

Beethoven and the Romantic Unique Subject: The Dialectic of Affect and Form in the “Marcia funebre sulla morte d’un eroe,” op. 26, III

Jeffrey Perry

Wenns so komm, wie man es gewöhnt ist,
ist’s in Ordnung: das kann man verstehen.
Kommt es aber anders, ist es ein Wunder.¹

Music and the Romantic “Unique Subject”

Lawrence Kramer has suggested two imperatives that seem to impel Romantic music. Although he is speaking of Schubert’s *Lieder*, his observations are relevant to the genesis of nineteenth-century musical Romanticism in general. Kramer states that the first imperative for Romantic music is “to break away from the harmonic contour of the Classic style, and especially to break the grip of the dominant and its dominants—the cadential circle of fifths— . . . on musical structure.” Of the second imperative, he says that “the purpose [of Romantic music] is to represent the activity of a unique subject, conscious, self-conscious, and un-conscious, whose experience takes shape as a series of conflicts and reconciliations between inner and outer reality.”² To the extent that such a subject is discernible within a given composition, therefore, that composition is an embodiment of the Romantic in music.

¹ Arnold Schoenberg, from text to “*Das Gesetz*” (“The Law”), *Sechs Stücke für Männerchor* op. 35 no. 2. [“If things happen as one is accustomed, things are in order: that we can understand. If things happen otherwise, it is a miracle.”]

² Lawrence Kramer, “The Schubert *Lied*: Romantic Form and Romantic Consciousness,” in *Schubert: Critical and Analytical Studies*, ed. Walter Frisch (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), 201-2.

Kramer identifies harmony as the agency through which this drama of subject and inner/outer realities unfolds in Schubert. The dialectic between Schubert's harmonic innovations and the tonal norms that present a backdrop and active antagonist to these innovations is, for Kramer, at the center of musical Romanticism:

Schubert's harmony repeatedly steps beyond Classical boundaries. Yet the music invokes the Classical context of these Romantic harmonies so strongly that the Classical style retains a substantial lingering authority. Harmony thus becomes a matter of clashing perspectives . . . dialectic rather than systematic. . . . Schubert's Romantic idiom evolves by negating, but never escaping, its Classical origins.³

Kramer's apparently non-Schenkerian view of harmony still allows him to arrive at a cogent, substantive appreciation of Romanticism and how it differs from Classicism. One would expect a refined analytical method informed by Schenkerian techniques to articulate the Classic/Romantic distinction still more lucidly. Although Schenker's own interests in revealing the common roots of all great art were clearly inimical to any attempts to periodicize or subdivide the tonal repertoire, recent applications of Schenker's techniques to Romantic repertoire by McCreless, Stein and others have suggested ways to rehabilitate the notion of Romanticism and make it relevant to analysts.⁴ To generalize, it is in considering the relationship of the deepest middleground levels to the *Ursatz* that the dialectical nature of musical Romanticism becomes clearest; the Romantic middleground often presents a clear challenge to the essential mechanism of eighteenth-century Enlightenment tonality, a challenge that nonetheless functions within the context of that mechanism. It is provocative to consider the more unruly chromatic middleground schemes found in the music of Beethoven, Schubert, Mendelssohn, Schumann, Paganini, Chopin, and Liszt as structural expressions of the Romantic hero's defiance of convention and conformity.

³ Ibid., 203.

⁴ Patrick McCreless, "Schenker and Chromatic Tonicization: a Reappraisal," in *Schenker Studies*, ed. Hedi Siegel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 131-45; Deborah Stein, "Schubert's 'Die Liebe hat gelogen': The Deception of Mode and Mixture," *Journal of Musicological Research* 9 (1989): 109-31.

If the most purely diatonic way to move from the background to the foreground of a piece of music is, as Kramer implies, to nest diatonic arpeggiations and I-V-I divisions within one another, then one embodiment of the Romantic challenge to eighteenth-century diatonicism lies in the presentation of a cycle of thirds, dividing the tonal field into equal segments, as a counterpoise to the I-V-I division of the tonal field, which, with the descending *Urlinie*, determines the background topology of a piece.⁵ If the orderly composing-out of the diatonic, dualistic background is in some way isomorphic with the natural order, promulgated and sustained by a rational, paternal deity, the Romantic composer's musical persona⁶ is a Prometheus or Lucifer standing in heroic, ultimately futile defiance to that order.⁷ One of the analyst's tasks is to indicate the compositional devices by which this defiance is embodied.

***Beethoven's "Marcia funebre sulla morte d'un eroe," op. 26, III:
Dramatis personae***

Beethoven's "Marcia funebre sulla morte d'un eroe," the third movement of the Sonata in A-flat Major, op. 26 is a convenient point from which to begin an investigation of these issues. In this movement, Kramer's unique subject is a dual persona. The two components of the subject are identifiable as (1) Hero (the deceased protagonist) and (2) Mourner, a second-person narrator whose grief is depicted in the outer sections of the movement—and whose *reminiscences* of the Hero's past exploits, perhaps, rather than those exploits themselves, are recalled in the trio. The subject's journey is arduous and chromatic, as summarized in example 1a. The composer moves from the minor tonic on A-flat to the relative major, C-flat

⁵ See Howard Cinnamon, "Tonic Arpeggiation and Successive Equal Third Relations as Elements of Tonal Evolution in the Music of Franz Liszt," *Music Theory Spectrum* 8 (1986): 1-24.

⁶ Edward T. Cone, *The Composer's Voice* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 20-40 and 88-94.

⁷ Schenker's own view of music, at least in his earlier works, makes the evolution, or discovery, of tonal form an heroic act in and of itself. In his *Harmonielehre* Schenker states that musical form rests on "the motif, and the motif alone," whose organizing power was achieved only after "a host of experiments and the toil of many centuries." Heinrich Schenker, *Harmony*, trans. Elisabeth Mann Borgese, ed. Oswald Jonas (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), 4.

Example 1. Beethoven, op. 26, III

1a. Schematic representation of key centers and principal harmonic motions between them

mm. 1 8 9 16 17 19 21 31-38 39-68 (like mm. 1-30) 69-75

III[♭]: I III

A[♭] minor: I III vii^{°7} V I I[♯] (I[♯] etc.) I[♯]

1b. Cross-relation motive, mm. 8-9, 30-31 and 38-39

m. 8 m. 9 m. 30 m. 31 m. 38 m. 39

d8 d8 d8 d8

A8

(mm. 1-8), then at the start of the next passage (m. 9) makes use of mode mixture to shift to the parallel minor of the new key.⁸ That the new key is enharmonically respelled as B, rather than C-flat, is a practical aid to the pianist, but if Treitler⁹ is correct, the sudden move to the sharp side of the circle of fifths (i.e. B minor, two sharps), from the far reaches of the flat side (i.e. C-flat major, seven flats) delivers an affective message to the performer as well—the music, in a state of severe notational depression at the outset, experiences a violent mood swing in m. 9: the music simultaneously moves to the sharp (bright, extrovert) side of the tonal field and to the minor (introverted, affectively intense) mode. Most probably, the mitigation of the Mourner's grief in m. 8 (movement to relative major) is canceled out by a

⁸ I will refer to mm. 1-8, 9-16, 17-21, and 22-30 as the first, second, third, and fourth passages of the movement; the corresponding parts after the trio (mm. 39-46, 47-54, 55-58, and 59-68) as the reprise of the first passage, reprise of the second passage, etc.; and mm. 69-75 as the coda.

⁹ Leo Treitler, "To Worship That Celestial Sound': Motives for Analysis," *Journal of Musicology* 1 (1982): 162-69.

new surge of depression in m. 9; in any case, the fact that the right hand not only remains in a low register throughout mm. 1-8, but in fact *descends* from the E \flat 4 of m. 1 to the C \flat 4 of m. 8 (harmonized with a close position triad in the bass register) effectively limits any parting of the clouds that one might otherwise anticipate as resulting from a shift to the relative major.

The second passage (mm. 9-16) moves the music to the relative major of its new B minor center. This move to the mediant's mediant is suggestive of a cyclical, recursive, symmetrical process, which indeed might have continued on to a tonicization of F major, F minor, A-flat major and so back to A-flat minor. As Schenker has brilliantly illustrated, however, Beethoven situates his chromatic tonicizations of B major and minor firmly within a diatonic framework. The thickly scored bass-register chords that confirmed the movement's first tonicization of C-flat major in m. 8 are replaced by bare octaves on the newest root, D natural.¹⁰ The status of D major as the newest root is negated at the very start of the movement's third passage (anacrusis to m. 17), where the probable yet ambiguous D major tonic of m. 15 becomes a fully diminished seventh chord on D. It is as if D, the leader of this latest revolt against the diatonic order, looking behind itself as it prepares to storm the fortifications of the city and discovers that its followers have deserted it (the bare octaves of m. 16), is immediately captured, chained and laden down with a humiliating, crushing burden (the fully diminished seventh chord of m. 17).

It is tempting to view this movement as the symmetrical presentation of a cycle of ascending minor thirds,¹¹ but in fact Beethoven introduces each member of the cycle in a slightly different way, thus facilitating the ultimate reassertion of diatonic order over chromatic challenges to it. E-flat major, the movement's original dominant, returns in m. 18, but neither a stabilization of V nor forward motion to I is possible until after considerable

¹⁰ The succession of a bare octave by a close position chord in the bass is a prominent enough feature that I will refer to it henceforth as the octave/chord motive. It enters the music with the E \flat anacrusis figure preceding m. 1, and returns at the start of each half-passage—again on E \flat before m. 5, and on F \sharp before m. 9. For extensive discussion of bare octaves as a nineteenth-century motif, see Joseph Kerman, "A Romantic Detail in Schubert's *Schwanengesang*," in *Schubert: Critical and Analytical Studies*, ed. Walter Frisch (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986), 48-64.

¹¹ Albeit an incomplete expression of the cycle—an F \sharp tonic never appears. The complete chromatic thirds cycle is presented in works such as Paganini's Capriccio no. 1 in E major, op. 1 and most famously in Tchaikovsky's Fourth Symphony, first movement.

equivocation in mm. 17-20 between the diminished seventh chord on D and the major triad on E \flat , accompanied by a violent dynamic outburst (indicative of the Mourner's moving on to the next stage in the mourning process?¹²). The music is wrenched away from the relative stability of the E \flat triad on the downbeat of m. 20 by a bare F \flat octave half note on the second beat. This is the second new metric position in which the octave/chord motive has been presented, representing the latest stage in its promotion from anacrusis (mm. 1, 5, 9) to downbeat (m. 16) to syncopation/agogic accent. The F \flat octave moves, via a lead-in figure in sixteenth notes, to the next passage and back to the original tonic, itself at first expressed as a bare double octave in the bass on A \flat , but soon (m. 21, second beat) present in its original voicing as a complete triad.

This fourth passage (mm. 21-30) is in a narrow sense similar to the first (mm. 1-8), but, as I will discuss below, the differences between the two passages are quite significant. The latter passage seems to be the road to recovery, since there is a brief shift to the parallel major (to the less "depressed" form of the tonic triad) in m. 25, and a still more significant juxtaposition of Neapolitan II (B-double-flat major, the "depressed" supertonic) in m. 27 and the dominant seventh chord (reintroducing the pitch B \flat , the "natural" supertonic, without a mediating V $\frac{4}{4}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ motion) in mm. 27-28. The passage (and the first large section of the movement) concludes in m. 30 after a crescendo to an authentic cadence on the tonic triad, A-flat minor, which for the first time spans both treble and bass registers—the top voice is on A \flat 5, which with the cadential progression B \flat 5-C \flat 5-B \flat 5-G \sharp 5 that precedes it in mm. 28-29, represents the only high treble-register pitch activity in the movement so far. At this point it is reasonable to expect any reprise of this opening section to bring the *Urlinie* of the piece back "down to earth"; here, as elsewhere, Beethoven is not especially interested in what is reasonable.

In the middle section, or trio, a remembrance of happier, more reliably diatonic times is signaled by a shift to the parallel mode, A-flat major. Vigorous martial activity (i.e., action, by contrast to the current grief-stricken paralysis of the Mourner) figured prominently in these "happier times," as indicated by the drum-roll and fanfare effects of mm. 31-38. It is

¹² In *On Death and Dying* (New York: MacMillan, 1969), Elizabeth Kübler-Ross gives the stages in the mourning process as (1) denial and isolation, (2) anger, (3) bargaining, (4) depression, and (5) acceptance.

this patch of text-painting that most strongly suggests that the deceased protagonist of the movement is some composite of Prometheus, Achilles, Napoleon, and Beethoven himself, a warlike hero, the *eroe* of the composer's subtitle.¹³ (The degree to which this hero is or is not the hero of the more famous—and more diatonic—*Eroica* funeral march is a topic for another time.) It is here, where the funeral procession seems to pause, that A \flat is presented for the first time as the tonic of a *major* key (although this shift is foreshadowed in m. 25).¹⁴ It is interesting to note how, at the points where the quality of the third scale degree changes from major to minor and back again, Beethoven is typically careful to present the different forms of $\hat{3}$ in different registers. This care has already resulted in an E \flat 3/E \flat 4 (D \flat 4) cross relation in mm. 8-9 during the transition between the second and third passages; here, there is a C \flat /C \sharp cross-relation between m. 30 and m. 31, and a compensating C \sharp /C \flat cross-relation between m. 38 and m. 39, as shown in example 1b. (In addition to the octave/chord motive mentioned above, we may therefore speak in terms of a cross-relation motive.) In mm. 15-17, however, where another change of third occurs, F \sharp and F \flat are juxtaposed in the same register. In the latter passage, however, F \sharp and F \flat are not major and minor chordal thirds of the local “tonic,” but rather an accented passing tone (part of the cadential six-four that adumbrates D major) and the third of a dissonant seventh chord, respectively. This use of register and texture to underline the fact that the C \flat /B tonicization of the first passage and the more fleeting D tonicization implied toward the end of the second passage occupy different structural levels seems to corroborate Schenker's hearing of the movement.¹⁵ Schenker's graphic analysis is shown in example 2.

¹³ See Scott Burnham, *Beethoven Hero* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), esp. 3-9 and 16-18, for Prometheus/Napoleon connections. In *The Beethoven Encyclopedia: His Life and Art from A to Z* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1994), 163-64, Paul Nettl discounts any connection with Ferdinando Paer's opera *Achille*, which Beethoven heard in 1801, apparently *after* having sketched the third movement of Op. 26. Compare Steven Ledbetter's program note to John O'Connor, piano, *Beethoven Piano Sonatas Vol. V* (Telarc CD-80237, 1990), which apparently relies on the testimony of Ferdinand Ries.

¹⁴ For Schenker's understanding of mode mixture, see Heinrich Schenker, *Harmony*, 86-96. Compare the more inclusive model in Cinnamon, 2, fn. 3.

¹⁵ Heinrich Schenker, *Harmony*, 334; cited in Matthew Brown, Douglas Dempster, and Dave Headlam, “The \sharp IV (\flat V) Hypothesis: Testing the Limits of Schenker's Theory of Tonality,” *Music Theory Spectrum* 19, no. 2 (Fall 1997): 166; fig. 40.6 in Heinrich

Example 2. Heinrich Schenker, graphic analysis of Beethoven, op. 26, III¹⁶

The image displays two staves of musical notation with Schenkerian analysis. The upper staff shows measures 6 through 18, with annotations including 'm.', '8, 9', '18.', '17', '18', and '||'. A large bracket labeled 'I' spans from measure 6 to 18. Below the staff, the chord progression is indicated as I, $\frac{3}{4}IV^7$, V, and I, with a parenthetical sequence '(=I - IV - V I)'. Further down, the analysis is labeled '{A₁ - {a₁ - - a₂)'. The lower staff shows measures 19 through 22, with annotations including '(mixture)', '(Trio)', and '-B -'. Above the staff, there are notes with accidentals and Schenkerian symbols: $\frac{3}{4}A_3$, $\frac{3}{4}A_2$, '(=n.n.)', $\frac{3}{4}A_3$, $\frac{3}{4}A_2$, $\frac{3}{4}A_1$, $\frac{3}{4}A_3$, $\frac{3}{4}A_2$, $\frac{3}{4}A_1$. Below the staff, the analysis is labeled '- A₂'.

The Mourner is recalled to the business at hand, i.e., mourning the dead, in m. 39, when the opening music returns, verbatim, with the addition of a seven-measure coda. Even without this coda, the music of mm. 39-68 is *not* “the same” as that of mm. 1-30. The martial trio (mm. 31-38) has presented A-flat for the first time, as a *major* tonic; as the coda in A-flat *major* corroborates, this modal shift is not thereafter to be shelved as a momentary aberration, but rather a significant if less than conclusive *transformation* of the tonic triad. The movement ends with the Mourner still in mourning, but

Schenker, *Free Composition*, vol. 2, trans. and ed. Ernst Oster (New York: Schirmer, 1979).

¹⁶ Schenker, *Free Composition*, fig. 40.6. Cf. fig. 39.2, a graph of Beethoven’s op. 10 no. 3, II. This is another introspective slow movement for which Schenker hears the *Kopftön* $\hat{3}$ supported by a fully diminished seventh (vii^{o7} of V).

with his resolve apparently strengthened by the modal shift and text-painting of the trio.¹⁷

Further, the coda develops the Neapolitan of mm. 27 and 65, thus returning the treble voice to A \flat 4 in m. 73, and thus to what might seem to be the obligatory register of the piece. This question of obligatory register provides further illumination; as shown in example 2, while Schenker has his *Urlinie* unfold from C \flat 5 and B \flat 4 in mm. 17-18, and shows the latter as harmonized by a dividing dominant, he resumes the *Urlinie* from C \flat 6 in m. 29 (and similarly in m. 67) and completes it on A \flat 5 in m. 30 (and in m. 68). The movement's coda reiterates A \flat 5 as the goal pitch of the movement; since it fails to restate the *Urlinie*, at least in its modally unmixed form, in the original, lower register, the coda serves as an affirmation of the higher octave as the *Urlinie*'s final "home."¹⁸ Were it not for the coda, the transfer of the *Urlinie* in mm. 29-30, like the shift to major in the trio, might be perceived as a temporary distancing effect applied to a musical subject defined by the descent from C \flat 5 to A \flat 4 and immovably rooted in the minor mode; the coda reveals that the change of register undergone by the fundamental line in mm. 29-30 has left a permanent trace on the subject.

The irony embodied in the coda is that the latter negates the return to the tonic minor of mm. 39 and 59 but reinforces the registral transfer of the fundamental line effected in mm. 17-18. With respect to both of the defining dimensions of the subject manipulated in the course of the movement (register and mode), Beethoven uses the coda to reassert the more destabilizing of the two possibilities presented in the first section and trio.

Tonal Processes and the Hero's Journey

Despite the presentational distinctions between the tonal centers implied in mm. 1-21, it must be acknowledged that the chromatic thirds cycle represents a byway often trodden in nineteenth-century music.¹⁹ Divorced

¹⁷ "After 1720, the tonality of the trio section [of a ternary movement], in its relation to the tonic of the whole, is one of lowered tension: relative minor and tonic minor predominate." Charles Rosen, *Sonata Forms*, 2d ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 1988), 17.

¹⁸ Heinrich Schenker, *Free Composition*, vol. 2, fig. 40.6.

¹⁹ See the many examples provided in Brown, Dempster, and Headlam, "The \sharp IV (\flat V) Hypothesis."

from the setting described above, the process by which first C-flat major, then B minor, then D major become momentary tonics in mm. 1-30 is an ordered deployment of change of tonic and change of mode, as summarized in example 1a. Many of the most celebrated chromatic odysseys in nineteenth-century music may likewise be described as specific chromatic operations in a specific sequence. Just as Patrick McCreless hears chromatic harmonies in music by Beethoven, Schubert and Brahms as functioning motivically,²⁰ I hear these pathways from one key and mode to another as potential motives whose components are techniques of chromatic alteration and tonicization rather than specific pitches, rhythms or textures. We may symbolize the pattern of tonicization and mode mixture established by mm. 1-17, for instance, as shown in figure 1.

Figure 1. Patterns of tonicization and mode mixture in op. 26, III, mm. 1-17

	(1) a	(2) a'
m. 1	mm. 1-9	mm. 9-17
m (a-flat):	T ₃ → M/m	T ₃ → M [°] 7

The figure indicates departure from an initial minor mode tonic, tonicization of the relative major followed by alteration of the goal triad's quality from major to minor (1), and tonicization of the "new tonic" followed by alteration of the new goal sonority's quality from major triad to diminished seventh (2). If we take (1) as the original form of the motive, *a*, (2) becomes a modified version, *a'*.

By altering motive *a* to *a'* as indicated above, the anticipated goal of D minor in m. 17 is replaced by the fully diminished seventh chord on D. This is the agency through which the tonal hold of A^b is reasserted, a rescue of the movement from the specter of endless depression-ridden aberration. The D diminished seventh chord is important enough that Schenker uses it, although a dissonant sonority, as harmonic support for the C^b that serves as the point of departure for the piece's *Urlinie*.

It is worthwhile, however, to recall that although the chromatic processes embodied in motive *a* suggest a cyclic process, the new key centers that the motive generates—or attempts to generate—are not given

²⁰ Patrick McCreless, "Schenker and Chromatic Tonicization: A Reappraisal," 131-35.

equal weight when actually composed out by Beethoven. Schenker's graph of the piece makes this point very well. The fundamental structure of the movement (or at least of mm. 1-30) is set in motion by a pair of arpeggiations: the rising sixth $E\flat_4-C\flat_5$ in mm. 1-17 is extended into the rising thirteenth $E\flat_4-C\flat_6$ of mm. 19-29, with the tonal interruption of m. 18 answered by the completed $\hat{2}-\hat{1}$ motion of mm. 29-30. Indeed, it is as an illustration of the *Sextzug* that Schenker includes this movement in *Der freie Satz*. He enharmonically renotates mm. 9-16, representing the $F\sharp_4-G\sharp_4-F\sharp_4$ motion that governs the treble in those measures as $G\flat_4-A\flat_4-G\flat_4$, respells the bass $B\sharp_4$ of mm. 9-13 as $C\flat_4$, and introduces the $D\sharp_4$ of m. 16 as $E\flat_4$. The one pitch not so renotated is the $D\sharp_4$ of m. 17. In Schenker's view,²¹ the bass tone $C\flat_4$ in mm. 8-9 is a component of the linear progressions that compose out the initial tonic. The bass $D\sharp_4$ of m. 17 is an analogous composing-out of III via an ascending third progression, completely analogous to the composing-out of I in mm. 1-8 and relating to the movement's tonic primarily through III; however, it also functions as a foreground chromaticization of a middleground diatonic IV that prepares the V of m. 18.²² (It is interesting that in his graphic analysis of the movement Schenker places the $\sharp IV^7$ of m. 17 on a deeper level than the diatonic IV of m. 26.²³)

Schenker's sense of the chromatic middleground as a comprehensible composing-out of the tonic triad is only half of the story, albeit perhaps the conceptually prior half.²⁴ The remainder of this paper will seek to integrate the Schenkerian insight about this movement with a sense of how and to what extent the music embodies Romantic sensibility and Romantic form. This requires only that we shift our focus, using our understanding of norms of tonal harmony and voice leading as one term of a dialectic process, as suggested by Kramer. Indeed, the way in which Schenker represents the $D\sharp_4$

²¹ Compare the relevant passage in Schenker, *Harmony*, 334.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ I am indebted to my colleague David H. Smyth for this observation as well as for his close reading of this paper and his many helpful suggestions during its gestation.

²⁴ Howard Cinnamon observes (p. 3) that "equal division of the octave by successive thirds represents a type of prolongation in which the foreground harmonic relationships that generate it are not referential to the middleground harmony being prolonged." This seems to contradict Schenker's assurance in the present case that despite the perceived disjunction of surface events, they are plausibly explained as contrapuntal composings-out of the diatonic background.

moment just discussed in his graph—providing multiple derivations for what appear to be two statements of the same pitch—suggests that he himself felt that a certain conceptual tension, perhaps born of a dialectic between the imperative of tonal coherence and other factors, inheres in this passage.

The dialectic process is not merely part of how the Romantic composition is to be received, but indeed is inherent in its very workings. As in the present piece, Kramer's unique subject is typically a dual persona. The nature of the relationship between the two parts of the Romantic subject's persona determine the genre to which the work in question belongs; if, as in the third movement of Beethoven's Op. 26, the two components of the subject are identifiable as active protagonist and passive observer, the work exemplifies the heroic mode of Romanticism; but if, as elsewhere, the components of the subject are second-person narrator and estranged double (as in Beethoven's Sonata op. 13 or Schubert's "Die Stadt" and "Der Doppelgänger"), the work exemplifies Romanticism's pathetic mode.²⁵ Although other possible modes of relationship between component parts of the subject may arise, these two seem to be of greatest relevance to the defining phase of musical Romanticism. The heroic and pathetic modes are so closely linked that it is appropriate, for present purposes, to consider them as different expressions of a single genre of Romantic experience.

Contrariwise, to a twentieth-century listener, positivism, a thread that runs throughout the nineteenth-century Romantic sensibility, is likely to stamp an artwork as inferior, no matter how well executed. The positivist hero's universe consists of a series of difficulties he is to surmount, of episodes of disorder for him to bring to order.²⁶ Both positivism and related

²⁵ The expressionism of later German Romantics, and in particular the young Arnold Schoenberg, seems mainly to be an outgrowth of the pathetic genre as influenced by proto-Freudian psychology and psychiatry. There is thus a line of continuity from Goethe's *Sorrows of Young Werther* to Schoenberg's *Book of the Hanging Gardens*; not the least of the achievements of Beethoven and Schubert is the transduction of the pathetic from literature into music.

²⁶ Note the assumption of masculine gender here. Examples of female Romantic heroes (rather than Romantic heroines, who are seldom, if ever, permitted to be true protagonists) are almost entirely lacking in the usual canon of Romantic literature. A close approach is made by Beethoven's Leonora, who must masquerade as a male. Beethoven ultimately chose to use her chosen persona, Fidelio, rather than Leonora herself, as the eponymous protagonist of his opera. Susan McClary has argued that the only route to anything approaching hero, or protagonist, status for women in nineteenth-century music is madness or death. She cites Donizetti's *Lucia di Lammermoor* and

stepchild subgenres of Romanticism such as sentimentalism²⁷ are tedious or repellent to the critical listener of the late twentieth century for the same reason: at the end of the journey, the protagonist emerges essentially unscathed, either having set the world right (in the positivist scenario) or blinking back a few stray tears (in the sentimentalist scenario), but in either case essentially *untransformed*. Most of the Romantic music of the lineage of Beethoven and Schubert, however, bypasses the positivist and sentimentalist world view (which may, indeed, be more the product of a slightly later phase of Romantic thought, embodied by the Biedermeyer culture of Metternich's Europe, than the Enlightenment and Napoleonic decades that shaped the latter two composers' formative years) and remains within the heroic/tragic mode, wherein the hero *is* transformed by his travails, even while occasionally seeming to surmount them.

That the Promethean minor-third cycle of the op. 26 funeral march is, ultimately, a parenthesis within a I-V-I, $\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{1}$ diatonic framework, and is readily explained as a composing-out of the latter, reminds us that Beethoven's aesthetic is the product of a Classical-Romantic dialectic. What is most interesting about the movement as Romantic music, however, is the degree to which the musical embodiment of the unique subject (which we may identify not with any single presentation of the theme or tonality, but rather with its history throughout the movement) struggles against the diatonic norm and undergoes essential transformation.²⁸ The salient details of this transformation are as follows:

(1) The elaboration, both in the trio (mm. 31-38) and in the coda (mm. 71-73), of the first section's three-measure excursion into the high treble register (mm. 28-30), reflected in Schenker's analysis by the transfer of the *Urlinie* to this register.

Strauss's *Salome* as examples of the former path, Bizet's *Carmen* as an example of the latter. Susan McClary, *Feminine Endings* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), 56-67, 98-101.

²⁷ The central tenets of sentimentalism are difficult to discover, but the genre seems largely to involve the manipulation of affective signs primarily in order to impact the emotional state of the audience, for which telling the story of a Romantic protagonist's struggles serves as pretext.

²⁸ Scott Burnham devotes considerable attention to the transformation of the principal theme of the first movement of the *Eroica* Symphony for just this reason; at the opening of the movement, the theme is not yet a theme: "It will have to wait until the coda before it is granted . . . themehood." Scott Burnham, *Beethoven Hero*, 8.

(2) The promotion of the octave/chord motive from an incidental detail (anacrusis to m. 5) to a central feature of Beethoven's composing-out of the thirds cycle (m. 16) which, with the problem of how the tonic will be regained, governs the main body of the movement. This feature remains uncontradicted in the return of the opening material (m. 54); the crucial D^{\sharp}/E^{\flat} never supports a stable triad.

(3) The appearance of A-flat as a major tonic in the trio (mm. 31-38). Beethoven's emphasis on A-flat major at the movement's close (mm. 70-75) would seem to suggest a triumphant (or at least consoling) shift from a minor to a major tonality in the course of the movement, but since the patches of A-flat major (the trio plus the coda) are overwhelmingly overbalanced by the A-flat minor passages (all of the opening section of the movement plus mm. 39-67), the final impression is of an uneasily mixed-modal tonality, neither comfortably major nor fully resigned to minor. Further, the upward thrusting of the trio is *not* taken up in the reprise of the first section, and remains an undeveloped, even aberrant detail.

Unique Subject and Essential Melody

One of the voices in the right-hand chords of mm. 1-8 must be the principal melodic voice. If, as Kramer states, "the purpose [of Romantic music] is to represent the activity of a unique subject . . . whose experience takes shape as a series of conflicts and reconciliations between inner and outer reality,"²⁹ the question of where the actual melodic line (as distinct from the *Urlinie*) of the movement is to be found adds a further dimension to the search for the unique subject. Although it is simplistic to identify the principal melodic voice with Kramer's unique subject, the history of the conflicts and reconciliations between the melodic line and other components of the movement's voice-leading structure ought to be suggestively isomorphic with the work's narrative of heroism and mourning.

Searching for the melody is worthwhile because it raises a crucial topic, namely that of doubling—doubling both in its musical and in its literary, Romantic sense. The notion of the *Doppelgänger* appears in several guises: first, in the continual shadowing of the melody by its discant line (to the point that there is no local evidence indicating which of the two lines is the principal one); second, in the continual concealment of both moving parts by

²⁹ Kramer, 201-2.

a cover tone; finally, in the antiphony between moving lines in the treble and the moving line in the bass, which echoes the treble in mm. 2, 6, 10, and 14.

In mm. 1-13, the principal melodic voice is clearly not the top voice; the ostinato E_b4 of the beginning is a cover tone. It is significant, given the octave/chord motive discussed above, that the only sure melodic focus in these measures is the dominant anacrusis: after the octave E_b upbeat to m. 1, the melody is concealed in the web of upper voices making up the close position A-flat minor triad; the anacrusis on the last beat of m. 4 is again on the E_b octave, and the downbeat immediately following is again a tonic chord in close position. Examples 3a through 3d show the various possible pathways from this anacrusis to the downbeat of m. 1. The best choice from among these four possible beginnings must be 3c, with reservations. An attempt to justify this choice and explain the reservations that accompany it will reveal still more about the relationship of voice leading and texture to affect and topic in this germinal work of early Romanticism.

Example 3. Possible beginnings of the principal melodic voice, Beethoven, op. 26, III

The image displays four musical examples, labeled (a) through (d), each showing a different melodic pathway from an anacrusis on the last beat of measure 4 to the downbeat of measure 1. The music is written in the bass clef with a key signature of three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat) and a common time signature. Each example shows a sequence of notes and rests across four measures, with the final note of the fourth measure being a half note on the E_b octave, which then leads into the downbeat of the first measure of the following measure.

Comparison of funeral marches by Beethoven and other nineteenth-century composers suggests that a relatively low anacrusis leading to a relatively high downbeat constitutes a *topos* of ritualized mourning—suggestive, perhaps, in a sublimated way, of the wailing voices of mourners.

The examples from nineteenth-century literature shown in example 4 indicate that even when the initial anacrusis does not budge immediately, its eventual destination tends to be a melody note higher than itself. As shown in example 4a, the opening of the *Eroica* funeral march is a rather intricate composing-out of the *topos*. In the “Marche funèbre” from Chopin’s piano sonata in B-flat minor, op. 35 (example 4b), the entire passage from the downbeat of m. 1 to the third beat of m. 3 comprises an expanded anacrusis that finally ascends on the upbeat to m. 4. Example 4c shows the start of Siegfried’s funeral march from the third act of *Götterdämmerung*. In this interlude, which constitutes perhaps the most extensive composing-out of the funeral march *topos* in the literature, a three-bar anacrusis ascends to the C^b4 on the fourth downbeat of the excerpt, moving progressively upward to E^b4 (second beat of the last measure of the excerpt), G^b4 and C^b5 (not shown) before cadencing on B^b4 (seventh downbeat of the interlude), setting into motion an extensive review of Siegfried’s life and deeds, *leitmotif* by *leitmotif*, that takes its registral trajectory from this initial ascent. In example 4d, the “Trauermarsch” that begins Mahler’s fifth symphony is seen to represent a similar example of postponement of the expected ascent from an initial anacrusis that, as in the Wagner example, initiates a melodic arpeggiation of the tonic triad.

The foregoing examples weigh the evidence strongly in favor of example 3c or 3d as representing the start of the principal melodic voice of the op. 26 funeral march—especially since we can hear 3c (the leap of a minor sixth) as an intensification of 3d (the leap of a perfect fourth), the former is appealing as a starting downbeat tone. Our choice of the former is further guided by Schenker’s graphic analysis of the movement, which is intended, among other things, to illustrate the variety of ways in which a certain type of linear intervallic pattern, the sixth progression, can be composed out. He interprets mm. 1-17 (the first and second passages in my analysis, and the downbeat initiating the third) as being governed by the ascending sixth arpeggiation E^b4-C^b5. This sixth is the means by which the *Kopfton* is established in m. 17; the descent from *Kopfton* to tonic is interrupted at B^b4 in m. 18.

Example 4. Openings to representative nineteenth-century funeral marches

4a. Beethoven, Symphony No. 3 op. 55 (*Eroica*), II

Vln. I *sotto voce*
pp

4b. Chopin, “Marche Funèbre” from Sonata in B-flat Minor op. 35

Lento
p

4c. Wagner, Siegfried’s Funeral March (*Götterdämmerung*, Act III, 2)

Feierlich.
ff
dim.
p

4d. Mahler, Symphony No. 5, I (“Trauermarsch”)

Trumpet
p < *sf* *p* < *sf* *p* < *sf* < *sf* *molto f*

A second attempt to use this arpeggiation to initiate a successful unfolding of the *Urlinie* descent begins with a second Eb4, not given a measure number in Schenker's graph but obviously occurring in m. 20, in the second-to-highest voice. The Cb that completes this second *Sextzug* in m. 29 is not Cb5, but rather Cb6, a "correction" whose repositioning of the movement's *Urlinie* and its affective implications has been discussed above. Schenker uses slurs to show that this compound sixth is indeed to be considered equivalent with respect to function and structural level to the simple sixth of mm. 1-17. This time the fundamental descent from the *Kopfton* concludes unimpeded in m. 30.

Throughout the movement, the ascending sixth is the way in which the *Kopfton* is introduced, first as shown by Schenker's Eb4-Cb5 slur of mm. 1-17, and next in mm. 20-28 through a less deeply embedded pair of unfoldings that fills in the compound sixth of mm. 20-29, as the Fb4 of m. 20 leaps up to the Db5 of m. 27 and thence to the Bb5 of m. 28, thus preparing the *Kopfton* Cb6 of the next measure. Likewise, descending thirds are either subordinate patterns embedded within the governing sixths or fundamental descents to the tonic, in which case they are either interrupted as in mm. 17-18 and 32-33 or complete as in mm. 29-30, 37-38 and 67-68. By selecting the Eb3-Cb4 interval shown at the start of example 3c as marking the principal melodic voice, we mirror the large-scale structure of the movement, as embodied by the two Eb-Cb sixth progressions of mm. 1-17 and 20-30, in the movement's smallest detail.

In certain instrumental and vocal textures the principal melodic voice is routinely found in an inner voice; this may be especially true of eighteenth-century band music, scored as it mostly would have been for woodwinds and for valveless brasses, which were relegated in large part to playing ostinati and pedal tones due to their relatively limited gamuts. The notion of this movement as a piano realization of a military band playing a slow dirge is made far less fanciful by the treatment given it by Beethoven himself in his incidental music to *Leonore Prohaska*, WoO 96, for a play by J. F. L. Duncker, secretary to the King of Prussia. For a Vienna performance of this play (which, according to Thayer, "tells the story of a maiden who, disguised

as a soldier, fought through the war of liberation”) in the fall of 1815,³⁰ Beethoven rescored the entire movement for an orchestra of paired flutes, clarinets in A, bassoons, and horns in D and E, plus timpani and strings. In order to fit in with the other numbers he composed for the play³¹ (and also, certainly, to make the music playable by what were probably less than solo-quality pit band players), Beethoven transposed the piece to B minor, substituted a *dal segno al fine* indication for the written-out repeat of the op. 26 original, and cut the first three of the coda’s seven measures. In the 1815 scoring, Beethoven uses the winds extensively to make the association with military band music explicit—such a band, and not a symphony orchestra, would, after all, be the likely performing medium of a Napoleonic-era *marcia funebre sulla morte d’un eroe*.

In the orchestral version of the march, the beginning of which is shown in short score in example 5, the usual rule of thumb that places the principal melodic line in the first violins is of no help, since except during the pivotal action of mm. 17-21 and 26-30, the upper strings are relegated to the role of cadential punctuation. Beethoven assigns the two moving upper voices (i.e., the two voices that begin on A \flat and C \flat in example 3, now B \sharp and D \sharp) to the bassoons, doubling them in the clarinets an octave higher; the octaves on the dominant cover tone (now F \sharp) are given to the first and third horns, and doubled an octave higher in the flutes. Horns two and four are available to double the two moving inner treble lines at the lower octave, in unison with the bassoons. It is conventional to use the fourth horn for harmonic support, i.e., to double the timpani in a general way, in so doing performing an extremely simplified version of the bass line; when the fourth horn is used for such a purpose, only the third horn is available to double one of the treble parts. The line that Beethoven chooses to double is the one that begins on D \sharp , the third scale degree. This line is equivalent to example 3c, the line we selected above as bearing the principal melodic voice. Note that by

³⁰ [Alexander Wheelock,] *Thayer’s Life of Beethoven*, ed. and rev. Elliott Forbes (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964), 619. See Forbes’s note on the probable date of this performance.

³¹ The four numbers Beethoven composed for the play are (1) Krieger-Chor (unaccompanied male chorus), (2) Romanze (soprano and harp, tempo “In gehender Bewegung”), (3) Melodram (glass harmonica with spoken cues, tempo “Feierlich doch nicht schleppend”), and (4) Trauermarsch (orchestra, tempo “In gehender annehmlicher Bewegung”).

starting with the full tonic chord, and not simply octaves on the dominant scale degree, Beethoven alters the character of the line; the sense of an ascent to the anacrusis that is lost by filling in the initial octave in this fashion is somewhat restored by the entrance of the timpani and bass on the downbeat.

Despite the slight weighting of the *Prohaska* scoring towards the upper of the two moving lines of example 3, for Beethoven in Op. 26 these two lines exist largely in tandem, as halves of a whole. If in the original piano version of the march the principal melodic line is to be associated with the music's unique subject, that subject is essentially dual, provided with its own *Doppelgänger* throughout much of the movement; the C \flat line of example 3c and the A \flat line of example 3d form an all but inseparable pair, the one the discant to the other. When this coupling seems about to end in mm. 7-8, as the cover tone finally descends, forcing the inner voices down with it, the new octave anacrusis to m. 9 reestablishes the melodic concealment of m. 1 below a new pitch, F \sharp .

In some ways, it is not the melodic double but rather the dominant cover tone that is the most interesting manifestation of the concept of doubling in the piece. Example 6 synthesizes the E \flat cover tone's journey throughout the movement. This example shows notes from the bass line, the cover tone line, and example 3c. The E \flat sounds in the uppermost part almost continuously in the first passage (as does its transposition, F \sharp , in the second passage), but as a result of the outburst of mm. 17 it ends up in the inner voice of the dividing dominant chord of mm. 18-20. It should be noted that the pathos-ridden F \flat of m. 19 is in fact an upper neighbor to this inner-voice E \flat and not part of a passing tone motion from the upper voice; it is indeed the device whereby the E \flat reclaims its upper-voice position in m. 20. In the next passage, E \flat reappears as a cover tone over the A-flat minor tonic triad (this parallelism with m. 1 is a surface manifestation of the two-part form of mm. 1-30), retains its position in mm. 22-24 as well as in m. 25, where mixture transforms the tonic triad from minor into major, and then, as a consequence of the series of unfoldings in mm. 26-28, again finds itself in an inner voice, with C \flat on top.

The two E \flat lines that depart from the anacrusis to m. 1 are clearly octave doubles of one another; they proceed to shadow the melody and interact with

Example 6. Placement of E \flat cover tone in (a) mm. 1-24 and (b) mm. 21-29

6a.

mm. 1-4 17-20 21-24

6b.

21 25 29

(b) 5 5 (b) 3

(b) (b) 5

the bass in complex ways. In m. 2, the dominant triad is arpeggiated upwards from E \flat 2 to G \sharp 3, thus forcing the lower of the two right-hand E \flat s out of the way. To hear the bass countermelody of m. 2 in this way (i.e., as reaching into the right hand on the fourth beat) allows this passage to adumbrate the unfolding tenths of mm. 26-28 in Schenker's graph, the passage that accomplishes the ascent to the *Urlinie* in its final register. The bass countermelody, then, compels the lower of the two cover-tone lines in the right hand to move; the upper cover tone on E \flat 4, however, only budes in m. 7, when it descends to the goal of the movement's first melodic third progression, C \flat 4. Upon its first appearance in m. 2, then, the bass countermelody uncouples the cover tone from its double; upon its second appearance in m. 6, it sets the hitherto unmoving cover tone in motion toward the first of its melodic goals. Judging from the fact that the left-hand countermelody arpeggiates an E \flat major triad in m. 2 but an E \flat minor triad in m. 6, the interaction between cover tone and bass countermelody affects the equanimity of both.

To continue exploring this melody/bass interaction, the second passage (mm. 9-16) is, as noted above, in many ways parallel to the first, but to judge from Beethoven's dynamic markings its meaning and position in the narrative of the movement as a whole is quite different. In place of the mostly flat affect of mm. 1-8 (an initial dynamic of piano, one slight crescendo in m. 5, and back down to piano at the upbeat to m. 7), the dynamic situation in mm. 9-16 is volatile, dominated by crescendi and sudden returns to piano, the base dynamic of the entire movement.³² The texture here is thicker than in the analogous part of the first passage; the lower of the two cover-tone lines (now on F \sharp , the local dominant) does not budge while the bass countermelody (now itself doubled in octaves) moves into the right hand on the fourth beat of m. 10. When the bass countermelody in mm. 10 and 14 is the only moving voice, it is as if this hitherto subliminal whisper comes, in mm. 9-14, somewhat closer to the forefront of the conscious mind, breaking through all suppressive barriers and finally attaining overt expression in m. 20. In mm. 9-15 alien pitches—first F \sharp , then E \natural —replace the E \flat cover tone of the beginning before cadencing on the upper two of the three unaccompanied D \natural s of m. 16. The latter “chord” is significant as one of the only places in the entire movement where paired lines in parallel thirds actually converge on the same pitch; this convergence gives m. 17 its unusual power.

Once equanimity is restored in m. 21, the relationship between melody and bass countermelody is at first a repeat of that of mm. 1-8. The former, however, begins at the anacrusis to m. 23 to take a more explicitly melodic path. The downbeat of m. 23 bears the movement's first and only trill indication, which, with the *sforzando* that mainly affects the left-hand countermelody, is a sort of an aftershock recalling the outburst of m. 20, as well as a premonition of the mounting intensity of mm. 26-30. (Note as well the lengthening of the downbeat C \flat and the addition of a passing tone to m. 23 as compared to m. 3.) In the latter passage, the music rapidly ascends

³² At least two discrepancies in the dynamic markings for mm. 9-16 exist between Ludwig van Beethoven, *Complete Piano Sonatas, Vol. I*, ed. Heinrich Schenker (New York: Dover Publications, 1975), 224, and other performing editions; for example, see Ralph Turek, *Analytical Anthology of Music*, 2d ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1992), 266. Schenker gives a forte at m. 10, Turek's source a sforzando; the crescendo-decrescendo given by Turek in mm. 13-14 is absent in the Schenker edition, which leaves the goal of the crescendo indication at the anacrusis to m. 14 to the performer's understanding.

from its depressive tessitura via a series of melodic unfoldings in the right hand; the left hand supports and shadows the right with fragments of the bass countermelody; indeed, the block chords in the right hand in mm. 27 and 28 plus the dominant of m. 29 imitate the lowest notes of the left-hand arpeggios in mm. 26-28, unfolding the sequence $D\flat_2-B\flat_2-G\sharp_2$ in mm. 26-27, corrected to $D\flat_5-B\flat_5-G\sharp_5$ in mm. 27-29. (The two *Urlinie* chords on beats 1 and 3 of m. 29 are thus in a sense interpolations.) Taken together, the bass with its fragments of countermelody and the right hand with its chordal unfolding in mm. 26-28 represent an unchecked increase in the intensity and imbalance of the Mourner's grief; the apparent restoration of emotional control in m. 21 was premature, to say the least. The appearance of a return to some semblance of self-control in this measure is clearly a pathetic pretense that the Mourner can maintain for only a few measures. All divergences of mm. 22-25 from mm. 2-5 ought to be performed with this notion of reprise-as-façade in mind. If, as Schenker's analysis shows, m. 21 is the start of the reprise or consequent of a two-part form with an important part to play in the emotional narrative of the movement, then this reprise is a formal obligation: one that proves, in more than one sense, impossible to honor.

Before completing the imitative pattern, which should ascend to $G\sharp$ on the last beat of m. 29, the right hand states the two chords that make explicit the *Urlinie*. Were it not for these two chords, the $E\flat$ dominant seventh on the fourth beat of m. 29 would arrive (a) on the downbeat of m. 29 and (b) one octave higher. By moving the $E\flat$ seventh chord from the downbeat to the last beat of the measure, the *Urlinie* chords, which arrive at the crest of the dynamic wave governing mm. 26-30, derail the runaway emotional train that has already frustrated the Mourner's attempt to return to the seemingly show of public grieving of m. 1; by appearing in this register (with a soprano line on $C\flat_6$ and $B\flat_5$ rather than in the higher octave that is the goal of the series of unfoldings in mm. 26-28), they literally bring the right-hand material back down to earth, or at any rate prevent it from drifting further away into the Empyrean. The left hand is suitably chastened and reverts to providing unobtrusive bass support in mm. 29 and 30.

The coda (anacrusis of m. 69 to m. 75) synthesizes the turmoils of the entire movement. The right hand, as before in parallel thirds, first leads from $B\flat_4$ down by step to the by-now inevitable $E\flat_4$ cover tone, in so doing presenting a kind of brusque negation of the unfoldings in mm. 26-28 and

64-66 (the corresponding section of the reprise). Meanwhile, in the tenor voice, above a tonic pedal in quarter notes, a last echo of the left-hand countermelodies of the march's main body makes a stepwise ascent from C \sharp 3 to A \flat 3 that is in rhythmic unison with the right-hand descent. This simultaneous ascent and descent (suggestive, perhaps, of the conundrum faced by the Mourner, who must recall both the past glory and the irrevocable absence of the Hero) is immediately repeated in invertible counterpoint, although this time the left hand has the descending line, which leads all the way past E \flat 3, its expected goal, down to C \sharp 3. The right hand meanwhile rises, again by step, from C \sharp 5 to A \flat 5, returning the music to the register of m. 68 and reiterating the final pitch of the *Urlinie*. The Neapolitan sonority of mm. 27 and 65 returns in the second half of m. 72 over a tonic pedal, moving first to the leading tone, G \sharp , before resolving to A \flat on the downbeat of m. 73. The B \flat -G \sharp diminished third in the top voice, harmonized with \flat II 6 over a bass tonic pedal and leading to I (A \flat in the soprano) suggests a kind of plagal cadence, which seems to stress the fact that this return to the higher register (and to the major tonic), although unnatural, is inevitable. The remainder of the coda reviews the structure of the movement as articulated by register in roughly reverse chronological order. Measures 72 and 73 return the music to the register that, according to Schenker, is the "obligatory" one, and the one in which according to his graph it completes itself in mm. 67-68. The next gesture (mm. 73-74) repeats this formula an octave lower, returning the principal melodic voice to the register that would have been the proper target for the *Urlinie* in its first interrupted appearance in mm. 17-18; finally, in mm. 74-75 the tonic chord is restored to its original voicing and register, with the singular difference that it is the tonic of A-flat major rather than A-flat minor.

One final detail may, indeed, be most telling. The movement ends with four iterations of the A-flat major tonic (example 7a). The tonic scale degree, present in the uppermost voice in the first iteration, is absent from the uppermost voice in the second and third; in the fourth and last iteration of the chord, the missing tonic reappears in the tenor voice. The composite melodic line this implies is presented in example 7b; a final $\hat{3}$ - $\hat{1}$ motion unfolds beneath the eternal E \flat 4, suggesting a final entwining of essential melody and cover tone. Example 7c, showing underlying linear relationships in this passage, is presented for comparison purposes.

Example 7. The last three measures of the movement

7a)

7b)

7c)

Conclusions: Linear Operations and the Themes of Romantic Music

At first appearance, the apparatus of Schenkerian analysis and the tropes and topics of less score-driven interpretation of the music of the nineteenth century would appear to represent two mutually exclusive filters through which to experience and reflect upon the repertoire exemplified by the present piece. As I have attempted to indicate, however, the workings of tonality as understood in the light of Schenker's analyses and commentaries have a great deal to offer musicians and scholars seeking to enhance their appreciation of the affective and literary context of Beethoven's music; contrariwise, an understanding of this context can provide analysts with an aesthetically and historically sound basis for their work, which is no less a

task of critical evaluation and personal judgment than that of the literary scholar.³³

In particular, because they tend to enrich and conceal simple voice leading structures, the various Schenkerian linear operations—registral transfer, arpeggiations, unfolding, voice exchange, motion from an inner voice, and reaching over, to name the most commonly explored—suggest myriad isomorphisms with the themes of self and subject in the Romantic literary mythos, themes well known to Beethoven either through his direct experience with the literature and dramaturgy of his day (for example, Goethe's *Sorrows of Young Werther*, Paer's *Achilles*, and Duncker's *Leonore Prohaska*) or through a more diffuse *Zeitgeist*. To make note of such isomorphisms is not to impute programmatic value to linear and harmonic operations; rather, it is to be aware of the patterns, and often the rituals, that underlie complex and powerful musical utterances, whether emotionally or formalistically conceived and received. Indeed, rituals such as funeral marches are powerful topics precisely because they join deep feeling with predetermined structure. A funeral march can channel emotion without fully containing it; how and when emotion overflows the barriers presented by ritual can provide a potent model of artistic form. The tension between private grief and public mourning suggests a musical dialectic between formalistic norm and the complications of context that—as Beethoven aptly demonstrates—may play out quite effectively in musical terms.

³³ Gary Don, in “Goethe, Boretz and the ‘Sensuous Idea’,” *Perspectives of New Music* 34, no. 1 (Winter 1996): 132, eloquently defends analysis in the Schenkerian tradition as an interpretive act by stating, “If a Schenkerian graph represents the true shape of the masterwork . . . it follows that there can be only one ‘correct’ graph. If we were to accept this ideal, then our act of comparing graphs, instead of being an intellectually stimulating exchange . . . would degenerate into a desperate attempt to legitimize our own graph by besmirching the legitimacy of everyone else’s graph.”