Harmony in Mendelssohn and Schumann

This innovative book continues David Damschroder's radical reformulation of harmonic theory, presenting a dynamic exploration of harmony in the compositions of Mendelssohn and Schumann, two key figures of nineteenth-century classical music. This volume's introductory chapters creatively introduce the basic tenets of the system, with reference to sound files rather than notated music examples permitting a more direct interaction between reader and music. In the Masterpieces section that follows, Damschroder presents detailed analyses of movements from piano, vocal, and chamber music, and compares his outcomes with those of other analysts, including Benedict Taylor, L. Poundie Burstein, and Peter H. Smith. Expanding upon analytical practices from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and strongly influenced by Schenkerian principles, this fresh perspective offers a stark contrast to conventional harmonic analysis – in terms of how Roman numerals are deployed and how musical processes are described in words.

DAVID DAMSCHRODER is Professor of Music Theory at the University of Minnesota. His current research focuses on harmony in tonal music, a project that began with a careful examination of historical analytical practices, the basis for his *Thinking About Harmony: Historical Perspectives on Analysis* (Cambridge, 2008). He has since published studies on harmony in selected composers including Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, and Chopin, and he is the author of *Tonal Analysis: A Schenkerian Perspective* (W. W. Norton, 2017).

Harmony in Mendelssohn and Schumann

DAVID DAMSCHRODER
University of Minnesota

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108418034
DOI: 10.1017/9781108284110

First published 2018

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Damschroder, David.
Title: Harmony in Mendelssohn and Schumann / David Damschroder.
Description: Cambridge, United Kingdom ; New York, NY : Cambridge University Press, 2017. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2017033145 | ISBN 9781108418034 (alk. paper)
Subjects: LCSH: Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Felix, 1809–1847 – Harmony. | Schumann, Robert, 1810–1856 – Harmony. | Music – 19th century – Analysis, appreciation.
Classification: LCC MT90 .D35 2017 | DDC 781.2/5–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2017033145

ISBN 978-1-108-41803-4 Hardback

Contents

Preface

How did composers working just before or during the first half of the nineteenth century conceive of and apply harmony? My emerging answer to that question has by this point devoted due attention to the four superlative composers active in or near Vienna in the decades around 1800 (*Harmony in Haydn and Mozart, Harmony in Beethoven*, and *Harmony in Schubert*), as well as to a wondrous expatriate Polish pianist/composer in Paris a bit further into the century (*Harmony in Chopin*). Now it is time to assay what Mendelssohn and Schumann were accomplishing in various German locales.

Though textbook and treatise authors of the era were active in building analytical systems to make sense of the contemporary harmonic practices (generally employing Roman numerals, as I relate in *Thinking About Harmony*), their budding efforts have been extensively transformed in my writings, in part because I incorporate notions proposed by later thinkers (Heinrich Schenker in particular) and in part through my willingness to jettison aspects of conventional modern harmonic analysis stemming from those early efforts in favor of fresh and (I trust) improved ways of proceeding that may more fully unlock for us the processes these composers were pursuing. Though my work is intended mainly for graduate students and professional musicians, I hope that my reconfigured harmonic theory also will be introduced at the foundational level of instruction. *Harmony in Beethoven* offers an inviting *Harmonielehre* that might aptly supplement any of the standard undergraduate harmony texts, giving initiates who may have become complacent or indifferent an eye-opening exposure to a new way of thinking about the topic.

As a complement to the *Harmonielehre*, this volume opens with *Harmonic analysis through listening* (chapters 1 through 8), written in a way that should be accessible to undergraduates while concurrently offering more seasoned readers plenty of rewarding content. It is curious yet true that, though music enters our consciousness through the ears, almost all of what you might draw upon to assist in developing your analytical capacities is absorbed through the eyes. I have taken the

unusual step of here introducing the foundations of my harmonic perspective through the act of listening to music. In contrast to passive reading about harmonic analysis, you will be invited to ponder questions that get to the heart of how a passage you listen to is conceived harmonically and realized in its details, and then to compare your responses to my suggestions. These featured excerpts may be accessed via audio examples available on this volume's web page (www.cambridge.org .9781108418034). Rhythmic grids annotated with location symbols provide the means of identifying discrete moments within each sounding excerpt, so that both the questions and the responses can be crafted with specificity. (It is important that you peruse my proposed responses in the endnotes even when you are sure that your own are correct, since I may introduce terminology or a strategy that will be needed in future responses.) I have indicated each question's level of challenge by the number of bullets (•, ••, or •••) to the left of its identifying number, so that you have the option of pursuing only the easier questions during a first pass through the chapters, returning to the others later. Each listening excerpt is introduced by some preliminary commentary and the vocal generation of its essential features, focusing on the harmonic relationships that will be featured in what follows. Though you might be taken aback by my request that you proceed through eight chapters of a "scholarly" book in this interactive mode, I hope that you will find it to be a transformative experience, touching on vital components of musical perception and comprehension that are difficult to access through more conventional modes of author–reader interactions.

This book's centerpiece is a Masterpieces section offering detailed analyses of compositions by Mendelssohn and Schumann, featuring the tools that I advocate for harmonic analysis. Roman numerals generally are displayed in the context of Schenkerian graphs, which provide insights regarding harmony's hierarchical organization as well as on a range of other parameters. (During this portion of the book, some prior exposure to Schenkerian analysis is assumed, either through my *Tonal Analysis: A Schenkerian Perspective*, or by some other means.) As has been the case also in the earlier analytical volumes of my Harmony Project, I guide you through a direct comparison of each analysis with an interpretation by another prominent analyst (or sometimes two others), thereby deepening your perceptions regarding these works and highlighting what is at stake in the analytical process. (These alternative analyses all appear in publications that should be available at any collegiate music library. The critiques are set off from the main flow of my analyses by shading.) Consequently, my

Harmony in . . . volumes not only point a way forward for the study of nineteenth-century music but also together comprise a unique and wide-ranging assessment of the state of tonal analysis in English-language scholarship over the past fifty or so years. Since my Masterpieces chapters already offer substantial analytical challenges, I have *not* endeavored to extend the project's purview even further to incorporate assessments of publications in other languages. (Such works occasionally have been addressed in the endnotes.) Likewise some worthy analytical publications were passed over because they focus on issues only marginally related to harmony, making the sort of comparative analysis pursued here unworkable.

Though I completed my first two Cambridge books without a clear sense of what ultimately was to emerge, or even awareness that something warranting being called a Harmony Project was in the works, by now my six monographs from Cambridge together constitute a bountiful and unified body of analytical commentary on this important repertoire. I intend next to explore harmony in music after 1850, leading in due time to Debussy.

I thank the University of Minnesota for granting me a sabbatical leave permitting a year of uninterrupted work on this volume and for the support of an Imagine Fund award that both covered the costs associated with the music examples and sound files and allowed me to acquire books and to visit major research libraries. I am grateful to the New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations, for allowing me to purchase on microfilm and to make references to the Oster Collection: Papers of Heinrich Schenker. As in the earlier volumes of my Harmony Project, Peter Smucker has provided expert setting of the music examples.

Conventions regarding note relations, chords, keys, and Roman numerals

Pitch simultaneities (such as C-E-G) are indicated using hyphens (-), while pitch successions (such as C–E–G) are indicated using dashes (–). Direction may be indicated in melodic succession: ascending as C<E<G, descending as G>E>C. A black arrow may be used to indicate a descending-fifth relationship that is or emulates a $V^{(7)}$–I succession, whereas an outline arrow may be used to indicate a succession from a chord of the augmented-sixth type; for example, C➔F–D➔G➔C; C–A♭–D⇨G➔C.

Keys and chords are distinguished as follows: C Major (with a capital M) is the key of C Major; C major (with a small m) is a C major chord.

Unless another analyst's methodology is being discussed, Roman numerals are presented in capital letters regardless of a chord's quality, modified by one or more accidentals if the chord is altered. Thus C Major: I II V I and not I ii V I; and A Minor: I II V♯ I♯ (closing on a major tonic), not i ii° V I. An accidental to the left of the numeral corresponds to the chord's root, to the right corresponds to its third. If the chordal fifth, seventh, or ninth is altered, the analytical symbol will incorporate the corresponding Arabic numeral, as in C Minor: $\mathrm{II}^{5\sharp}_{\sharp}$. (Arrow notation – here II➔ – offers an attractive, though less precise, alternative to the complete analytical symbol.) The bullet symbol (•) indicates an absent root. For example, B-D-F in C Major will be analyzed as $\mathrm{V}^{7}_{\bullet}$ (or, with less precision, as V➔).

Likewise a progression of chordal roots generally is presented in capital letters (C–D–G–C), though on occasions when quality is a factor in the discussion a capital letter may refer to major quality, a small letter to minor quality, and a small letter followed by a degree circle (°) to diminished quality; for example, C–a–F–d–b°–G–e–C.

A bracket is used to connect the analytical notation for two musical events that normally would follow one another but that in the context under discussion occur at the same moment; for example, C⌈F♯ B⌉E when an F♯-A♯-C♯ chord sounds with, rather than before, root B in a descending circle of fifths.

Parentheses around a pitch in an analytical example indicate that it is not actually present in the score, though it is understood. Parentheses around analytical notation may refer to the expansion of a deeper-level harmony (for example, when I is expanded by I IV V I) or to the harmonic assertion of a voice-leading phenomenon (for example, when the 6 phase of a I^{5-6}, as in C-E-G to C-E-A, asserts the harmonic role of VI). Open parentheses designate a voice-leading transition between two harmonies. For example, I ( ) IV indicates that the chords between I and IV (perhaps a circular, parallel, or sequential progression) do not themselves participate in the harmonic progression, but instead serve to connect the harmonies I and IV.

When a score's chordal spellings do not coincide with the structurally appropriate spellings (for example, the substitution of easier-to-read F♯-A-C♯ for cumbersome G♭-B𝄫-D♭), I generally will use the structurally appropriate spellings in my examples and commentaries, often placing the enharmonic spellings within square brackets to assist readers in locating the pitches in question within the score.

I pay very close attention to hierarchies among pitches and chords. To alert readers to various hierarchical relationships I often will underline some pitch names to indicate their hierarchical prominence. For example, C<E D>B C above bass C–G–C conveys the relationship between two unfolded strands: a more prominent outer strand E>D>C, and a subordinate inner strand C>B<C.

Because diverse musical contexts are analyzed using graphs, it is difficult to pin down precise guidelines for how their notation should be crafted and read. Many styles of "Schenkerian" notation have appeared since the publication of Schenker's *Free Composition* (hereafter abbreviated as *FC*), which itself does not present a single normative style. I regard the creation of a reductive graph as an art, endeavoring to use notation that is as clear and informative as possible. In general, open noteheads in my graphs represent deeper structural or harmonic events than filled-in noteheads, while notes at the endpoints of beams or slurs are deeper than internal notes. Notes connected to a beam by a stem are more integral to the structure than those that are not. Occasionally annotations using abbreviations (including those pertaining to form borrowed from James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory*, Oxford University Press, 2006) indicate functions of individual pitches or formal events, as follows:

ant.	anticipation
C	closing zone
CP	chromatic passing note
CV	chromatic variant
EEC	essential expositional closure
ESC	essential structural closure
HC	half cadence
IAC	imperfect authentic cadence
IN	incomplete neighboring note
MC	medial caesura
N	neighboring note
P	an individual pitch: passing note
P	form: primary-theme zone
PAC	perfect authentic cadence
prg.	progression
S	secondary-theme zone
susp.	suspension
TR	transition
W	wobble

Of course, the graphs often will incorporate Roman numeral harmonic analyses, and in this regard I sometimes depart from Schenker's practice. Because it is innovative, I document my Roman numeral usage very carefully as the chapters unfold.

Because measure numbers are a pervasive feature in my close analyses, I have developed an abbreviated style of reference, in the form $\text{measure}_{\text{beat}}$. For example, the symbol 2_3 indicates the third beat of measure 2. Generally the word "measure" will not precede the number. I regard measures in $\frac{2}{2}$ and $\frac{6}{8}$ as containing two beats. A measure designation such as 14/16 means that a given chord is prolonged from measure 14 through measure 16, with contrasting content occurring between statements of the chord, whereas the designation 14–16 indicates a continuous prolongation of a single chord without significant internal contrast. The symbol 15|16 indicates measure 16 along with its upbeat. When an x appears among the measure numbers in a music example, it signifies either that the example's content at that point does not actually sound but instead is suggested by the context or that the example displays a hypothetical continuation that the composer does not in fact pursue.