⅰ-line Ursatz that provides linear and harmonic closure for Paul’s aria, the bulk of the aria is devoted to the thwarting of tonal progress; and indeed, even the arrival of closure itself rings hollow, given that Paul is delusional when he finally achieves it. Korngold conveys this thwarted progress primarily through the use of the technique of interruption. Ask a Schenkerian for a brief explanation of the concept of interruption (*Unterbrechung*) and you will most likely get something like “Ⅲ → Ⅰ || Ⅲ → Ⅰ,” or “a descent to Ⅰ over the dominant, followed by a return of the primary tone and closure on Ⅰ.” Ask for a more detailed explanation, however, and you are likely to get an answer that touches on form in instrumental music, particularly sonata form. Two articles in *Music Theory Spectrum*—David Smyth’s essay on “‘Balanced Interruption’ and the Formal Repeat,” and Peter Smith’s study of sonata form according to Brahms and Schenker—are representative.²¹

Schenker’s discussion of interruption is primarily found in two sections of *Der freie Satz*, the latter of which is devoted to sonata form. The earlier section occurs within Schenker’s presentation of structural aspects of the first middleground. After demonstrating an interrupted 3-line, he notes that “the initial succession 3–2 gives the impression that it is the first attempt at the complete fundamental line,” but that “2 [over] V appears as the limit of an initial forward motion of the fundamental line.” As Peter Smith has noted, this statement apparently contradicts Schenker’s later assertion that the interruption “has the effect of a delay, or retardation, on the way to the ultimate goal.” The figures accompanying the two descriptions are reproduced in Figure 10. The apparent contradiction concerns the relative importance of the first segment of the interruption. According to the first statement, the initial descent from 3–2 is subordinate to the completed version that follows it, while the latter gives it more weight, de-emphasizing the subsequent retracing of the 3–2 as a mere “delay.” In an editorial note on the two contrasting descriptions, Ernst Oster points out that, although Schenker used two different notations for the interruption, favoring the form shown in Figure 10a perhaps for its visual clarity, both were

**Figure 10.** Schenker’s models of interruption (*Free Composition*, Fig. 21)

---


24 Schenker, *Free Composition*, §90 (p. 37).
intended to show the same thing: the relative importance of the first half of the interruption, which Oster calls the first "branch."^{25}

Schenker’s emphasis on this first branch of the interruption—which he makes explicit in stating that, “with respect to the unity of the fundamental structure, the first occurrence of 2\(\over V\) is more significant than the second”^{26}—makes phenomenological sense. Because it receives priority of place in a musical work, the initial, interrupted descent is of primary importance. In fact, the term “interruption” properly belongs only to the initial “broken” descent: the reinstatement of the primary tone and closure to 1\(\over I\), as noted by Smith, are more correctly identified as the “completion” or “continuation” of the fundamental line. As Cadwallader and Gagné put it, the actual “‘point’ of interruption” occurs at the end of the first branch.^{27}

Stanislavsky’s Concept of Objectives and the Idea of a Permanent Interruption.

Given the teleological significance of the point of interruption, should not the analyst admit the possibility of a “permanent” or “sustained” interruption, one in which the second “branch,” the completion or continuation, is omitted? Schenker implicitly dismissed the possibility of such a broken structure in Der freie Satz, maintaining that “[i]f recent musical products have almost no end or seem to find no end, it is because they do not derive from a fundamental structure and hence do not arrive at a genuine 1\(\over\); without this 1\(\over\) a work is bound to give the effect of incompleteness.”^{28} But what if “the effect of incompleteness,” particularly as it pertains to a fundamental structure, is precisely the effect a composer seeks to create?

^{25} Schenker, Free Composition, 37, n.7.
^{26} Schenker, Free Composition, §90 (p. 37).
^{28} Schenker, Free Composition, 129, n.6.
Two articles, in particular, have addressed this issue in differing ways: David Loeb’s essay on “dual-key movements” in *Schenker Studies*, and Carl Schachter’s essay on “das Drama des Ursatzes” (the drama of the fundamental structure) in *Schenker Studies 2*. While Loeb’s essay includes some trenchant observations—most notably that “when pieces begin and end in different keys such that neither key is understood as subsidiary to the other, then we must abandon our usual approach and seek a different kind of overall structure”—his focus is primarily on Baroque instrumental forms. Schachter, for his part, notes that in the absence of a normative background structure, “what the analyst must do is to arrive at the intuition of some higher level—middleground or background—and to test that intuition against the totality of impressions made by the piece.” He then proceeds to graph Chopin’s Mazurka in A♭ Major, op. 41/3, as a 5-line in which “the ghostly presence of the missing 2 and 1 is so clearly evident that the analysis should suggest something like the following: 5–4–3, but where are 2 and 1?” His graph, reproduced in Figure 11, uses question marks and parentheses to indicate the absent but implied structural pitches.

Schachter maintains that “often, as here, Schenkerian theory is able to accommodate structural anomalies without the need for extending it by postulating, for example, new Ursatz-forms.” That is, the mazurka would count as “a transformed 5-line piece, and not one that simply traverses a third from 5 to 3.” When the “totality of impressions” made by a piece includes a scenario in which a protagonist fails to reach a desired goal, however, Schachter’s view must be extended: a new Ursatz form—the *permanent interruption*—offers an effective, indeed

---

compelling, compositional response. Adele Katz puts it best when she claims that Wagner’s music, and by extension dramatic vocal music in general, must be studied “from two different points of view: first, whether it demonstrates the principles of structural unity; second, whether any sacrifice of these principles is due to the demands of the text. . . . [One must] consider any deviations in the basic techniques in relation to the text or dramatic action they represent.”

But how does one isolate what dramatic action is being represented by the text, let alone the music, at any one moment? In a recently published book on American opera, I argued for the adoption of a system of dramatic analysis created by Constantin Stanislavsky, in which a hierarchical set of “objectives,” or goals that motivate a given character’s actions, is outlined for each character: one for the complete role, one for each scene in which the character participates, and even one for each line or group of lines spoken by the character. For present purposes, we need focus on just one particular concept developed by Stanislavskians Irina and Igor Levin and Stella

34 Latham, Tonality as Drama.
Adler: the concept of the “interrupted event” or “interrupted action.”

According to the Levins and Adler, an objective is interrupted when a character fails to achieve his or her objective, when a conflict remains unresolved, or when an action is left incomplete. The Levins define the interrupted event specifically as “a string of events with the same conflict, leading character, and main objective,” and note that it could span a series of smaller (or “beat”) objectives, or even main objectives, until it is either resolved or discarded.

The Multi-Movement Ursatz.

In the case of Franz Schubert’s Winterreise, however, the wanderer’s objective—to put his past literally behind him—is neither resolved nor discarded; indeed, it becomes the driving force that pushes him relentlessly onward through the frozen landscape of the cycle. Dramatically, Wilhelm Müller’s text constitutes a permanent interruption, one that spans the entirety of its twenty-four poems. As Alan Cottrell notes, “part of the power of the end of the cycle is derived [from] the tension resulting from the fact that the strong desire for death goes unfulfilled and the wanderer is condemned to continue an existence which has become meaningless and which must ultimately lead to the grave.”

Traditionally, Schenkerian analysts have restricted themselves to tonal structure within a single piece or movement. Two articles by David Neumeyer and Patrick McCreless, however, argue for a widening of analytical scope to include multi-movement works. McCreless, as part of

---


a bid to reconcile Schenkerian analysis with Leo Treitler’s work on key associations, claims that “linear analysis . . . is by no means incompatible with a point of view that finds tonal meaning echoing from moment to moment in a single movement, or from movement to movement in a multipartite work.” Neumeyer, for his part, lays the groundwork for the future development of a model for multi-movement works, which is worth quoting in its entirety. He writes that

when the closed analytic system—in our case, Schenker’s method applied to single movements—is confronted with a situation outside its capacities—here, the problem of multimovement forms—the way to proceed is to add other pertinent structural criteria and develop an expanded, but again closed, methodology. Thus, for the song cycle and other expanded vocal works (including opera’?), we need to add to Schenker’s harmonic-tonal and voice-leading model, as expressed in the Ursatz, the narrative or dramatic criteria, and from this develop a broader analytic system which can treat these two as co-equal structural determinants.

This sort of composite analytical model is ideal for an examination of Schubert’s song cycle, Winterreise.

A Vision of Linear Failure in Winterreise.

In her exemplary monograph on Schubert’s most important song cycle, Susan Youens notes that “a subtle web of tonal connections and dramatic associations links groups of adjacent songs and even forms associative arches between widely separated songs.” Although Youens seems to base this observation primarily on her analysis of the cycle’s key relations, a Schenkerian reading of the cycle as a single Ursatz only strengthens her argument. The key scheme of

---

Winterreise constitutes a large-scale motion from tonic (D minor) to dominant (A major) that spans the entire length of the cycle. The harmonic interruption suggested by this tonal relationship is reinforced by the primary tones of the songs. Figure 12 provides a middleground graph of the entire cycle; each song is represented by its primary tone and tonic harmony, and these in
turn are shown as elements of the structure of the cycle as a whole. Song 1 begins in D minor with F as its primary tone. Interpreted as the primary tone of the whole cycle, F is prolonged through a middleground replica of the fundamental line—a descent through E (♯ of A major, Song 2) to D (♭ of B minor, Song 9). Yet, because the would-be tonic of this descent is harmonized deceptively by the mixed submediant rather than the tonic, the replica remains imperfect. At the next appearance of the tonic key (Song 17), the primary tone is not reinstated. Instead the primary tone of Songs 17 and 18, A (∆ of D major), completes a secondary, inner-voice interruption, a structural alto voice (marked with downward stems in Figure 12) that descends in stepwise motion from the implied tonic of Song 1.40 Songs 19 through 24 then complete the primary interruption by prolonging the structural dominant (A major) through a series of parallel tenths and moving the fundamental line to ♯, whereupon its forward progress is permanently halted.

A comparison of the tonal structure of the cycle with the dramatic structure of its texts provides some insight into the role of these interruptions. Table 5 shows the score of the wanderer’s role: “SO” stands for “superobjective,” his goal for the cycle; “MO” stands for “main objective,” his goal for each song; and a slash or an “x” in the in the “Outcome” column stands for his success or failure (respectively) in each song. Müller’s wanderer stumbles several times along his journey. Although he makes some progress, culminating in the symbolic burying of his old relationship in Song 7 (where he carves names and dates into the frozen river’s crust), he is nonetheless unable to forget the city and his beloved in Song 8. The use of the subjunctive verb tense in the final stanza of this song (“Kömmt mir der Tag in die Gedanken”) is misleading, since he clearly is already thinking of the past in stanza 2. After resolving to press on in Songs 9–

40 Schenker identifies ∆ as the point of division for an 8-line, substituting for the interruption after ♯ that is possible in ∆- and 3-lines. See Schenker, Free Composition, §100 (p. 40).
### Table 5. The dramatic score for Winterreise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key Line</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>to find peace, put his past behind him</td>
<td>“And I journey on endlessly, restless and seeking peace.” (Song 20)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₁</td>
<td>to leave town, make a physical break with the past</td>
<td>“My fine lady-love, goodnight!”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₂</td>
<td>to press onward, without looking back</td>
<td>“The wind sports with the weathervane outside my fair love’s house.”</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₃</td>
<td>to ignore his pain, keep his icy resolve</td>
<td>“And yet you gush forth . . . as though you would melt all Winter’s ice!”</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₄</td>
<td>to find hope for the future, a life after lost love</td>
<td>“If my heart ever melts again, her image will dissolve too.”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₅</td>
<td>to get past the linden tree</td>
<td>“And still I hear a rustling: ‘you would have found peace there!’”</td>
<td>/ ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₆</td>
<td>to work through his grief, toward a new springtime</td>
<td>“And the ice will break up into floes, and the soft snow will dissolve.”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₇</td>
<td>to entomb his love, mark a finishing point</td>
<td>“In your coating I engrave . . . the day that I first met her, the day that I went away;”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₈</td>
<td>to forget the city, the hometown of his beloved</td>
<td>“Were I to think again of that day I would want to look back once more,” (false subjunctive; he is thinking of it)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₉</td>
<td>to press onward</td>
<td>“Every stream will reach the sea, and every sorrow its grave.”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₁₀</td>
<td>to ignore the pain of his loss</td>
<td>“You too, my heart . . . begin to feel the worm that gnawing stirs inside you!”</td>
<td>/ !!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₁₁</td>
<td>to embrace the future, entertain the possibility of finding a new love</td>
<td>“When shall I hold my [new] love in my arms?”</td>
<td>/ ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₁₂</td>
<td>to press onward</td>
<td>“So I make my way onward with dragging feet . . . .”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₁₃</td>
<td>to ignore the posthorn—and the memories it brings of the city and the beloved</td>
<td>“The post brings no letter for you. Why then do you leap so high, my heart?”</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₁₄</td>
<td>to maintain his icy resolve</td>
<td>“How far it still is to the grave!”</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₁₅</td>
<td>to ignore the crow, harbinger of despair and death</td>
<td>“Crow, strange creature! Are you determined not to leave me?”</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₁₆</td>
<td>to cling to the last shred of hope</td>
<td>“I watch one particular leaf and pin my hopes to it.”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₁₇</td>
<td>to abandon the dream of new love</td>
<td>“I have finished for good and all with dreams . . . why should I linger among the sleepers?”</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₁₈</td>
<td>to harden his icy resolve with blustery declarations</td>
<td>“My heart . . . is nothing but winter; winter cold and wild.” [I am a rock!]</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₁₉</td>
<td>to “surrender to the gay deception”</td>
<td>“For me illusion is the only prize!”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₂₀</td>
<td>to take the road from which “none have ever returned”</td>
<td>“One signpost I see standing fixedly before my gaze; one road I must travel.”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₂₁</td>
<td>to press onward</td>
<td>“Then onward, ever onward, my trusty walking staff!!”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₂₂</td>
<td>to face death bravely</td>
<td>“Into the world then merrily”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₂₃</td>
<td>to prepare for death</td>
<td>“I [will] be in the dark, and happier that way.”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO₂₄</td>
<td>to die</td>
<td>“Strange old man, shall I go with you?”</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12, he is again thwarted in Song 13, this time by the sound of the posthorn, bringing with it a flood of memories.\textsuperscript{41} Though he clings to a last shred of hope in Song 16, in Songs 17 and 18 he attempts to abandon the dream of a new love (previously projected in Songs 4, 6, and 11), and in Song 19 he “surrenders to the gay deception,” perhaps losing his own sanity or succumbing to the effects of hypothermia.

The reader-listener is left to wonder where the wanderer’s journey will end, as he concludes the cycle with hallucinations (Songs 19 and 23), grim foreshadowing (Songs 20 and 21), delusions (Song 22), and, ultimately, an unanswered question (directed to the “hurdy-gurdy man” in Song 24): “Strange old man! Shall I go with you?” The musical setting of this final question returns the melody to E (\textsuperscript{5} in A minor), the very pitch that would have continued the fundamental line down to the tonic. Because the wanderer’s fate is uncertain, however, Schubert chooses to avoid a final return to the tonic key, thereby creating a permanent interruption in which the only possible reinstatement of the primary tone comes when the piece “cycles” back to the opening song.

Two objections might be raised to the type of analysis advanced above—indeed, the same objections that have been raised to many other analyses:

First, how can one be sure that Schubert \textit{intended} to create the large-scale tonal connections proposed above? Of course, there is no way to know for certain; but the consistency with which the tonal-dramatic strategy is played out on all three structural levels—background, middleground, and foreground—suggests that Schubert was probably aware of it to some degree.

\textsuperscript{41} In their first versions, songs 10 and 12 prolonged a restatement of the primary tone F over tonic D minor; a performance that incorporated these original keys would obviously have to address any concomitant changes in interpretation.
However, one could argue that, whether Schubert intended to create it or not, the permanent interruption that spans the cycle stands out as one of its defining structural features—a classic rejoinder that invokes the “intentional fallacy.”

The second objection follows from the response to the first: is it really possible to hear tonal connections between such temporally disparate moments? Even if we set aside issues pertaining to absolute pitch, it is possible to claim that such connections are indeed audible, specifically because of the importance that tessitura and register play in vocal music. Winterreise was written for a tenor or a high lyric baritone, whose Fach, or vocal range, is divided into five main registers: G2–C3, C3–G3, G3–D4, D4–G4, and G4–C5. Each of these registers is defined by the amount of head voice versus chest voice used to produce its pitches, and therefore each has a distinct timbral signature. The last two in particular—whose lower boundary pitches are defined as the first and second passagio, respectively—are timbrally unique. Because the primary interruption I have shown, F4–E4, falls above the first passagio, it is registrally marked both at the foreground and at the middleground levels, especially because the tessitura of Winterreise lies mainly in the second and third registers, below the first passagio.

In addition to Winterreise, Schubert’s Die schöne Müllerin (Figure 13) and Schumann’s Dichterliebe (Figure 14) provide compelling examples of permanent interruption within the context of a multi-movement work, with the interruption motivated in each case by a protagonist’s failure to achieve his dramatic objective. Because of this feature, these three cycles stand in sharp contrast to the other major ones from the nineteenth-century: Schubert’s Schwanengesang (Figure 15), and Schumann’s Liederkreis, op. 39 (Figure 16) and Frauenliebe und -leben (Figure 17). The latter cycles do provide a return to the home key at their ends, though none are dramatically the stronger for it.
**Figure 13.** The middleground structure of Schubert, *Die schöne Müllerin*

**Figure 14.** The middleground structure of Schumann, *Dichterliebe*

**Figure 15.** The middleground structure of Schubert, *Schwanengesang*
Song cycles and operas, along with other dramatic vocal works, are not the typical focus of Schenkerian analysis, yet they are uniquely qualified to highlight the presence or absence of closure at multiple structural levels. Works that present a thwarted linear narrative filled with obstacles and roadblocks (like Schubert’s Winterreise and Korngold’s Die tote Stadt) embody a tragedy that is poignant to performers and audiences alike, and the analyses presented here capture aspects of that tragedy. Though these analyses are most immediately indebted to my own synthesis of Schenkerian and Stanislavskian principles, and to adaptations of the cadential
postulates of Schmalfeldt and Caplin, a conceptual forbear is found in Forte’s work. His focus on onset and closure throughout fifty years of writing on both tonal and post-tonal music—while in one sense a generalization that helped him sidestep the controversy over prolongation in post-tonal music—served also to draw his reader’s attention to the beginnings and endings of phrases, sections, and complete works; and these are the very places where the successes and failures of characters in dramatic vocal works are most apparent.
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